

GENDER AND WOMEN'S STUDIES:
SITUATED ACADEMIC
MARGINALIZATION

A THESIS SUBMITTED TO
THE GRADUATE SCHOOL OF SOCIAL SCIENCES
OF
MIDDLE EAST TECHNICAL UNIVERSITY

BY

CANSU DAYAN

IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS
FOR
THE DEGREE OF MASTER OF SCIENCE
IN
GENDER AND WOMEN'S STUDIES

SEPTEMBER 2016

Approval of the Graduate School of Social Sciences

Prof. Dr. Tülin Gençöz
Director

I certify that this thesis satisfies all the requirements as a thesis for the degree of Master of Science in Gender and Women's Studies.

Prof. Dr. Yıldız Ecevit
Head of Department

This is to certify that we have read this thesis and that in our opinion it is fully adequate, in scope and quality, as a thesis for the degree of Master of Science.

Prof. Dr. Mehmet C. Ecevit
Supervisor

Examining Committee Members

Assoc. Prof. Dr. İlknur Yüksel-Kaptanoğlu (Hacettepe Univ., SRM) _____

Prof. Dr. Mehmet C. Ecevit (METU, SOC) _____

Prof. Dr. Ayşe Gündüz Hoşgör (METU, SOC) _____

I hereby declare that all information in this document has been obtained and presented in accordance with academic rules and ethical conduct. I also declare that, as required by these rules and conduct, I have fully cited and referenced all material and results that are not original to this work.

Name, Last name : Cansu Dayan

Signature :

ABSTRACT

GENDER AND WOMEN’S STUDIES: SITUATED ACADEMIC MARGINALIZATION

Dayan, Cansu

M.S., Department of Gender and Women’s Studies

Supervisor: Prof. Dr. Mehmet C. Ecevit

September 2016, 115 pages

Gender and Women’s Studies graduate program is an institution of knowledge production and an area of political action with an almost 30-year-history in Turkey. Different from the mainstream academic disciplines, GWS resides in an interdisciplinary vantage point which makes accounts of the patriarchal system and, in a wider scope, of the world from women’s lenses. Nonetheless, it advocates a shared political agenda needed in order to transform the personally experienced inequalities into politically acquired rights. As GWS has its origins in feminist thought and action, these programs are directly and naturally supposed to be involved with feminist epistemology and methodology. When the historical process of GWS in Turkey is considered, it can be seen that feminism and academia have mutually marginalized each other from the beginning. This thesis discusses the situation of GWS within academia with a critical Feminist Standpoint Theory approach from the aspect of academic marginalization and analyses how GWS graduate programs can be thought as a field with a twofold epistemic superiority with regard to “better accounts of social reality”, as an academic marginal of academia. In this regard, the findings of the field study based

on semi-structured in-depth interviews with 17 academics of GWS programs from two distinctive universities are shared and discussed.

Keywords: Gender and Women's Studies, Feminist Standpoint Theory, Situated Academic Marginalization, Feminist epistemology and methodology

ÖZ

TOPLUMSAL CİNSİYET VE KADIN ÇALIŞMALARI: KONUMLANDIRILMIŞ AKADEMİK MARJİNALLİK

Dayan, Cansu

Yüksek Lisans, Toplumsal Cinsiyet ve Kadın Çalışmaları Anabilim Dalı

Tez Yöneticisi: Prof. Dr. Mehmet C. Ecevit

Eylül 2016, 115 sayfa

Toplumsal Cinsiyet ve Kadın Çalışmaları Anabilim Dalı, Türkiye’de yaklaşık 30 yıllık tarihiyle bir bilgi ve politika üretim alanıdır. Anaakım akademik disiplinlerden kendini bir toplumsal hareketin akademik ayağı ve bununla bağlantılı olarak da politik bir duruşa sahip olma özellikleriyle ayırarak konumlandırılan TCKÇ sadece bir ataerkil sistem eleştirisi değil daha geniş ölçekli ontolojik, epistemolojik ve metodolojik toplumsal gerçeklik sorgulamaları yapan interdisipliner bir programdır. Buna ek olarak, TCKÇ, bilgi üretim sürecinin hiyerarşisiz ve etkileşimsel yöntemlerle, kesişimsellikleri ve öznellikleri dikkate alan bireysel deneyimlerden doğru yapılması ve bu bireysel olarak deneyimlenmiş eşitsizliklerden ortak bir politika üretilmesi gerektiği düşüncesiyle anaakım akademik anlayışa meydan okuma ve değerlerden arındırılmış olduğu varsayılan nesnellik epistemolojisiyle toplumsal gerçekliğin anlaşılamayacağı yaklaşımıyla da toplumsal cinsiyeti göz ardı eden mevcut bilim anlayışını dönüştürme iddiasındadır. İtici gücünü feminist düşünce ve eylemden aldığı için bu programların doğrudan ve doğal olarak feminist epistemoloji ve metodoloji ile iç içe olması beklenir. Ancak TCKÇ’nin Türkiye’deki tarihsel gelişimine bakıldığında, en başından bu yana feminizm ve akademinin karşılıklı olarak çeşitli sebeplerle birbirlerini ötekileştirdikleri

görülebilmektedir. Bu tez Toplumsal Cinsiyet ve Kadın Çalışmaları Anabilim Dalı'nın Türkiye akademisindeki yerini Feminist Duruş Kuramı bakış açısıyla 'akademik marjinallik' bağlamında tartışmayı hedeflemektedir. Buna göre, Türkiye'deki iki üniversitenin Toplumsal Cinsiyet ve Kadın Çalışmaları Anabilim Dalı öğretim üyeleriyle yapılmış olan toplam 17 tane yarı-yapılandırılmış derinlemesine mülakat ışığında, TCKÇ anabilim dallarının nasıl konumlandırılmış bir akademik marjinalliğe sahip olduğu ve bu marjinalliğin "gerçekliği daha iyi anlatan" epistemik bir üstünlüğü nasıl sağladığı analiz edilmiştir.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Toplumsal Cinsiyet ve Kadın Çalışmaları, Feminist Duruş Kuramı, Akademik Ötekilik, Feminist Epistemoloji ve Metodoloji

To ÖZGECAN ASLAN and ALİ İSMAİL KORKMAZ

In The Name Of All Resisting Identities

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I have been aware of the fact from the very beginning that master's in an interdisciplinary field would never be easy. However, I have not thought it would be so difficult, neither. I have plumbed the depths for million times during this process, I have risen from my ashes as much, and I believe it might not have been such painful, but anyway, it has been and is over now. I would like to thank, at first, the universe for making it so hard and painful for me, for hitting me severely to the ground in tougher times and teaching me how to get beyond the limits of my surname. Thanks for reminding me that this is the way to 'become'.

I would like to thank my dear supervisor Prof. Mehmet C. Ecevit, first, for his effort to prevent me from dropping out the program during Gezi Resistance. I am grateful to him for his patience in familiarizing me with the concepts, frameworks and viewpoints that I had never heard and felt the courage to step in before. Although it has been a long and weary way, I appreciate his guidance and companionship during the whole process. This journey would have been meaningless without him and his valuable effort.

Also, I would like to thank Prof. Yıldız Ecevit for both her academic and personal contributions to my improvement during not only my thesis but also my whole master's journey. I have learnt a lot, experienced a lot and improved a lot while both working and studying with her.

I would also like to express my gratefulness to Prof. Ayşe Gündüz Hoşgör for her precious and continuous support, encouragement and motivation in all phases of my thesis study. Her warm and positive attitude has made this painful and difficult process not only bearable but also surmountable for me. I can never forget the feeling of tranquility she leaves on me and I especially thank for her big hugs and smiles!

I owe a huge debt of gratitude to my second family in Ankara: İlknur Yüksel-Kaptanoğlu, Nizam Kaptanoğlu and Arjen Can Kaptanoğlu. It would definitely be much

tougher for me to complete this process without their existence, support, encouragement and love. I thank a lot for all midnight calls, motivating and encouraging speeches and specially for the feeling that they are always and everywhere with me.

Of course, I would like to thank my family, especially my nephews, for their patience, endurance, love and trust in all circumstances! Thanks for holding me up whenever I feel like falling down and loving and supporting me with all my failures. Thanks for feeling my trouble and understanding it.

Moreover, I would like to thank all academics I interviewed without whom this journey would be impossible and meaningless. They have shared not only their time and energy but also experiences and knowledge accumulated throughout their lives. I have realized the depth of GWS from within their eyes and got my motivation out of their commitment and dedication.

Also, I thank Hilal Arslan for her determination in foreseeing the happy ending of this journey and her obstinacy in convincing me to this end, as well. Many thanks for all coffee breaks, force-feedings, waffle and beer sessions! Thanks for the longest speeches ever, and for persuading me not to give up.

Much of my gratitude and thanks go of course to my friends Sezgin Şen, Sade Öztürk, Saniye Yıldız Öner, Ayşe Özseri, Gönül Yakabasan Oluç, İlayda Yiğit, Ali İbrahim Bostancıoğlu, Sevinç Eskiocak, Selçuk Oğuz and Tülin Eraslan who have never left me alone during the process.

I would also like to thank a lot Sema Aydın for her priceless support and unforgettable motivation; Naile Duman for her encouragement and mentorship; our seminar group for their productive criticisms and discussions; and of course the great quatro ever: C4-444, especially Saadet Baltacı for her patience, motivating speeches and midnight breaks, specifically midnight visits to Devrim Stadium, and for feeling and sharing my excitement!

Last, I would like to thank my favourite: Assoc. Prof. Funda Civelekoğlu. This thesis is my debt and thus present to her. I am undescribably happy and grateful that she is in my life and with me. It would be impossible to complete the whole journey without her ineffable effort and support. Thanks a lot for prohibiting me from thinking negatively, for being there all the time especially when I feel completely down, failed and alone, for feeling my despair and instilling hope and self-confidence, for making me laugh even in my most unbearable moments, and for being both my instructor and my best friend ever. I thank her very much for every single moment she shares with me! Thanks!

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PLAGIARISM.....	iii
ABSTRACT	iv
ÖZ.....	vi
DEDICATION	viii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	ix
TABLE OF CONTENTS	xii
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS	xiv
CHAPTER	
1. INTRODUCTION	1
1.1. Background and Theoretical Foundation of the Study	2
1.2. Aims and Objectives of the Study	4
1.3. Methodology of the Study	5
1.4. Expected Potential Contribution of the Study	5
1.5. Organization of the Thesis.....	6
2. THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK.....	8
2.1. Feminist Standpoint Theory	8
3. LITERATURE REVIEW	24
3.1. Gender and Women’s Studies in the World	24
3.2. Gender and Women’s Studies in Turkey.....	31
4. METHODOLOGY	35
4.1. Reflexivity	35
4.2. The Base of the Study.....	38
4.3. Profile of the Sample	39
4.4. Process of Data Generation	39
4.5. Process of Analysis.....	40

5. ANALYSIS	43
5.1. Relationship of Knowledge and Politics	45
5.1.1. The Necessity of Self-Definition and Self-Valuation	45
5.1.2. Factors Influencing the Current Position of GWS	53
5.1.2.1. The Conditions of the Emergence of GWS in Turkey	53
5.1.2.2. Current Political Conjuncture, Academic Situation and Feminist Movement in Turkey	58
5.1.3. Situated Academic Marginalization	70
6. CONCLUSION	83
6.1. Contributions of the Study.....	83
6.1.1. Theoretical Contributions.....	83
6.1.2. Methodological Contributions.....	85
6.1.3. Practical Contributions	85
6.2. Limitations of the Study	86
6.2.1. Theoretical Limitations	86
6.2.2. Methodological Limitations	86
6.3. Recommendations for Future Studies	87
BIBLIOGRAPHY	88
APPENDICES	
Appendix A: Casebook.....	93
Appendix B: Field Guideline.....	94
Appendix C: Saha Yönergesi	96
Appendix D: Internals	98
Appendix E: Free Nodes	99
Appendix F: Türkçe Özet	107
Appendix G: Tez Fotokopisi İzin Formu	115

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

GWS	Gender and Women's Studies
WS	Women's Studies
FST	Feminist Standpoint Theory
UN	United Nations
CoHE	Council of Higher Education
YÖK	Yüksek Öğretim Kurumu
KÇ	Kadın Çalışmaları
TCKÇ	Toplumsal Cinsiyet ve Kadın Çalışmaları
AKP	Adalet ve Kalkınma Partisi

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

We had a precious teacher and one day she told “your faces are so pale, go and eat some homemade food...” The students had had no money to buy even a bagel! There is something that saves me from it. How can I make myself such a person? As I have been grown up now, I am a faculty member, I get a considerable amount of salary etc, how can I say I am in clover? I am not looking from that perspective of course, I definitely know but this is a work of blood, sweat and tears. Yes, we are unemployed, we were always unemployed and we will be unemployed even more. Yes, it is wearing; and yes, when we get home it is “what the hell women’s studies is, that is all we need now?” and so on. That is, we are already “damaged goods,” however, we read and write from exactly this standpoint, as we have a very limited time, we should accumulate more and more knowledge.

O

(Çok kıymetli bir hocamız vardı, bir gün şey demişti, ‘suratınız çok soluk, gidin bir ev yemeği yiyin’ falan. Çocukların simit alacak parası yok! Beni ondan kurtaran bir şey var, ben kendimi nasıl öyle biri yapabilirim, şimdi hani büyüdüm, öğretim üyesi oldum, deli yüküyle maaş alıyorum falan, nasıl tuzum kuru diyebilirim? Oradan bakmıyorum, tabii ki kuşkusuz biliyorum ama bu iş çok kan ter ve gözyaşı işi. Evet işsiziz, hep işsizdik, daha da işsiz kalacağız, evet çok yıpratıcı bir şey, evet eve gittiğimizde ‘ne KÇ’si, şimdi bu mu çıktı başımıza’ falan.. Yani zaten ‘arızalı’ tipleriz ama işte tam da buradan okuyup yazıyoruz ya, çünkü çok az zamanımız var, çok bilgi biriktirmeliyiz..

O)¹

This thesis is going to discuss the situation of Gender and Women’s Studies (GWS) graduate programs within mainstream academia of Turkey in the face of academic

¹ Indented quotations from field data will be given also in Turkish throughout the thesis in parentheses following the translated English version.

marginalization and to analyse whether this seemingly disadvantageous academic marginalization of GWS can be transformed into epistemic advantages of it or not within the scope of Feminist Standpoint Theory (FST).

1.1. Background and Theoretical Foundation of the Study

GWS is an academic reciprocity of feminist movement which claims to challenge and transform patriarchal institutions whose knowledge and practices disempower women and chain them within an invisible framework. First feminist activists settled academia with the aim of challenging mainstream academic understanding of not only women but also science and to transform the knowledge produced on behalf and in the name of women which does not reflect their reality, and to produce knowledge with, for and about women. However, this first group is criticized by the second for thinking dichotomously as men and women and for remaining deeply within the understanding of orthodox modernity, although the first group forms the ground for such kind of academic discussion. According to the second group, gender-based explanations do not tell the realities of women and create a unified and holistic category of woman which ignores the specificities within and among women appeared with the discussions of gender and intersectionality. This second group is, then, criticized by FST theorists due to their sole focus dichotomy and incapability of justifying their claims as a result of their lack of a theoretical framework. According to FST, intersectional understanding of women is not enough neither in that intersubjectivity and the specificities of multiple subjectivities should also not be ignored and all knowledge claims are partial and situated. Inspiring from postmodernist epistemology of subjectivity and perspectives of multiplicity, diversity and partiality, FST holds a situation in between postmodernity and modernity. However, postmodernity is a rejection of modernity while FST is a radical and deep criticism of modernity. According to FST, partial and situated knowledge claims are critical in that they cannot be abstracted and generalized. Moreover, an essential base cannot be grounded due to partiality and multiplicity of locational, contextual, situational and other specificities. Furthermore, rationality is not

such abstract, it is practical and its functionality is direct parallel with the situation and the specificities of the situation knowledge produced. Different subjectivities and recognition within and among these diverse and active subjects are significant in constituting intersubjectivity and production both knowledge and collective politics.

As an academic reciprocity of feminist movement, GWS has a political characteristic in a conventional knowledge production *institution* where almost all of the disciplines are struggling to be 'objective'. Evaluating this epistemology as 'not rigorous or objectifying enough', FST asserts that all knowledge claims are partial no matter how objective they are, while the viewpoints of the marginalized account better for reality in that they experience the world with a double vision both from inside and out as outsiders within and their accounts of reality are less partial, thus, that is a stronger objectivity. In my case, GWS is an outsider with its political nature while an insider with its scientific practice within academia. This outsider within position enables GWS to experience academia both from inside and outside, which adds a distinction to its knowledge claims, an epistemic superiority in other words. As an academic program, GWS has almost no permanent academic positions within academia and it confronts serious budgetary problems when compared to firmly established conventional academic disciplines. Moreover, its political nature adds one more layer to its marginalization under various cloaks like mockery, non-recognition, ignorance, subtle preventions and others. The scope of this marginalization varies from material inadequacies to recognition of both the agents and the knowledge of GWS by not only administrative bodies but also the other academic disciplines from natural sciences to social sciences. The insights of GWS, therefore, on the functioning of academia and, in a wider scope, on social relations are critical since it can experience what is not relevant to mainstream academic disciplines in addition to those relevant. For instance, it can constitute a non-hierarchical instructor-student relationship with the help of interactive outside gatherings and solidarity, which then creates a mutual contribution between feminist pedagogy and politics within and outside the classes, and this provides it with a special meaning in the production of knowledge.

1.2. Aims and Objectives of the Study

The aim of this thesis is on no account to compare and contrast GWS programs, neither is it to evaluate them. The main objective is to understand the current position of GWS within academia from the viewpoints of its agents; then, to see if it is exposed to an academic marginalization due to its specificities; and last, if yes, to discover whether this academic marginalization can be transformed into an advantage of epistemic superiority or not.

The main research problematic of the study is the question of the relationship between the marginalization of GWS programs within academia and the dynamics of knowledge and politics. My sub-questions are: How does situated knowledge contribute to understand the marginalization of GWS? What is the relationship between partiality and marginalization and to what degree does partial knowledge help to situate GWS within academia? How does the outsider within position attribute a positive meaning to marginalization? To what extent do strong objectivity, collective consciousness and shared political agenda contribute to adopt this marginalization? How do intersectionality and intersubjectivity reflect on interdisciplinary characteristic of GWS and on its position within academia?

I have used Feminist Standpoint Theory for this inquiry as it both values the experiences and accordingly the knowledge of the marginalized and takes them as the subjects of the knowledge with the help of a non-hierarchical and interactive knowledge production process of its methodology. Moreover, it problematizes the relationship between production of knowledge and power relations. Although its criticism of both modernity and postmodernity, and its neither full rejection nor full acknowledgement of the both make my position difficult to hold on, it is still in quite direct parallel relationship with the challenge and transformation claims of GWS.

1.3. Methodology of the Study

In order to achieve my aims and objectives, I have preferred feminist standpoint methodology and a qualitative research. I have chosen two characteristically different GWS programs from universities with different backgrounds and specificities in Turkey to be able to understand current situation of GWS within academia. I have arranged in-depth interviews with the academics of these two programs and interviewed 17 GWS academics. I coded their names from A to S, and universities as X and Y. Due to ethical concerns about the identities of the academics I interviewed, I prefer not to give the specificities of universities and programs in deep detail.

In the light of my research questions and the approach of FST, the experiences, observations and knowledge of the agents of GWS have led the study into a point of situated academic marginalization. That is, a GWS program naturally has a marginal position within academia due to its political and interdisciplinary characteristics along with its historical emergence process and current situations of feminist movement and academia. However, the adoption and protection of this marginal position change from a program to another according to the programs' specificities and characteristics of being political and interdisciplinary. In other words, the stronger political and interdisciplinary a program is, the closer it is to the claims of challenge and transformation, thus, the more marginalized it is. Since the conditions of the universities and the approaches of the university administrations and of other academic disciplines are multiple and diverse, the level of this academic marginalization is multiple and diverse, as well. So is the epistemic superiority they have.

1.4. Expected Potential Contribution of the Study

Although discussions of otherness, ghettoization, marginalization of GWS within academia are not new in Turkey, they are quite scarce. Looking into a further depth of marginality and reading it as an advantage with a feminist standpoint approach will add a completely new dimension to the issue and help understand the position of GWS

within academia from the viewpoints of its agents. Moreover, unveiling the subtle preventions of academia, remembering the existence claims of GWS falling behind in the long run of more than 20 years, self-defining and self-criticising the field in this process will provide a healthier improvement for its future and insights not only for a valuation of the field but also for a required self-valuation. In addition, using feminist standpoint theory and methodology will contribute both to the improvement of the theory and to the enhancement of the subject matter of GWS.

1.5. Organization of the Thesis

The thesis consists of six chapters. The first one is a brief introduction about the scope of the topic and the study; a short summary of both GWS and FST; aims and objectives of the study; methodology of the study and expected potential contributions of the study are introduced here.

The second one is the theoretical framework where the key concepts of FST and their relationship to GWS in the light of my topic are taken place; the definitions of the concepts such as partial and situated knowledge, outsider within, epistemic privilege, strong objectivity are given in this chapter.

The third chapter is where I have made a literature review about the emergence and development of GWS programs both in general and in Turkey, and positioned my subject matter within this background.

In the fourth chapter, I focus on my methodology and the factory floor; feminist standpoint methodology is highlighted in this chapter; and I give detailed information about my field work and its preparations.

Fifth chapter is my analysis chapter and it is composed of three sub-sections. I discuss the necessity of self-definition and self-valuation of GWS in the first sub-section in the light of Patricia Hill Collins' views about the subject matter. I continue, then, with the factors influencing the position of GWS within academia which are the emergence conditions of GWS, current political conjuncture, and current situations of academia

and feminist movement in order to form a base to be able to position GWS within academia. Finally, I end with situated academic marginalization and put the focus on GWS' characteristics of being political and interdisciplinary.

At the end of the chapters, I conclude with the findings of the study; theoretical, methodological and practical contributions; theoretical and methodological limitations of the study; and recommendations for future studies.

CHAPTER 2

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

In this chapter I focus on Feminist Standpoint Theory and its reflections on the position of Gender and Women's Studies within mainstream academia. I start with the meaning of FST and go on with exemplifying its basic concepts in the light of their definitions taken place within the literature. These basic concepts consist of standpoint of the marginalized, situated knowledge, partiality, outsider within position of the self, epistemic privilege, strong objectivity, and collective consciousness integrated with their correspondences to my subject matter. Then, I conclude with some criticisms of FST and their refutations.

2.1. Feminist Standpoint Theory

To begin with its meaning, Feminist Standpoint Theory is “a critical theory about relations between the production of knowledge and practices of power” (Harding, 2004, p. 1) emerged in 1970s, highly influenced by Marxism's thought of the proletariat which asserts that the oppressed class has a special access to knowledge when compared to the dominant class. What separates FST from Marxism is that

Humanistic Marxism was polluted at the source by its structuring ontological theory of the domination of nature in the self-construction of man and by its closely related impotence to historicize anything women did that did not qualify for a wage. But Marxism was still a promising resource in the form of epistemological feminist mental hygiene that sought our own doctrines of objective vision. Marxist starting points offered tools to get to our versions of standpoint theories, insistent embodiment, a rich tradition of critiques of hegemony without disempowering positivisms and relativisms, and nuanced theories of mediation (Haraway, 2004, p. 84).

Material life, as Marx, Lukacs and Gramsci had suggested, structures the way we understand society and the relations within; however, it constrains that, as well. Highly

influenced from this viewpoint, the first assumption of FST is that the visions of the dominant and oppressed classes are radically different from each other, and the world understanding of the dominant mostly does not reflect the reality of the oppressed. As Nancy Hartsock draws attention, “[t]here are some perspectives on society from which, however well-intentioned one may be, the real relations of humans with each other and with the natural world are not visible” (1983, p. 159). Acknowledging the viewpoint of the dominant as objective and this objectivity as an interpretation of reality causes some serious problems in that it constructs a unidimensional understanding of reality and excludes the experiences and specificities of the marginalized. This viewpoint leads to an essentialist understanding of modernity which determines the lives and experiences of the marginalized in direct parallel with the needs and wishes of the dominant and reduces their subjectivities into accordingly constructed rational and functional actions. In the adaptation of this to my subject matter, regarding the situation of GWS within academia, the real relations between GWS programs and social sciences, natural sciences, academic recognition, and administrative approaches are not always visible from the viewpoint of academia in general, except for the agents of GWS programs themselves. From the viewpoint of academia, or specifically any other agent excluding GWS, the only position GWS can obtain is being the ‘object’ of the knowledge. No matter how well-disposed they are, GWS ‘is defined’, its limits are set by these definitions and its voice is muted. Moreover, it gains its value only in relation to its benefits to academia, the knowledge it produces is consumable only when it serves for the needs of academia and is not reasonable when it is political. However, in FST, GWS is not an object; instead, it is the subject of the knowledge who has its own voice not in a silent but in an active manner and whose experiences are valuable. Here GWS has the power to make a self-definition which “involves challenging the political knowledge-validation process that has resulted in externally-defined, stereo-typical images” (Collins, 2004, p. 106). From this perspective,

feminist standpoint theory seeks to expose both acts of oppression and acts of resistance by asking disenfranchised persons to describe and discuss their experiences. Based upon a belief that knowledge is socially constructed,

feminist standpoint theory privileges the knowledge of disenfranchised persons, with hopes that their knowledge will reveal otherwise unexposed aspects of the social order (Allen, 1998) (Allen, Orbe, & Olivas, 1999, p. 409).

As another assumption of FST, the belief that knowledge is socially constructed stems from the claim that all sorts of knowing are always “socially situated” (Harding, 1991, p. 142) and are “influenced by ‘noncognitive’ factors as one’s gender ... and socio-economic status” (Valadez, 2001, p. 70). Recognizing that one’s knowledge possibilities are shaped and limited by both one’s experiences and particular social locations, status, contexts and conditions one shares underlies the assumption of situated approaches to knowing. To put it differently, socially situated knowledge is intrinsic only to the specific situation it belongs, that is, it can neither be totalized nor universalized. Abstraction, generalization, totalization and universalization are all different ways of losing specificities of subjectivities and particular meanings stemming from them. The understanding of situated knowledge is a harsh criticism of this modernist assumption of universality in that it reveals the features of each context, location, constrain, condition and others, and values the meaning that these specificities add to a situation. As Alison Wylie enlarges upon,

social location systematically shapes and limits what we know, including tacit, experiential knowledge as well as explicit understanding, what we take knowledge to be as well as specific epistemic content. What counts as a “social location” is structurally defined. What individuals experience and understand is shaped by their location in a hierarchically structured system of power relations: by the material conditions of their lives, by the relations of production and reproduction that structure their social interactions, and by the conceptual resources they have to represent and interpret these relations (2004, p. 343).

Gender and women’s studies emphasize this situated position of knowledge by valuing ‘women’s knowledge in rejection to the universal and essential category of ‘woman’, and underline the importance of its social feature through a relational and inclusive term, ‘gender’. Acknowledging this socially situated aspects of knowledge, GWS defines itself as “theoretical and empirical studies produced about, for and with women” (Ecevit Y. , 1996, p. 319). The viewpoint of academia on GWS is shaped and limited in that it highlights the importance of objectivity and disregards GWS due to the fact that

feminism is a political movement and GWS cannot produce objective knowledge since politics distorts scientific knowledge. This understanding is a structurally defined one and not only ignores the subjectivities of GWS but also falls far away from its own reality. The assumption of ‘situated knowledges’ (2004), coined by Donna Haraway, is also a criticism of the conventional understanding of epistemology of objectivity in that truth is always partial and moreover can be interpreted only with a partial perspective. Academia’s advocacy of scientific knowledge and accordingly value-neutrality is an oxymoronic claim, which unduly marginalizes intellectual and everyday knowledge, in that

... all systems of conceptualization reflect certain social interests and values. In a society where the production of knowledge is controlled by a certain class, knowledge produced will reflect the interests and values of that class. In other words, in class societies the prevailing knowledge and science interpret reality from the standpoint of the ruling class. Because the ruling class has an interest in concealing the way in which it dominates and exploits the rest of the population, the interpretation of reality that it presents will be distorted in characteristic ways. In particular, the suffering of the subordinate classes will be ignored, redescribed as enjoyment or justified as freely chosen, deserved, or inevitable (Jaggar, 2004, p. 56).

Therefore, no knowledge claim can optimally be ‘objective’, as science likes to claim for ages. To clarify, the problem here is not with objectivity but with the perception of objectivity, that is, with the claim of being objective when keeping away from politics. It is just an illusion. It is not possible for anyone to be objective with detachment from politics due to the fact that her/his interests, values, decisions, viewpoints, any single act are full of subjectivities and they are all constituted with certain social locations. This does not simply mean that individuals are socially constructed by structural forces, but they are constituted as active agents in an interaction with any kind of social relations. Then, the thought of explaining everything with an objective approach is an illusion, too. Haraway names this illusion as a “God-trick” which means “seeing everything from nowhere” (2004, p. 86).

This is the gaze that mythically inscribes all the marked bodies, that makes the unmarked category claim the power to see and not be seen, to represent while

escaping representation. This gaze signifies the unmarked positions of Man and White, one of the many nasty tones of the world *objectivity* to feminist ears in scientific and technological, late industrial, militarized, racist and male dominant societies, ... I would like a doctrine of embodied objectivity that accommodates paradoxical and critical feminist science projects: feminist objectivity means quite simply *situated knowledges* (Haraway, 2004, p. 87).

The plural concept of ‘situated knowledges’ is an informed choice in that the singular understanding of situated knowledge would be a trap that one might easily fall into since the claim of situated knowledge itself actually embodies a reaction to singularity and totalization. ‘Situated knowledge’ is a mere reproduction of ‘objectivity’ claim of the ‘master’ when it is used with its hidden meanings while ‘situated knowledges’ are intrinsic to multiple and diverse agents and their life experiences. Situated knowledge is unique, that is, it is specific to the context, conditions, location, time and place it belongs to. FST makes use of postmodernist perspective of multiplicity, diversity and plurality with the help of the understanding of socially situated knowledge since situated knowledge is full of subjectivities and it neither eliminate them via objectivity epistemology nor ignore them as an extension of universality assumption. As for the marginalization of GWS within academia, for example, ‘situated marginalization’ will refer to a marginalization specific to the conditions of that specific program within changeable contexts. Specific characteristics of a program- such as its achievement of interdisciplinarity or application of feminist pedagogy- and the university it belongs to- e.g. if it is technical or foreign language-based- gain importance in the envisagement of situated marginalization in addition to the current political conjuncture in the country, and the current situations of feminist movement and academia. Then, it is valid to say that academic marginalization of GWS changes not only from program to program but also within the history of a program. Therefore,

objectivity turns out to be about particular and specific embodiment, and definitely not about the false vision promising transcendence of all limits and responsibility. The moral is simple: only partial perspective promises objective vision. ... Feminist objectivity is about limited location and situated knowledge, not about transcendence and splitting of subject and object. In this way, we may become answerable for what we learn how to see (Haraway, 2004, p. 87).

There may be a counter-attack for situated knowledges in that it may turn to a relativity of the relativism issue and whether it takes the issue to a postmodernist realm with a rejection of modernist understanding instead of its criticism or not. However, it is not a vicious circle, taking experiences and specific situations into center, FST both gets inspired by and avoids postmodernist assumption of relativity of the relativism and situates itself to specific situations without falling into the realm of totalization of orthodox modernity, as well. In other words, while postmodernity is an explicit rejection of modernity, FST is a deep, harsh and radical criticism of modernity. It is inspired by the epistemology of subjectivity of postmodernity and its assumptions of deconstruction of the structure and decentralization of the self on one hand, and criticizes its tautological relativism and multiplicity on the other. As for modernity, FST makes a heavy criticism of not only main assumptions of rationalism, universalism and essentialism, but also its dichotomous, causal, deterministic and reductionist understanding of methodology. However, this harsh criticism does not mean to reject modernity, neither. Instead, it includes subjectivities and specificities of multiple subjectivities not only within agents but also structures and reveals an active interrelationship within and among these two. By this way, it aims to produce both knowledge and politics. Combining modernity and postmodernity with an intersectional and intersubjective standpoint of socially situated knowledge, FST thus criticizes both modernist and postmodernist assumptions. In Haraway's sentences:

The alternative to relativism is partial, locatable, critical knowledges sustaining the possibility of webs of connections called solidarity in politics and shared conversations in epistemology. Relativism is the way of being nowhere while claiming to be everywhere equally. The "equality" of positioning is a denial of responsibility and critical enquiry. Relativism is the perfect mirror twin of totalization in the ideologies of objectivity; both deny the stakes in location, embodiment, and partial perspective; both make it impossible to see well. ... But it is precisely in the politics and epistemology of partial perspectives that the possibility of sustained, rational, objective enquiry rests (2004, p. 89).

Partial knowledge bears a criticism of almost all modernist assumptions. It is a criticism of universality since truth cannot be understood fully and thus cannot be interpreted

fully, neither. From this perspective, it cannot be abstracted and generalized for all humanity, it changes from situation to situation and from person to person due to its partiality. The claim of universal truth is a holistic viewpoint which ignores the differences between subjects and constructs a unified understanding of not only reality but also of the self. As an extension of this point of view, partial knowledge has the potential to problematize the subject and the agency of the subject. It is thus a criticism of essentialism, as well. Determining a base for reality and universalizing it reduces the subject into some previously defined criteria through which rational action comes to fore and subjectivities, norms and values are ignored. However, partial knowledge values the experiences, feelings and perceptions of the subjects and produces knowledge from their active agencies. It advocates a shared political agenda for an active interrelationship and aims to constitute a collective consciousness. Thus, partial knowledge requires a practical rationality instead of an abstracted and universalized one since rational action is in direct accordance with the situation, context, location and other specificities within which partial knowledge is produced. Criticizing rational action leads the subject matter to the criticism of subjectivity. Postmodernist understanding of subjectivity creates a multiple drove of subjectivities, that is, as many subjectivities as individuals, as a result of which relativity of relativism appears. FST criticizes this perspective due to the difficulty it brings on collective action and thus production of knowledge and politics. Intersubjectivity is the solution of this singular subjectivity. Since intersubjectivity enables both to understand different subjectivities and to constitute a relationship among them which thus produce politics and solidarity.

A standpoint of intersubjectivity requires that we claim the universal need for human dignity and, at the same time, let go of the illusion that universal knowledge, and subjectivity, and a unified plan of action are possible or necessary. A standpoint of intersubjectivity would allow us- indeed require us- to recognize instead the legitimacy of partial knowledge, and the longterm effectiveness of coalition politics as coordinated, multiple plans of action (Fowlkes, 1997, p. 114).

In addition to the criticism of relativism, FST faces a criticism of essentialism in that it values the experiences of the marginalized in comparison to that of the dominant. The

reason for this criticism is that FST values the knowledge of women and, in a wider scope, of the marginalized groups since they experience the world with a “double vision” (Bowell) both from “the outside in and from the inside out” (hooks, 2000, p. xvi). The “outsider within”, as Collins (2004) calls it, develops a way of life enabling to learn from her/his experiences within a world that constructs her/him by the experiences of the dominant. The outsider within position of FST is a criticism of dichotomous understanding of modernity since it melts the hierarchy between the oppressed and the dominant and constitutes a new form of being with its intersubjective characteristics. For example, in the case of GWS, academia is not one which GWS enters and occupies on the same terms as other disciplines do. An interdisciplinary program under the Graduate School of Social Sciences without an undergraduate degree, GWS posits an opposition to fully institutionalized departmental academic disciplines. However, its aim to institutionalize the participation of not only men but also women with a non-hierarchical and more self-reflexive viewpoint in knowledge production process pushes the limits of ‘value-neutral’ mainstream academia whose focus is on scientific knowledge and of the understanding of institutionalization itself to the ground. Although a highlighted women’s knowledge and accordingly, women’s experience, presents a challenge to objectified, rationalized and universalized understanding of science, GWS conducts a conceptual/abstract practice of academic work within the conceptual structures of academia. With this practicing academic body, it is an insider while is an outsider due to its activist agenda within the political arena, representing a practical/concrete activity that results in its social and academic non-recognition, lack of permanent staff and unstable curricula in the sight of academia. With Dorothy Smith’s words, this “bifurcation of consciousness” (2004, p. 27) is a pivotal feature of experiencing the world and thus, is relevant to GWS in that

the dual perspective available to [GWS] in this position leaves [it] well-placed to recognize the underlying assumptions and evaluative commitments that drive and shape the dynamics of power within the Academy, while at the same time providing [it] with a critical frame of reference derived from [its] own experience of the Academy, within which to potentially gain a better understanding of its power structures and dynamics (Bowell, n.d.).

Reproducing its subjectivity throughout this bifurcation of consciousness, GWS holds not only a radical but also critical position within academia, aware of its value-laden and purposefully political characteristics, which leaves it outside the realm of the traditionally institutionalized body of knowledge. Digging a room for women's everyday life experiences and narrations of their own within mainstream accounts of abstracted and universalized category of 'woman' unchains academia from its strict boundaries of unidimensional and unconditional understanding of individual and knowledge.

From this aspect, FST assumes that the viewpoint of the marginalized has an epistemic privilege because of their outsider within positions which have the potential to enable them to generate critical insights about their lives and social order, in a wider sense. As Harnois cited in her work "although some men see the gender bias dynamics that women see, [men] fail as a group to 'translate' these observations into a feminist consciousness (2002:690)" (2010, p. 69) on one hand, and "that failure by dominant groups to interrogate beliefs arising from their social situation leaves them in an epistemologically disadvantaged position, that is, one that distorts" (Patterson & Satz, 2002, p. 121), on the other. Therefore, starting off thought and research from the experiences and lives of the marginalized groups can be counted as a solution to modernist research(er)'s failure. According to Harding,

this kind of account enables us to understand how each oppressed group will have its own critical insights about nature and the larger social order to contribute to the collection of human knowledge. Because different groups are oppressed in different ways, each has the possibility (not the certainty) of developing distinctive insights about systems of social relations in general in which their oppression is a feature (2004, p. 9).

To turn back to the criticism of essentialism, from the viewpoint of FST, it is misleading to read the valuation of the standpoint of the marginalized as reproduction of a dichotomous understanding in which the viewpoint of the marginalized turns to be 'the dominant'. On the contrary, it is itself a criticism of the dichotomous understanding of modernist science which hides both the visibility of the inferior side and what is visible

to/from the standpoint of this inferiority. As Patricia Hill Collins clearly states it, dichotomous understanding has three characteristics:

Either/or dualistic thinking, or what I will refer to as the construct of dichotomous oppositional difference, may be a philosophical lynchpin in systems of race, class, and gender oppression. One fundamental characteristic of this construct is the categorization of people, things, and ideas in terms of their difference from one another. For example, the terms in dichotomies such as black/white, male/female, reason/emotion, fact/opinion, and subject/object gain their meaning only in *relation* to their difference from their oppositional counterparts. Another fundamental characteristic of this construct is that difference is not complementary in that the halves are different and inherently opposed to one another. (p. 110).

This can be exemplified as dominant/marginalized, objectivity/subjectivity, academia/GWS, natural/social, modernist/postmodernist, theoretical/practical, disciplinarity/interdisciplinarity and others for my topic; however, the components of these dichotomies should not be considered to ‘gain their meaning only in *relation* to their difference from their oppositional counterparts’. Instead, according to FST, both have their own subjectivities. Moreover, these subjectivities are multiple and have also their own specificities which are multiple, as well. In other words, each specificity of a subjectivity generates its own unique meaning which obstructs making abstraction and generalization. For instance, in the case of GWS, GWS does not gain its meaning only in relation to its difference from mainstream academia; it is true that it is different from mainstream academia with its aspects of being political and relatively interdisciplinary. However, this does neither mean that academia is in exact contradiction with politics nor that GWS has a biased objectivity due to its political characteristic. The claim of objectivity cannot be fulfilled completely since knowledge is always partial. In addition, academia cannot be detached from politics in that every single choice is immanently political. Therefore, an intersectional understanding reflects reality better and more accurate in comparison with oppositional constructions. To continue,

a third and more important characteristic is that these oppositional relationships are intrinsically unstable. Since such dualities rarely represent different but equal relationships, the inherently unstable relationship is resolved by subordinating

one half of each pair to the other. ... Dichotomous oppositional differences invariably imply relationships of superiority and inferiority, hierarchical relationships that mesh with political economies of domination and subordination (p. 110).

That is, it can be easily observed that disciplinarity supercedes interdisciplinarity in institutionalization and recognition, natural sciences are superior to social sciences, the dominant defines and rules the marginalized, and so on. As a result of this, the subordinated parts lose, or optimistically, hide their real meanings, capacities and potential. To reveal the hidden meanings, FST values the experiences of the marginalized. However, this does not mean to reverse the dichotomy, that is, simply to focus on the experiences of the marginalized and ignore the dominants', but to try to understand the reality from the lens of the marginalized who are both outside and inside the circle, in other words, who play an away game with the rules of the quarterback. Moreover, looking from the viewpoint of the marginalized enables not only to uncover the everyday reality of marginalized but also to change the whole picture about social reality which has previously been constructed from a single point due to the fact that the parts of the dichotomy are not defined in relation to their difference from each other. They are free, unstructured, subjective agents. Also, the correspondence and reflection of epistemic superiority is not epistemic authority and it is on no accounts 'automatic'. "Rather, a standpoint is an achievement, something for which oppressed groups must struggle, something that requires both science and politics" (Harding, 2004, p. 8). Due to the fact that the oppressed groups are not only outsiders but also insiders within the system of the dominant, their perceptions and understandings have the possibility of being blocked and "obscured by the dominant, hegemonous ideologies and the practices that they make appear normal and even natural" (Harding, 2004, p. 9).

Politics is vital not only from the aspect of the achievement of a standpoint but also of the transforming effect on the consciousness. Political engagement is necessary to create a collective consciousness through a shared agenda via which generating self-definitions and self-valuation becomes possible. This political vision can enable the marginalized "to transform their consciousness into an oppositional one and to begin to

see the possibility of ending their oppression” (Harding, 2004, p. 6). Via this, a socially and politically disadvantageous position can be turned into an epistemologically, scientifically, and politically advantageous one (Harding, 2004, p. 8). In the case of GWS, as an academic reciprocity of feminist movement, GWS defines itself as a political discipline within a ‘value-neutral’ academia. GWS’ claims of challenge and transformation can be succeeded through a political engagement since it requires a non-hierarchical, interactive and critically reflexive standpoint not only in knowledge production but also in knowledge dissemination process. A discipline which does not reside itself to an ivory tower can easily transform its own constructed values and perceptions and can produce ‘better accounts of knowledge’ for everyone. Moreover, embracement of marginalization provides GWS with epistemologically, scientifically and politically more powerful tools to challenge and transform mainstream understanding of science and knowledge. On the contrary,

the more value-neutral a conceptual framework appears, the more likely it is to advance the hegemonous interests of dominant groups, and the less likely it is to be able to detect important actualities of social relations. ... We need not- indeed, must not- choose between “good politics” and “good science,” standpoint theorists argued, for the former can produce the latter (Harding, 2004, p. 6).

In other words, it is, again, not a dichotomous understanding on which the parts gain their meanings in relation to their differences from each other. Instead, it is a collaboration of both sides located within a specific situation, which enhances and improves both sides. Good politics can produce good science and a better produced science can lead to a better politics. However, for Harding “the problem with the conventional conception of objectivity is not that it is too rigorous or too ‘objectifying’... but that it is not rigorous or objectifying enough” (2004, p. 128). The approach of situated knowledges and accordingly, feminist standpoint epistemology provides the basis for this “strong objectivity” and produces a “less partial and perverse” reality (Harding, 2004, p. 322). GWS realizes this through an intersectional and intersubjective understanding of its interdisciplinary feature. Interdisciplinarity has a

special and political meaning for academic feminism in that it rejects to stay within only a single discipline and to separate knowledge into fractions among categorical units. Instead, interdisciplinarity is an epistemological preference with a more integrated knowledge claim referring to the indivisible holism of society (Sancar, 2003, p. 189). In parenthesis, this indivisible holism of society is not one that totalize the individuals but the integration and contribution of all fractions into social order. Moreover, interdisciplinarity brings academics and students from different backgrounds with different standpoints and perspectives all together. Therefore, an intersectional and intersubjective understanding of women involving not only a sociological or historical account but also a political and economic aspect along with all that are related displays the invisible relations among women, society and knowledge which become lost within structured academic disciplines and produces a shared political agenda out of multiplicity and diversity. Intersectionality fills the gaps within a framework through interactions among the sections and gives a bigger result than the sum of the sections while intersubjectivity enhances the possibility of understanding and acknowledging different and even conflicting views with the chance of problematization of the selves. Interdisciplinary characteristic of GWS, thus, provides it with a drove of separate situated knowledges of different disciplines and different standpoints on women, gendered identities and their experiences and knowledge. As a result, GWS has a potential to gain a less partial and perverse standpoint in its knowledge and to achieve a stronger objectivity with the help of its political and interdisciplinary characteristics which enable it to produce critical insights about academia and wider social order.

Reframing feminist standpoint theory for the postmodern and poststructuralist context of that moment, Harding clarified that giving up ‘the goal of telling one true story about reality’ need not mean that ‘one must also give up trying to tell less false stories’ (Harding 1991: 187). On the contrary. Science had never been value-free, as scientists liked to claim. A stronger version of objectivity could be achieved by combining the view from below with enquiry that was *reflexive*, by researchers who named and clearly situated themselves, coming clean about power, interests and values, as informative about the subject and source of knowledge as about the studied objects (Cockburn, 2010, s. 141).

Via this way, FST gives way to the hierarchical relationships stemming from a biased objectivity, and leaves the floor to a non-hierarchical, interactive and reflexive relationship in which not a linear but a circular and progressive knowledge production process takes place not only among instructors and students but also within each group.

In conclusion, to summarize the features of FST,

a standpoint is an account of the world constituted by (and constitutive of) a collective subject, a group. It is derived from life activities and achieved in struggle. It is subversive of the hegemonic account. It is potentially the foundation of oppositional and revolutionary movement (Cockburn, 2010, p. 140).

From these aspects, FST critically differs from gender-based and gender-biased theoretical frameworks of previous feminist approaches. Since gender-based accounts of knowledge cannot understand and explain the differences between women and since gender-biased explanations are limited with the criticism of dichotomous understanding and have not been able to produce conceptual frameworks for its criticisms, FST has made a special room for itself within feminist theory which does not reject modernity but makes a harsh criticism of it while inspring from postmodernity but criticizing it as well. In other words, since orthodox feminism analyzes reality in a dichotomous way, as men and women for instance, and sets a hierarchy between the relationship of the two, it loses the subjectivities and the explanation it makes does not tell the reality of the lower side of the dichotomy. Since, then, critical feminism- which criticizes this orthodox understanding of dichotomy and attributes both a value and an empowerment to the lower side of the dichotomy- is not able to justify its criticisms with a valid conceptual framework and does not include the specificities of the subjectivities within this criticism of dichotomous understanding, it remains as a thought, and the explanation it makes does not tell the reality of women fully, neither. The strength of FST, among these, comes out of its inquiry of subject and subjectivity with the help of its claims of partial and situated knowledge along with its criticisms of rational, essential and universal understanding of reality which are produced by hierarchically dichotomous, causal, deterministic and reductionist relations between the agent and structure.

Within this scope of theoretical background, GWS resides in an academically marginalized position of a knowledge production institution due to its untraditional understanding of epistemology and methodology that highlights the importance of the outsider and the constituted experiences. This position of academic marginalization provides GWS with a less partial viewpoint of the reality on one hand, and results in its social and academic non-recognition leaving it face to face with a number of problems during its survival within mainstream academia on the other. Varying from the scarcity of academic positions to the lack of a regular budget, from the indifference and unawareness of traditional disciplines to the marginality of the topic of 'women' accordingly the fear of bias, to the process of integrating feminist conceptualizations with practical positions and problems of women, and most significantly from disinclusion of knowledge and politics GWS produces to the marginalization of this produced knowledge and politics, problems and difficulties of GWS differ from one university to another in that each GWS programme has a unique and specific academic body of itself with its components of students, academic staff, curricula and not only an academic but also a social university environment within and among different cities and regions. Marginalization, in this thesis, refers to the marginalization, disinclusion, unrecognition and invisibility of the knowledge and politics GWS programs produce within academia. Although the first layer of marginalization GWS born into is a given one, situated academic marginalization is one that depends on the achievement of each program of gaining that critical standpoint. Since this standpoint is not automatic, turning the given and disadvantageous marginalization which results with non-recognition of GWS both within and outside academia into an advantageous and privileged one with critical insights and transformative power requires struggle and politics. This thesis, therefore, interrelates marginalization of GWS with partial and situated knowledge claims of FST. Moreover, it makes a reflection between the relationship of outsider within position of GWS in academia and epistemic privilege and strong objectivity. My main research question is, thus: How does marginalization of GWS contribute to the knowledge it produces? My sub-questions are: To what extent

does outsider within position of GWS provide it with an epistemic privilege? How do a political academia and political GWS agents make a better account of knowledge? To what degree does an acquisition of a critical standpoint produce a shared political agenda?

CHAPTER 3

LITERATURE REVIEW

In this chapter, I draw a picture about the history of Gender and Women's Studies graduate programs in general and then, I specifically focus on the emergence and development of them in Turkey. Last, I situate my subject matter within this general and specific literature. Due to limited studies related to the marginalization of GWS programs within academia from the viewpoint of FST, which adopts marginalization as an advantage, I focus on the history and development of GWS programs around the world.

3.1. Gender and Women's Studies in the World

Gender and Women's Studies graduate program is a field of knowledge production and an area of political action with a more than 40-year-history in the world. Sprouting up from the 2nd wave women's movement, the initial goal of GWS was to bring women and their experiences more fully into knowledge, by means of which then to challenge all knowledge claims constructed on behalf of them within mainstream academia, and to transform these constructions into what in reality reflect their own histories and experiences with their own ways and words not as the objects but as the subjects of their knowledge.

The name of the program has had a wide range of diversity such as Feminist Studies, Women's Studies, Sexuality Studies, Gender Studies and their combinations or derivations. The reasons of this diversity are various. At the beginning of 1970s, in the United States, the first programs appeared as *Feminist Studies*. Then, they converted into *Women's Studies*, and last to *Gender Studies*. According to some scholars, the name of Feminist Studies has had the risk of ghettoization due to its direct connection and

connotation with feminist ideology and politics, which beclouds acknowledgement of the program within academia. In this situation, the programs make a compromise to have a place within academia with the fear of ghettoization, marginalization and exclusion. For others, this name has provoked a number of groups of people and reduced the number of potential students. Victory Grace, an academic at the University of Canterbury, New Zealand, accounts for the reason of this change in her university as this:

The adaptations our program is making to these challenges to retain a viable student base firstly involved our reluctant change in name from “Feminist Studies” to “Gender Studies”. Reluctance occurred because this name was a genuine achievement in the conservative university context of the mid-1980s and also because the academic staff still believes this name best conveys what we actually do academically. The change resulted from our recognition of the extent to which the *feminist* word was not so much putting interested students off taking our courses but making it increasingly difficult for them to explain their choices to others, particularly if they completed a major with us. It has become clear over the last few years that the word *feminist* evokes connotations for employers, parents, and students other than those who enrol with us, which are not commensurate with our intent and do not adequately or reasonably describe our actual work. Rather than trying to change and update the general public’s perception of the word, we changed our name (2002, p. 35).

This ostensibly slight change bears the risk of a heavy compromise in the long run if the program does not protect its objectives in that the name of the program embodies the self-definition and self-valuation which reflects the vision and mission of the program. The main objective of GWS programs within academia is to challenge and transform the institution they have been constructed by for ages. Digging a room for itself within academia relying upon such a compromise carries the possibility of bringing assimilation and focus shift in the claims of emergence with it. As a political discipline, GWS is a critical and assertive program, compromising on these characteristics provides it with an ordinary place within academia while it smoothes its critical and challenging aims and objectives. Since,

the emergence of Women’s and Gender Studies in itself discloses one of the hidden agendas of modern academy, namely the fact that the production of

knowledge and the development of academy in modernity is to be read not only as an intellectual history but also as a historical, societal process. The emergence and institutionalization of Women's and Gender Studies is but one element in a far-reaching process of change characterizing academy and society today (Zimmermann, 2002, p. 63).

This political characteristic offers a marginalized position to GWS within a strictly 'objective' academia. However, as Zimmerman stated above, this marginal position brings the chance of characterizing academia and society. Therefore, the more political a GWS program becomes the more marginalized its position happens to be and so does its achievement in transformation.

The engagement with the question of 'gender' during 1980s, GWS expanded its research area into identifying how gender distinctions made in all societies differ from one culture to another and how the definition patterns of male, female, masculinity and femininity have evolved and perpetuated throughout history and in what ways these can be redefined.

The academic turn to gender undoubtedly had some enabling features. It led to the inclusion of masculinities as an object of study (which also took off in Turkey) and immensely broadened the scope of arenas onto which a gender lens could be trained. Any institutional domain, from the state to the street, could henceforth be subjected to critical scrutiny from a gender perspective (Kandiyoti, 2010, p. 170).

On the way gender paved, intersectionality debates have recently come to the fore, and the question of how these diversified gender constructions and the power relations they entail intersect with the constructions of race, ethnicity, sexuality, social class, nation, age and other differences has raised. In direct proportion to this development on the research areas of GWS nourishing from not only feminist movement but also contextual political conjunctures and academic encounters, methods and models shaping the content of the curricula of programs have been re-evaluated and adapted to include intersecting experiences of women and dynamics of gender. As Zimmermann furthers the issue,

Women's and Gender Studies as subject fields relevant to inquiry into society, culture and human life over time and space do not base the production of (seemingly universal) knowledge on historically and geographically unique patterns of gender relations, i.e. patterns characteristic for specific social and cultural systems. In assuming, instead, the variability of the construction of gender over time and space, Women's and Gender Studies allow for integrative – and also truly comparative, i.e. relational and flexible *as well as* category-based – analysis of capitalist and non-capitalist, European and non-European societies and cultures (2002, p. 63).

This emphasis of integrity and intersectionality is significant in that there must not be any society or culture in history remained untouched and uninfluenced by the systems of gender relations. Therefore, no knowledge claim can be detached from gender perspective if it aims to understand reality better. As one of my interviewees puts forth, as it is not possible to be a political scientist without knowing the theory of state so is it not possible without knowing the theoretical approaches concerning gender-based power relations (H).

Gender and Women's Studies graduate programs are the product of a grassroots movement of feminist activism aiming to achieve a radical and deserved change for women in most parts of the world. Although the specificities can vary from university to university across local, national and international contexts as it is mentioned before, GWS programs, in general, therefore, can be regarded as a bridge between feminist movement and academia where knowledge on the position of women from different and within the same racial, ethnic, economic groups is produced and a shared political agenda is to be generated. Gabriele Griffin states that

one might argue that women's studies as an academic discipline does not exist where there is no grassroots movement, and that in most countries today it is more likely that there are non-academic women's organizations than academic courses in women's studies (2002, p. 18).

However, the kind of the relationship between the grassroots movement of a feminist activism and that of GWS programs cannot be argued to be organic in all cases. Since the historical backgrounds of the countries, the political conjunctures and changing and evolving situations of academia and feminist movements obscure the characteristic of

relationships in local, national and international platforms. For example, while it has been a complete symbiotic relationship in countries like Canada, the United States and England, it has occurred to be inorganic in Turkey and other developing countries as a result of the shared agenda of 1995 Beijing Conference and United Nations, which affects the marginal position of GWS within academia. A GWS program within an indirect and inorganic relationship with its movement has problems in challenging mainstream academic understanding and bears the risk of assimilation. Losing the advantageous marginal position transforms the program to an occupational profession which has a notable place within academia with marginal political orientation and objectives.

In parallel with its existence claims of being different from and critical of the mainstream academic disciplines, GWS resides itself in an interdisciplinary vantage point which makes accounts of the patriarchal system and, in a wider scope, of the world out of gender and women's lenses. Nonetheless, it advocates a shared political agenda needed in order to transform the personally experienced inequalities into politically acquired rights. This interdisciplinarity issue has been a big deal for GWS from the very beginning until now. The choice of interdisciplinarity was actually not a random but a political one.

From the beginning of feminist reform in the academy in the late 1960s, the claim has been made that women's studies must be interdisciplinary, an insistence supported by the transgression of traditional disciplinary boundaries in faculty research, teaching, and service and in governance structures of women's studies programs (Friedman, 1998, p. 301).

However, even though it was not random, there have existed so much resistance and difficulty in achieving interdisciplinarity. At first, there appears a problem with the meaning of interdisciplinarity. For some, interdisciplinarity means to be a combination of several disciplines on the same topic. For others, it is not a combination but a mixture which necessitates a new meaning from the parts of the whole. Friedman, for example, thinks interdisciplinarity as

an umbrella category which, much like the highly contested and politically charged term “hybridity” in cultural studies, contains multiple forms of “mixing” and border crossings- some more effective than others; some referring to individual scholarship or teaching and others relating to collaborative work by people in different disciplines (2001, p. 506).

The meaning problematic of interdisciplinarity is important in that the methods of knowledge production and the application of the methods vary in direct accordance with its definition. Then, the problem of application of interdisciplinarity follows. There are many reasons that underlie this problem. One of them is that interdisciplinary work does not have a base and epistemological depth. According to this view, this superficial knowledge may touch on so many disciplines but cannot internalize and consume their knowledge in depth. Another reason is that interdisciplinary backgrounds of both academics and students prevent the usage of a common language in the courses and this situation creates a confusion in the minds of the agents of the programs. One other reason is that no matter how hard they work academics remain heavily on their own fields. These are common disadvantages that interdisciplinarity is uttered to have.

In addition to the disadvantages of its own nature, there also exist structural problems and resistance that interdisciplinarity faces within academia. The course load of the academics in their main disciplines makes interdisciplinary studies harder. Moreover, lack of permanent academic positions, budgetary problems, lack of places appropriate for interdisciplinary interactions and for courses carried out with feminist pedagogy, administrative permissions for political dialogues and activities can be counted among these structural problems. From this aspect, it appears that the problems related to interdisciplinarity occur because of its exclusion from mainstream academia rather than its autogenous disadvantages.

There are some scholars who read interdisciplinary approach as a criticism to mainstream disciplinary understanding of science.

Interdisciplinarity ... in the case of much feminist scholarship, bring to visibility previously suppressed knowledge. Indeed, such knowledge may be unassimilable by the disciplines; both in content and in form, and by virtue of

its very production, such knowledge stands as an implicit critique of disciplinary organization (Pryse, 1998, p. 4).

Some other scholars do not prefer creating a reverse dichotomy and search for an intersectional understanding of disciplinarity and interdisciplinarity due to the fact that

if the danger of disciplinarity resides in potential overspecialization, the danger of interdisciplinarity rests in potential superficiality. Disciplinarity offers depth but also insularity; interdisciplinarity offers scope but also rootlessness. Each counters the excesses of the other. I prefer a symbiotic relationship between the two, with each reining in the limitations of the other (Friedman, 1998, p. 313).

Both disciplinarity and interdisciplinarity are useful and applicable in accordance with the situations and conditions they are within. All in all, with its advantages and disadvantages, interdisciplinarity seems to have been a *sine qua non* of GWS. As Zimmermann clearly summarizes,

interdisciplinarity is of pivotal importance in Women's and Gender Studies, as many issues critical to feminist scholars fall to the margins or borderlands of any given discipline's subject of study. Themes and problems investigated in Gender Studies have not neatly conformed to disciplinary parameters. Therefore, in constructing their subject of study and in pursuing research, Women's and Gender Studies have not only been creating new organizing concepts and skills, they have also been developing ways and forms of integrating subject fields and disciplines formerly strictly divided from each other and have thus established basic new metaphors and paradigms. By making visible important "missing linkages" among aspects of human life, social structures, and motivations, Gender Studies has been rebuilding the prevailing structures of the construction of knowledge, which have been otherwise based on the exclusion of important dimensions of human experience from the body of knowledge accumulated in the diverse disciplines (Zimmermann, 2002, p. 64).

Exclusion of interdisciplinarity from academia reflects as a layered-marginalization on GWS since one of its crucial characteristics is this interdisciplinary approach. Finding a solution to achieve interdisciplinarity against mentioned hindrances, or combining disciplinarity and interdisciplinarity situationally, or looking for alternative ways thus will help protecting its advantageous marginalization.

3.2. Gender and Women's Studies in Turkey

The field of GWS has an almost 30-year-history in Turkey with a relatively younger and recently flourishing improvement. As a driving force, United Nations was significant in the emergence of GWS programs. Besides, consciousness raising groups, women academics returning from abroad, women-themed seminars taken place in BİLAR -which was the intellectual meeting point of academics following the 1980 coup d'état-, translations of Women's Circle (Kadın Çevresi) publishing, and women-related courses having already been offered at Middle East Technical University and Bosphorus University not only played a crucial role in the entrance of GWS into academia but also served its recognition and visibility outside academia (Arat, 1996; Ecevit, 2015).

In the first half of the 1990s, several women's studies centers and, later, programs were founded in major Turkish universities in response to the necessity of providing institutions that would produce knowledge and information concerning women's issues (Ege, 2002, p. 149).

First to have been founded in 1993 in Istanbul University, initial women's studies programs cannot be claimed to have been encountered much resistance during their entrance into academia. According to Arat,

some of the important factors that assisted the development of women's studies in higher education were the following: the academic structure facilitating interdisciplinary, interdepartmental, and intercollegiate work; the presence of a significant number of women academics and students; the support of women's groups and other feminists (1996, pp. 407-408).

It is important to signify that the time and place setting of such assisting factors changes among and within universities. That is, not all university administrations have assisted their programs from the very beginning until now. This varies both horizontally and vertically. Similarly, interviewee P indicated that there was a high level of 'readiness' at the university thanks to the first women academics and their efforts. She emphasized that "the university supported this field, at least it did not hamper". These emphases indicate a crucial point in understanding the approach of academia towards GWS and its position within it. The tendency of not preventing the foundation -and sometimes

even the development- of the programs within academia has meant to be a support. As Sancar sarcastically points out that

academia's respectable social scientists never puzzle their brains with gender researches; never learn nor criticize the doctrines of this field, they do not even follow the academic discussions in the field as listeners. This way, women's studies find opportunities for "free" and "independent" studies in its field. Notable characters of social sciences, on the other hand, neither bother themselves with "light" works such as women's studies nor fail to respect for women's studies field, as an indicator of their "democrat" and "liberal" sense of science (2003, p. 215).

However, this support comes out to be an illusion in the long term, giving rise to an indifference to the discipline along with a layered invisibility and non-recognition not only among natural sciences but also within social science disciplines. What GWS faces as a result of this backless support is an academic marginalization.

Academic efforts that are stuck in the autonomous field, which have grown into 'small but mine', in women's studies area at the universities are becoming 'tell yourself listen to yourself' in this way. While this state of setting free and releasing is in-between, to criticize the justifying but excluding and frosty manners of social scientists developed towards women's studies is growing difficult. It is completely a "marginalization" that women's studies experiences at the point it faces academically "valuable" behaviors such as staying on the sidelines and inviting [GWS] to prove itself standing on its own legs (Sancar, 2003, p. 215).

In addition, as GWS has its origins in feminist thought and action, these programs are directly and naturally supposed to be involved with feminist epistemology and methodology, though there exist a number of non-feminist programs, as well. Furthermore, holding the aims of challenge and transformation within academia, feminist pedagogy leaded by feminist ethics is the guide of the program, which explicitly highlights its difference. When mainstream academic structure and understanding of academia are considered, these differences seem to lead GWS to a double-marginalized position within academia as the program of a political movement. This marginality has potential to gain depth through not only the political feature of

GWS but also its interdisciplinary nature as I will mention in depth in the analysis chapter V. As Mary Evans states,

the history of theoretical feminism in Britain and the United States has yet to be written. However, when it is documented it would seem likely on the evidence so far available that women engaged in feminist research do not profit by that exercise in any orthodox sense, either inside or outside the academy. There are few indications at present that British or North American universities see women's studies as anything other than a peripheral or temporary phenomenon. Whatever the indications that the subject might be popular or lively it remains – as do its practitioners – in an outer courtyard, far removed from real centres of academic power and authority. Given these factors it is unlikely that those who decide to accept feminism, and work for it, will be able to ignore the consistent marginality and academic deviance of their position (1982, p. 73).

As for Turkey, this process has not been written adequately yet. Including the first program founded in 1993 at Istanbul University, graduate programs had been limited with only four until 2011. These programs were respectively founded at Middle East Technical University, Ankara University and Ege University and each one radically differs from the others from the aspects of founding bodies, historical backgrounds, the names and curricula of the programs, and their profiles of academics and students. Following the year 2011, there have been founded eight more graduate programs, which are at the universities of Mersin, Hacettepe, Akdeniz, Dokuz Eylül, Samsun 19 Mayıs, Gaziantep, Celal Bayar and Koç. Ankara University and Koç University are the only ones to offer a phd degree, the remaining ones offer master's with thesis and non-thesis degrees. In addition to the specificities of these programs, their names and self-definitions vary considerably from each other, as well. For instance, *women's studies*, *gender and women's studies* are common names while there a limited number of *women's researches*, *women and family studies* also exist. Thus, it is not possible to generalize them. However, within this conservative political atmosphere, there appears the risk of transforming these programs into the places where patriarchal knowledge is aimed to be produced and gender roles of women and men are acutely reproduced. To eliminate this risk, the need of self-definition and adoption of marginality turns out to be crucial. As dear Satı Atakul clearly draws the attention,

in such a country, we have lived all handicaps of our first institutionalization experience of such a subject matter. Declaring that we are students of women's studies graduate programs has always resulted in reactions of sneering smiles and astonishment. It has always been necessary to make long explanations. ... The weak position of the program within the university, the tense incidents we have experienced, the difficulties of our own selves, of other women, of femininity, of the subject of women and others –we can gradually broaden the circle- have highly significant influences on this situation (2002, p. 321).

Now that we have not surmounted these difficulties and that it is not possible to surmount them fully, it is vital to discuss the matter in detail, to problematize the room it makes for itself within academia, and to identify what GWS wants to be, how it can be and with which theoretical frameworks it can do so.

CHAPTER 4

METHODOLOGY

In this chapter, I make a detailed narration of my thesis story since it has a vital meaning in feminist methodology and qualitative research. I start with first sub-section Reflexivity and continue with The Base of the Study, Profile of the Sample, Process of Data Generation and end with Process of Data Analysis.

4.1. Reflexivity

At first, I should explain why I prefer ‘GWS’ while there exists a drove of names for the program. Simply, I just want to include all variations. GWS, to use the metaphor of Friedman (2001), is an umbrella concept for me which embodies the studies of gender, women, sexuality and feminism. It is definitely true that all of these abovementioned names have the possibility to consist them, as well. However, I preferred to signify this with the name as well as the content.

As a GWS student, the moment I have started my master’s program, I have been shocked with the reactions of the people within university when they have learnt that I am doing my master’s in GWS. These reactions have varied from embarrassment to astonishment due to the fact that they have not heard GWS at all though it has completed its 20th year at university. Then, I have realized the structural problems GWS faces within academia varying from the lack of academic positions to budget-related limitations and curriculum-formation difficulties. Feeling myself as the ‘marginal’ of the mainstream academic disciplines, I have just reflexively asked ‘why?’, why does GWS have a marginal position both within and outside the academia? How does this marginalization contribute to its recognition within academia or vice versa? What is the possibility of being familiar with an academically unrecognized GWS in our daily lives?

With the help of my supervisor's guidance, I have realized that I am making a generalization by admitting that GWS is the marginal of the academia, instead of initially asking what position GWS has within academia.

For this inquiry, I have chosen Feminist Standpoint research methodology which claims that acquiring knowledge from the standpoint of the 'marginal' provides a less partial knowledge in that the marginal is both the subject of the knowledge and has a double vision of the reality due to the 'outsider within' position. Moreover, the knowledge FST produces aims to be useful for its subjects and marginalization can be evaluated as an advantage in contrast to what we have thought.

In addition to these epistemological preferences, I have also made a political choice since I have wanted to criticize the traditional knowledge production processes which objectify the units of analysis and claim that it is scientific, and this methodology has provided me with the necessary tools to do so. As Jaggar states,

in a society where the production of knowledge is controlled by a certain class, the knowledge produced will reflect the interests and values of that class. In other words, in class societies the prevailing knowledge and science interpret reality from the standpoint of the ruling class. Because the ruling class has an interest in concealing the way in which it dominates and exploits the rest of the population, the interpretation of reality that it presents will be distorted in characteristic ways. In particular, the suffering of the subordinate classes will be ignored, redescribed as enjoyment or justified as freely chosen, deserved, or inevitable (2004, p. 56).

Applying this claim to my subject matter, it would not be wrong to say that in an academia where still the traditional modernist assumptions rule the knowledge production process, the knowledge produced on GWS would place it onto the lower side of a dichotomy and explain its existence not evaluated within its own specificities but determined within and according to mainstream academia. To clarify the point, I admit that I also evaluate the situation of GWS within academia with the claim of situated academic marginalization and create a dichotomy of academia versus GWS; however, from my standpoint, I reject not dichotomies but the hierarchical and deterministic

relationship between the two sides of dichotomies and do not define the parts of the dichotomy in relation to their differences from each other. Moreover, I include the influences of feminist movement and political conjuncture as intersectional factors to be able to understand the situation of GWS within academia along with the inquiry of the subject and subjectivity. In this regard, the evaluation of GWS within academia is meaningful only when its specificities are included and is in a non-hierarchical and interactive relationship with academia in which neither of the side determines the position of another, and both mutually improve each other. Within this framework, objectivity cannot be taken as an essential base and GWS cannot be reduced to a program producing only knowledge about gender and women since it has a political nature upon which its existence has been constituted. Moreover, it cannot be universalized in that the specific conditions of its emergence and improvement within each university are unique although mainstream academic structure and the political conjuncture they emerged and have been growing are common cutting lines. In addition, political and activist features of the agents- both academics and students- and different standpoints referring to these features within and among the agents gain importance to situate GWS programs where they want and claim to be. It is important to repeat and highlight for me that an analysis which regards academia and GWS with a classical understanding of dichotomy and which explain each in relation to their difference from each other would move the issue to the outside the realm of the reality and would not explain the situation of GWS experiences in real life. Additionally, an analysis which criticizes this classical understanding of dichotomy and which find a value in the lower side of the dichotomy with an attribution of empowerment is still not enough to understand the experience of GWS lives in reality. What is necessary and what I aim in this thesis to do with FST is not only to criticize the dichotomous understanding and to empower the lower side but also to value all knowledge claims as partial and situated by means of which specificities of multiple subjectivities have the chance to be included and taken into account within these knowledge claims.

I have one more political choice within this thesis: feminist language. I consciously use first person singular and active voice throughout the thesis with the aim of making my voice heard and my existence within this study visible.

4.2. The Base of the Study

Due to the fact that my aim is not to give a statistical evaluation of the GWS programs, but to understand the current position of GWS within academia and its relationships with other disciplines and the administrative bodies, I have decided to make a qualitative study. Mason states that qualitative research is

based on methods of analysis and explanation building which involve understandings of complexity, detail and context. Qualitative research aims to produce rounded understandings on the basis of rich, contextual, and detailed data. There is more emphasis on ‘holistic’ forms of analysis and explanation in this sense, than on charting surface patterns, trends and correlations. Qualitative research usually does use some form of quantification, but statistical forms of analysis are not seen as central (1996, p. 4).

I have thus chosen semi-structured in-depth interviews as my qualitative research method because I have been in need of the personal histories, experiences, observations and perspectives to position GWS within academia from a feminist standpoint theory approach. Instructors of GWS have been optimal choice for these personal histories and experiences in that they have taken place either in the emergence and development processes of feminist movement or academic feminism or in both and the experiences they share would make it more possible for me to situate GWS somewhere in academia and explore the connections from the beginning until now than the students or the alumni of GWS would enable me to do so.

Moreover, as I am one of the students of the program, I have felt the urge of keeping aloof from my subject matter to a certain extent; and thus did not prefer to include students as the subject of the knowledge.

4.3. Profile of the Sample

In order to enrich the produced data and to understand the effects of different academic existence forms on a GWS program, I have chosen the instructors of two GWS programs from the University of X and University of Y in Turkey with a similar historical background but different academic stories. I have preferred purposive sampling that included a wide range of instructors varying from the retired founders of the programs to recently introducing elective course instructors from different disciplines. I have added a casebook showing some academic characteristics of the instructors in Appendix A.

4.4. Process of Data Generation

As a data generation tool, I have prepared a quite general and thus, inclusive guideline in four sections. The first one is beginning with the academic and historical background and current situation of the program on local, national and international platforms. The second section continues with its institutional specificities focusing mostly on its interdisciplinary features, advantages and disadvantages of interdisciplinarity and alternative forms of being. The third section furthers the query with the problematization of knowledge and politics relationship including differentiation of feminist theories, modernity and postmodernity reflections, relationships between feminist movement, and ways of producing knowledge and politics. The last one ends the process with predictions about its future. In order to be able to form the guideline of the field study I have potentially made theoretical readings. Our thesis seminar group and discussions and studies we have made altogether have contributed much to my understanding of the theory and its application to my subject matter during the process, as well. As a group, we have prepared a substantial list of concepts and relations of FST out of various compiled FST articles. We, then, merged all of the charts we prepared and I categorized all of these merged concepts and relations according to FST concepts, for instance with the headings like *partiality / partial knowledge, epistemic privilege, experience, strong objectivity, action, specificities, contingency, location, situation, condition,*

intersubjectivity, intersectionality, collectivity and others. Following the preparation of this vast chart, we organized a one-week-study of this chart with a small group of friends and my supervisor. During this week, we tried to understand the meaning of each of these concepts from the perspective of FST and to relate them with a critical viewpoint to modernity and postmodernity. At the end of this intensive theory and concept-related study, we were able to generate our own concepts and relations and to interpret any concept and data with our theoretical standpoint. This study had grounded the most important basis of my background study at the end of which I brought out the concepts and relations on theoretical and topic-specific levels, graded and prioritized them according to my subject matter, and formed multiple and comparative concept maps not only in terms of social theory and feminist standpoint theory but also of academia in a wider and GWS programs in a narrower sense. The guideline, thus, has been formed with a strategy of including key concepts of GWS and academia in a chronological and consecutive sequence. I have added an example of the guideline in Appendix B.

The types of data generated by this semi-structured in-depth interview method are field notes, audio recordings and transcripts of 17 in-depth interviews in total, nine from one and eight from the other university. Arranging the interviews via e-mails, I have got 17 positive, three negative replies with six no replies. The interviews I made took place mostly in the offices of the instructors in a silent and peaceful atmosphere, and the duration varied from an hour to four hours and all interviews were recorded and eventuated in a total 28 hours of audio recording and 300 pages of transcription. In the second half of the interviews, I have revised the questions and furthered the recurrent ones.

4.5. Process of Analysis

As for the data analysis process, I have chosen content analysis method and used QSR NVivo 8. I uploaded all interviews as internal sources. Then, I prepared summaries of the interviews noting the most striking points of the academics, uploaded them as memos and linked them to their correspondences in the internals. Following, I coded

the full interviews, free coding was the first step and there appeared 140 nodes as a result of this coding process. *Marginalization, recognition, interdisciplinarity, politics, relationships with feminist movement, academia and political conjuncture, constituting a feminist identity, the emergence conditions, self-definition* are some of the critical codes. I add both internal and nodes in Appendix D and Appendix E. Taking notes during the whole process, I composed specific sets and models, made queries and checked for the relations. Then, I diagrammatized the common relations this time by using these nodes, and once again prepared comparative concept sets of FST and GWS separately in accordance with these schemes. Classifying the codes into their sections and sub-sections, I tried to understand what kind of relations were coming to the fore. When I felt the point, I ended the process.

In the very beginning, I had had academic marginalization in my mind. However, during the field study and analysis process, I forgot about marginalization and did not place a theme related specifically to marginalization within the guideline because I did not want to lead the study and look with a unidimensional viewpoint, instead I focused on understanding the situation it holds within academia from the very viewpoints of the academics of the programs. My guideline was so inclusive that my data set was huge in content and there existed numberless themes to focus on at the end of the analysis process. This had confused me a lot since the themes of interdisciplinarity, political characteristics of GWS and academia, conservative political atmosphere seemed to be separately important and I could not decide among them. At the end, when I checked for the relations among these themes, I realized the theme of marginalization to be quite powerful and to have the potential to reflect my generated data to a large extent as the common cutting line of other themes. However, it was not just an academic marginalization as I had thought previously, but a situated academic marginalization, instead. Here I realized different stages of marginalization among and within GWS programs in the light of FST and its conceptual framework. Therefore, I looked through the whole data with this new viewpoint once again and then modified the whole process in accordance with this finding. There also appeared some crucial themes related to the

inner dynamics of GWS programs, but I did not prefer to mention them here since they require a different background platform of discussion concerning my research problematics.

CHAPTER 5

ANALYSIS

This chapter consists of three sections. Under the heading of Relationship of Knowledge and Politics, I analyze The Necessity of Self-Definition and Self-Valuation, Factors Influencing the Current Position of GWS, and Situated Academic Marginalization. The reason why I decide to divide sections as these is that I have found out of my analysis that it is not possible to understand the position of GWS within academia without looking into its both inner dynamics and external factors. Within this regard, the self-definitions of the programs and the external factors affecting current position of GWS have lifted the issue out of the context of academic marginalization. In other words, the analysis has shown that the current political situation is a relatively important signifier and it is necessary to look at the self-definitions and external factors in order to reach academic marginalization.

In the first section, I examine the necessity of self-definition and self-valuation which has appeared as an *in vivo* code, that is it was unexpected and it came from the field. Although I have not had any specific or intended questions about self-definition, its necessity has occurred to be vital in that the mission, vision and current position of any program appear to be in quite direct relationship with this self-definition. I put the necessity of self-definition and self-valuation in the light of Patricia Hill Collins' views in *The Meaning of Self-Definition and Self-Valuation*. I, then, look whether the academics of the two programs I interviewed self-define themselves or not and if yes, how they do so. At the end, I made my own self-definition of GWS in order to situate my position throughout the study. According to my findings, the program of the

University of X self-defines itself as ‘WS²’ and the program of the University of Y makes its self-definition as ‘U.Y.³ GWS’. Their self-valuations change in accordance with their definitions. It is necessary to note that not all of the academics I interviewed make a self-definition since I did not intend to ask any kind of question related to it. That is why it is a better account to state that these self-definitions are situated. I examine them in detail in this chapter.

In the second section, I look at the external factors that my interviewees put forth. These are the emergence conditions of GWS in Turkey, current political conjuncture and current situations of academia and feminist movement in the country. According to these findings, the influence of 1980 coup d’etat on academia and critical thinking have smoothed the assertive and critical characteristics of GWS, while the existence of United Nations following 1995 Beijing Conference caused a non-direct, an inorganic relationship with the feminist movement of the period, both of which have paved the way for the marginalization of GWS within academia. However, these findings are not only specific results related to the two programs I examine, but general accounts that I draw out of them regarding Turkey. As for the current political conjuncture and current situations of academia and feminist movement within the country, the findings are current political situation has sharply affected both the situation of academia and of feminist movement, and thus unsurprisingly that of GWS within both. That is, the programs are now in a position of protecting current acquisitions instead of leaping forward to proceed due to the facts that, first, the political conjuncture does not provide any opportunity to improve and worse it prevents any initiation, let alone any support; second, academia is not in a period of expansion but in contrast it is in a period of decadence; and the third, feminist movement and its agents are one of the direct target boards of the president and it has its own inner problems. These factors are all leading the issue to the marginalization of GWS within academia. However, when I look at the

² Women’s Studies.

³ First capitals of *University of Y*, this is a pseudo name.

reflections of these influences on the two GWS programs I interviewed, I come across a *situated* academic marginalization.

The last section covers the finding of situated academic marginalization. Situated academic marginalization means that GWS programs were born into a marginalized position within academia but the level of marginalization changes from program to program in accordance with the specificities of the programs, universities, attitudes of these programs towards their universities and their adoption of marginalization. Their adoption of marginalization consists of their two significant characteristics: being political and interdisciplinary. The more they embrace these two characteristics the more they feel marginalized, and accordingly the more they produce a critical insight to understand academia and thus, to transform marginalization into an advantage. According to this, achieving interdisciplinarity turns out to be an issue shaped much in direct line with the university administrations, while achieving politics requires efforts of both universities and GWS programs themselves.

5.1. Relationship of Knowledge and Politics

The most important claim of FST is that there is a direct relationship between production of knowledge and the dynamics of power relations, and marginal groups take place in the middle of these relations. Since GWS is both a political and academic discipline and since I study the position of GWS programs within academia, it is possible to reveal and draw the lines of the relationship between knowledge production and political action. Here, I examine the relations among partial knowledge, socially situated knowledge, strong objectivity, intersectionality and subjectivity, collective and shared political action and marginalization, interdisciplinarity, political conjuncture and academic specificities.

5.1.1. The Necessity of Self-Definition and Self-Valuation

It is necessary to look through perceptions of Gender and Women's Studies outside the realm of GWS community prior to examining thoroughly what it does and does not

mean. There are a variety of popular urban myths about GWS. When interviewee O shares her experiences, she mentions that, for some, GWS may mean to be a discipline related with women's health or nursing. If not, it might be a house of wantonness for maybe 'spinsters', or those who 'have problems in sexual prowess and cannot spill the beans', or even those who are 'morally corrupted'. As an extension of this viewpoint, for others, GWS is a discipline that avoids meddling; as K states it is a discipline "even our friends look down on, mock at and criticize for 'messaging around with nonsensical women's or girls' matters while there are quite significant issues like politics, economics, class and struggle"". Similarly, as S indicates, GWS is defined by patriarchal institutions and those men and women holding and maintaining this institutional viewpoint "to study some 'light' and 'boutique' issues". From these points of view, GWS

was perceived as marginal, unimportant, moreover, fantasy and even 'magazine studies' and was ignored, on one hand; it was not included in the fresh water of serious academic activities. Women academics who were once seen as 'unsuccessful', 'avid' or 'useless' were 'sent' here; or, it even turned out to be a shelter for women academics who ran away from the fierce stress of competition between men in the university. On the other hand, at the universities where cooperation and coherent relations with some 'academic stars' and 'feminist princesses' that emerged in this field were available, the 'showcase' was shiny; however, the rest of the field was ignored to exist (Sancar, p. 190).

When 'perceptions' evolve to be 'definitions' they become more powerful, and this power enables the owners of these definitions to shape and lead a thought on behalf of which a basis is provided for inclusion as well as exclusion of some meanings. If these owners are not the subjects of the knowledge that is defined, and more significantly if they do not have a 'situated' position, then the definitions have the potential to dominate, to marginalize and to alienate. In order to avoid the stereotypical characterization of this historically and contemporarily pervaded dominant definitions, self-definition is a must. While Patricia Hill Collins writes about *The Meaning of Self-Definition and Self-Valuation* within her essay, she states that the insistence on self-definition "reframes the entire dialogue from one of determining the technical accuracy of an image, to one

stressing the power dynamics underlying the very process of definition itself” (2004, p. 106). Questioning not only the above-mentioned definitions and epithets constructed in the name of GWS but also “the credibility and the intentions of those possessing the power to define”, a self-definition of GWS will explicitly signify a clear rejection of “the taken-for-granted assumption that those in positions granting them the authority to describe and analyze reality are entitled to do so” (2004, p. 107). Moreover, due to the fact that self-definition embodies out-facing the political knowledge justification process resulting in extrinsically-defined, cliché images of not only an academic discipline and its knowledge but also, in a wider sense, of womanhood, the act of insisting on self-definition will play a significant role in validating the power of GWS as the subject of the field and its components as human subjects.

As for the self-definitions of the two programs I have selected for my thesis, one of them self-defines itself to be “not GWS but WS”. Since the academics of the program constantly have emphasized that “it is not GWS, we call it WS here” (O, H, K) it can be inferred that this is an important way of ‘being’ for them. It is a close and strong tie that brings them altogether and provides them with the sense of belonging to a group. For O, it is a home where she was born, grew and is still living. O states that “When they ask where I was born, I reply: I was born in WS,” while for K it is the space not to ‘take a breath’ but ‘to breathe’ and much more:

Everybody involves in this program with a great devotion, feeling themselves good and regarding here as a life space for themselves. From the personal dialogues, I know that these people are to be pretty sad in case they need to drift away from there. Here is a space⁴ which makes us feel good and feel that we are together with people alike, here is a breathing space that really refreshes us since we closely engage with our students. That is why we put a super-extra effort for here and make a great deal of sacrifices. Actually, it is the influence of this feeling that this program has leaped significantly forward and we are still able to conduct such huge activities without any financial support and any financial expectation.

(Çünkü herkes çok fedakarca ve çok kendini iyi hissederek, kendine bir yaşam

⁴ I specifically and consciously prefer the word ‘space’ instead of ‘place’ in my translation for Turkish word ‘yer’ since the original emphasis on the concept is an abstract one rather than a physical connotation.

alanı olarak görerek bu programa dahil oluyor, buradan kopmaları gerekirse insanlar çok üzülecek, biliyorum özelde yaptığımız konuşmalardan da. Burası bize kendimizi iyi hissettiren, benzerlerimizle bir arada olduğumuzu hissettiren ve öğrencilerimizle de çok yakın bir ilişki kurduğumuz için bizi gerçekten ferahlatan, nefes alacak bir ortam sunan bir yer. O yüzden buraya çok fazla emek harcıyoruz, çok fazla fedakarlık yapıyoruz. Biraz da buranın böyle bir atılım yapmasında hiçbir maddi karşılık olmadan, aslında hiçbir somut destek olmadan bu kadar çok işi, bu kadar çok etkinliği yürütebilmesinde bunun etkisi var.)

As an extension of this self-definition, the vision, mission, outputs and, in the long term, the position of the program take shape accordingly. In another part of the interview, K joyfully utters:

We have a political standpoint and this political standpoint brings the necessity of an equal relationship with our students with it. This is not something that we are forced to do, it is our perspective on life; if the students learn something from us, we learn something from them, as well. From this aspect, our courses pass highly interactive. It is true that we are instructors and we are standing by the chair and they are sitting there, but this does not mean that I can teach them but they cannot teach me, they are lower than me or so on. Most of us are trying not to set such a hierarchy, such an authority between us as much as possible. And this pleases our students a lot! We are going to the bar together, we are going to the protests together, we are sitting in the garden, meeting in our homes. Some of them have children, we are arranging joint activities for and with our children, and so on. ... What I am trying to say here is that such an interaction develops something beyond the courses: a solidarity, a mutual understanding and a remedy.

(Bizim bir politik duruşumuz var, bu politik duruş da bizim öğrencilerle daha eşit bir ilişki kurmamızı beraberinde getiriyor. Hani zorla yaptığımız bir şey değil bu, bizim zaten hayata bakışımız böyle, öğrenci bizden bir şey öğreniyorsa biz de öğrenciden bir şey öğreniyoruz. Gerçekten derslerimiz o açıdan çok etkileşimsel geçiyor. Hani biz hocayız, tabii ki öyle bir gerçek var, sen kürsüde duruyorsun o şeyde oturuyor ama yani ben sana öğretim, sen bana öğretilmezsin, sen benden aşağısın, öyle bir hiyerarşi, otorite, mümkün olduğu kadar kurmamaya çalışıyoruz, çoğumuz. O da öğrencilerin çok hoşuna gidiyor, birlikte bara gidiyoruz, birlikte eyleme gidiyoruz, bahçede oturuyoruz, evlerde buluşuyoruz, çocuklarımızı birlikte işte onların da çocukları oluyor, birlikte faaliyet yaptırıyoruz bilmem ne.. Öyle bir etkileşim de derslerin ötesinde aslında bir şey de geliştiriyor, bir dayanışma, bir birbirini anlama ve bir sağaltıcı bir şey de oluyor, onu söylemeye çalışıyorum.)

The last sentence is extremely significant due to the fact that the aim of feminist methodology is to achieve such kind of remedial solidarity and it asserts that its difference from the others lies at this point. This is a productive interrelationship which is born in the phase of the self-definition and turns back to it.

As for the second program, some of the academics called themselves “U.Y. GWS”. Mentioning the name of the program constantly with the name of the university proves the respect for the university and implies an equally respectful identity of the program. As D proudly states

U.Y. and GWS cannot be separated from each other, we, of course, conduct these studies with our identity of U.Y. and we are all from U.Y. ... U.Y. is one of the exceptional institutions which embodies academic freedom with all its components. And our GWS refers again and exactly to the same.

(Y Üniversitesi ve GWS anabilim dalı birbirinden ayrılamaz, biz tabii ki Y.Ü. kimliğimizle bu işi yapıyoruz, hepimiz çok da Y.Ü'lüyüz. ... Akademik özgürlük denilen şeyi bütün bileşenleriyle birlikte içinde barındırabilen ender kurumlardan bir tanesi Y.Ü. Bizim anabilim dalı da zaten tam da ve gene böyle bir problemi işaret eder.)

In addition, some insisted on ‘WS,’ while some emphasized the *G* of ‘GWS’. For example, L draws the attention that “The *G* part of GWS is being forgotten here, I would also like to mention this, *G* is also existent, it is not only women and their studies”. This reminder refers to the absence of queer and masculinities studies within the program, which is a must from the aspect of the mission and vision of the program in direct accordance with its name.

Within this regard, it is possible to infer that there is a diversity in self-definition of this program rather than a reign of integrity, which implies a richness in the standpoints rather than a collective action.

Now that it is important for me to define what Gender and Women’s Studies is and is not before indicating my position and producing knowledge from there, I will start with what it is not. First, GWS is not a field of gynecology nor nursing, which reduce women both biologically and socially into their gender roles. Then, GWS is not a ghetto where

a group of women come together, exclude men and produce knowledge and politics just for their own sake. Neither is it a free time activity that relieves whoever wishes from the *stressing atmosphere of work and daily life difficulties*. Not to forget, GWS is not a comfy and easy going way of academic proceeding whoever can touch on with a high hand, either. Last, GWS is not a playground for men nor women who reproduce patriarchal, unequal, marginalizing and alienating discourses under the name of feminism. The field of Gender and Women's Studies is the field of both academic and political existence and resistance of all somehow marginalized identities, which acts as a fountain by means of which the knowledge produced is disseminated among and penetrated into all academic disciplines. It is a political resistance initially against the patriarchal system which constructs a dichotomous power relationship between men and women, defines what male, female, masculinity and femininity mean, situates women inferior to men and composes the life pattern according to the needs and profits of the dominant. It is an activist resistance against this hierarchical and deterministic approach which universalizes both sides of the dichotomy grounding a rational and essential base for its purposes. GWS is an academic resistance then against the mainstream academia that serves the needs and profits of the patriarchal system with its *objective* knowledge. It is a methodological and epistemological resistance against exactly this objective knowledge production process and the knowledge produced in that it not only cries solely the voice of the dominant but also voices a partial and biased pronunciation under the cloak of objectivity. GWS is thus a serious and arduous way of life which requires a compatible and sturdy standpoint both within and outside academia. Most crucially, as R emphatically underlines:

I think there is such a progressive force at the heart of Women's Studies, in other words, it is not available for mainstreaming, it always has to oppose the mainstream, this mainstream may be liberal or conservative; however, I think we should always have an alternative discourse.

(KÇ'nin özünde öyle bir ilerici güç var diye düşünüyorum, müsait değil yani o anaakımlaşmaya, her zaman için anaakıma karşı bir yerde durmak zorunda, o anaakım liberal de olabilir, tutucu da olabilir ama bizim her zaman için alternatif bir söylem içinde olmamız gerekir diye düşünüyorum.)

In other words, GWS does have to constitute situated and critical standpoints in order to be able to surmount and survive with its differences and specificities. Even though this sounds like a manifesto of GWS, it is rather a self-definition and this is overwhelmingly necessary since the way for self-awareness and self-valuation passes from here. As L points out:

However, it is not something like a human that is born, grows up and dies, I believe its formalization and maintenance is a little bit about working on what is to be done. It can be closed if wanted, as well. It does not go on its own, it should be directed, we are not evolving, it will be whatever it wants politically.

(Ama bu yani insan gibi doğup büyüüp ölen bir şey değil, onun şekillendirilip devam ettirilmesi, birazcık da ne yapılmasına çalışılmasıyla ilgili diye düşünüyorum, istenirse kapanır da burası, hani şey gibi değil, kendi başına bırakıldığında giden bir şey değil bu, yön vermek lazım, hani evrimleşmiyoruz, politik olarak kendisi ne olmak istiyorsa o olacak.)

That is, what lies behind not only the characteristics and components of a GWS program, but also its future is this self-definition attributed to GWS. Its mission and vision are constituted in direct proportion to its self-definition. To underline and highlight, I am aware that this self-definition is situated from person to person and, in a wider sense, from program to program across local, national and global platforms. However, my self-definition is required to be able to situate this thesis to a critical standpoint and produce knowledge from here. What is self-defined here is not a rejection but a reaction to and a harsh criticism of the modernist understanding of science and its derivatives.

Following this self-definition, the theme of self-valuation takes the issue one step further. While self-definition speaks to the power dynamics involved in the act of defining images of self and community, the theme of self-valuation addresses the actual content of these definitions, as Collins puts it (2004, p. 107). To ridicule GWS by labeling it ‘the house of the wanton, of the spinsters, of the sexually troubled women’ or to mock at it by marking it as ‘fantasy’ or even ‘magazine’ reflect an effort to put all critical programs in its place and control the assertive characteristic of these critical

programs that challenge the ‘rules’ of mainstream academia and threaten its status quo.

As H insists:

Moreover, there is the issue of disincluding the knowledge of this field in their disciplinary fields; it seems like a separate field and they can just mind their own business. For them, yes, it is a field of gender and power relations of Political Science, who studies it can study it; however, it is not possible to be a political scientist without the knowledge of theoretical approaches related to power relations based on gender, just as it is not possible to be a political scientist without the knowledge of governmental theories. However, we are not at the point of comprehending this fact. It is a separate point of interest, it is okay not to know it, it is believed that it is okay if a political scientist does not know it. Therefore, it is not at the same level as other theoretical fields.

(Sonra da bu alanın bilgisini kolay kolay kendi disipliner alanına içermeme de var, hani o ayrı bir alan, biz de kendi işimize bakalım gibi. Yani onu bilmesen de olur, bu Siyaset Bilimi’nin bir cinsiyet ve iktidar ilişkileri alanı evet, onu çalışan onu çalışsın ama şöyle bir şey yani devlet kuramı bilmeden siyaset bilimci nasıl olunmuyorsa cinsiyete dayalı iktidar ilişkilerine ilişkin kuramsal yaklaşımları bilmeden de siyaset bilimci olunmaz ama henüz bunu kavrama noktasında değiliz, o bir ayrı ilgi alanı, bilmese de olur, bir siyaset bilimcinin toplumsal cinsiyet çalışmaları bilmese de olur diye düşünüyor. Dolayısıyla, birçok başka kuramsal alanla aynı düzeyde değil.)

This understandably partial-recognition of GWS within academia in the meantime of nearly 25 years entails a self-recognition and self-valuation process that “challenges the content of externally defined controlling images” (Collins, 2004, 107). To disinclude GWS similarly echoes an effort to keep away another threat of critical programs that discomforts and disturbs mainstream academic understanding and dispossesses it from producing knowledge that serves for its own perpetuity. In contrast to what most of the academics commonly ignore, K stresses, what they do not understand is that the issues sprouting out of the problems that heterosexism and gender inequality give rise to are intersectional with all other types of discrimination. To put it differently, gender issues cannot be separated from the issues of class, race and ethnicity, and the solution of the one goes neck and neck with the solutions of the others. Considering the potential damage of internalized control to the self-esteem and self-recognition of GWS community, and the remarkable effort and inner strength it requires, self-definition and

self-valuation turn out to be not luxuries but necessities (Collins, 2004, p. 109) for the survival of GWS. The position that GWS wants to have within not only academia but also feminist movement and social platforms in the both near and distant future is in quite accordance with the self-definition it makes and the frameworks it draws for itself with the help of this self-definition.

5.1.2. Factors Influencing the Current Position of GWS

After situating GWS into a critical standpoint and making an entrance into the subject of marginalization of GWS, now it is necessary to examine thoroughly the relationships between knowledge and politics in order to be able to understand the position of GWS within academia and its academic marginalization better. The conditions in which GWS was born and has been growing in Turkey, the current situation of not only academia but also feminist movement both in general and in Turkey, and the political conjuncture that Turkey has been facing today have altogether shaped the current academic position of GWS. GWS has naturally been influenced by these intersecting factors and we have to comprehend the difficulties GWS has confronted from the very beginning of its emergence until today.

5.1.2.1. The Conditions of the Emergence of GWS in Turkey

The entrance of GWS into academia as an academic discipline was in the mid-1990s, although its background had dated back to 1970s (Ecevit, 2015, p. 5). During this period two factors can be counted as most crucial in terms of GWS, one is the agenda of Gender and Development projects by means of which United Nations has played an important role, and the other is the crisis of critical thinking within academia in the aftermath of the September 12 events. To start with the first one, as Deniz Kandiyoti clearly points out that

Gender and Women's Studies in Turkey, as elsewhere, are the product of the confluence of at least three temporarily distinct, but mutually reinforcing sets of influences: women's movements; the epistemological/analytic challenges of feminism to academia; and the global "institutionalization" of standards and

mechanisms for gender equality through the workings of the United Nations (UN) system and major international donors (Kandiyoti, 2010, p. 166).

According to what Yakın Ertürk (2015) scrutinizes in her book, the 1990s was a significant period in terms of expanded human rights and a very crucial turning point with regard to women's rights. It was this period that the cold war came to an end, people gained an independent identity from their governments and became components of wider international networks, and global conferences organized through the agency of UN took place. These were the instruments of a mobilization and the issue of 'woman' was a significant component of these conferences. Especially as part of the UN Beijing Conference on Women in 1995, there created funds to support women's studies programs at national levels; and within the framework of a protocol between UN and Directorate General on the Status of Women, the foundation of gender and women's studies programs came into question (Ertürk, 2015). Therefore, according to R,

unlike the development patterns around the world, because, as you know, emergence of Women's Studies was a part of women's movement, in other words, it was a result of activism, therefore, it was an organic integrity- however, in Turkey it emerged by creating an opportunity somewhere as a result of such an international entity. However, its correlation with women's movement developed in time. It is therefore totally a mistake to say that it is a product of women's movement. There may be a natural weakness resulting from it and in my opinion it is valid for all Women's Studies in Turkey today.

(dünyadaki gelişim örüntülerinin tersine, çünkü ilk KÇ'nin ortaya çıkışı kadın hareketinin bir parçasıydı biliyorsun, yani bir aktivizm sonucu, dolayısıyla da orada organik bir bütünlük söz konusuydu- oysa Türkiye'de böyle bir uluslararası oluşumun bir sonucu olarak kaynakların oluşturulmasıyla bir yerde bir imkan yaratılması sonucu olmuştur. Fakat kadın hareketiyle bir bağlantısı zaman içerisinde gelişen bir şey oldu. Yani kadın hareketinin bir ürünüdür demek son derece hatalı olur. Oradan kaynaklanan tabii bir zayıflık olabiliyor ve bugün bence Türkiye'deki KÇ'lerin tümü için bu söz konusu.)

To put it differently, following a rather distinctive emergence pattern as a mobilization component of a wider and global project in comparison with the other examples of the world, GWS cannot be claimed to have a direct relationship with women's movement in the very beginning in Turkey. While there exists an exciting, harsh and loud

grassroots movements behind the emergence of GWS programs in most parts of the world –where GWS has grown relatively more successfully-, there mostly lies the influence of UN as a crucial impetus under the foundation of GWS in Turkey (C), and this, R emphasizes, has accelerated these programs on one hand, while formed their weak points on the other. Technical problems such as limited budget, lack of permanent academic staff and offices to study, unstable curricula and so on come up to be partly the results of these ending funds that form the weak point. The latter cannot be underestimated in that it has crucially influenced the development and future of GWS programs in the long run where the effect of UN has mainly been felt. Since these programs are not the harvest of merely United Nations, and that the problems confronted cannot be reduced to material needs, the efforts of some committed agents of the programs within academic structures have made them survive until today, even if on the brink of starvation.

Apart from the ending funds, this weak point become layered by the inorganic relationship with feminist movement, as well. Although it has been developed within time, having an inorganic relationship with feminist movement in the beginning has impeded to grasp the real meaning and objective of the programs by some agents.

However, when this issue of pushing from below, the internalization of feminism, is absent- and since we could not think the scientist as separate from society- it has leaked into GWS programs in a way. In other words, issues like how feminist the university administrations are that they will support these programs come up. Therefore, it is difficult to tell apart these two from each other (C).

(ama o kökten itme meselesi, feminizmi içselleştirmesi, o olmayınca, bu bilim insanını da toplumdan ayrı düşünemediğimiz için, bu GWS programlarına da o yolla bir şekilde yansıdı. Yani üniversite yönetimleri ne kadar feminist ki o programları desteklesin gibi meseleler tabii gündeme geliyor, dolayısıyla bu ikisini birbirinden ayırt etmek çok zor (C).)

When we have a look at the existence of the agents taking place in the foundation process of GWS we come up with a group of interwoven social relationships. As A classifies,

it is a mixture, in other words, in the first established GWS programs, there were academics who were feminist activists and who conducted feminist studies, who had the two features; there were those who had never been activists but conducted feminist studies; and the third group was neither of them – who was neither feminist activists nor conducted feminist studies, they were invited by others, were interested in the subject and they said they could study this subject from now on.

(o anlamda bir mixture diyelim; yani ilk kurulan GWS programlarında, hem feminist aktivist hem de feminist çalışmalar yapan, aynı iki özelliği kendinde toplamış olan hocalar var; hiç aktivist olmayanlar var ama feminist çalışmalar yapmışlar; 3.grup da ne ondan ne ondan, yani hem feminist aktivist değil hem feminist çalışma yapmamış, diğerlerinin davetiyle gelen ve konuya ilgi duyan, bundan sonra çalışabilirim, çalışayım ben bu konuda diyenler var.)

This intertwinement has defined the characteristics of GWS programs in Turkey whether they have been feminist or not on one hand, and identified their quality on the other. Programs whose agents are more politically engaged with activism have turned out to be more successful, as A underlines. Moreover, as I experience during my interviews, those who are in a much direct relationship with feminist movement and the field work itself have appeared to internalize feminist ethics and feminist pedagogy and to apply both in not only the management of the program but also the formation and updating of the curriculum much more than the others.

The impact of UN and the indirect relationship of initial GWS programs with feminist movement have highly influenced the improvement and settlement of GWS within academia. However, this situation cannot be extendable among all GWS programs in Turkey due to the fact that there are locational, contextual, conditional and situational specificities among them:

There are many different stories at various universities. It is not the same for everywhere, it had already been like that at the foundation phase, too. There were so different programs in terms of interests, university traditions and qualities of founding bodies, and they are still so (G).

(Farklı üniversitelerde çok farklı hikayeler var. Her yerde aynı biçimde değil, zaten kuruluşta da öyleydi, yani hem ilgi alanları hem üniversite gelenekleri, kurucu hocaların nitelikleri filan bakımından birbirinden çok farklı programlardı bunlar, hala da öyle (G).)

The differences and specificities of GWS programs have constituted different patterns of entrance and settlement processes for each one of them within academia. Therefore, their agents, visions, objectives, curricula, the difficulties and resistances faced, names and self-definitions and so on have been altered in accordance with these.

With the second factor influencing the current situation of GWS in connection with its entrance phase into academia, the crisis of critical thinking within academia following the September 12 events is worth mentioning. As Sancar outlines:

At the end of 1980's and beginning of 1990's, the period during which academic feminism has moved its criticism to university, a crisis period when impacts of September 12th were still effective was in question. The university defeated by militarism was suspected of its own academic forces and did not trust on its power of renovation. Moreover, during this process, the existence of new universities was not perceived as empowerment but as ruralization. Additionally, with the penetration of the policies contrary to classical traditions of Academia such as privatization, marketing, monetization for 'commodification' of knowledge into the university, the 'critical tradition' which is already weak has begun to feel itself totally defeated and weakened. This crisis of critical thinking and the crisis of the university has been experienced as the same process to a large extent in Turkey (2003, p. 207).

Highly influenced by this collided process, GWS finds itself considerably without support and even invisible owing to the academic indifference of the period.

Within that period, unlike the successful examples in the world, feminism that tried to transfer its criticism to university has been devoid of academic support of critical thinking to a large extent. This situation has restricted the efficient frontiers of feminist critical thinking in social sciences and restrained it from being an important component of 'social criticism' (Sancar, 2003, p. 207).

GWS, whose involvement in academia coincided with a politically dark and non-progressive period, has taken its place within academia in a quiet and retiring manner and been faced with the risk of being doomed to die on the vine, if not that much, of being underestimated and ignored. Although it has saved itself from this danger and made its own way, this situation has played a vital role in the situation of GWS within academia and added one more layer to its marginalization.

5.1.2.2. Current Political Conjuncture, Academic Situation and Feminist Movement in Turkey

Although I am aware of the fact that it is not possible to understand the current political conjuncture within a few paragraphs, my intention here is just to draw a unidimensional picture in relation to gender and women's studies to be able to understand its current position within academia. Difficult to separate the political conjuncture from current situation of academia and current situation of feminist movement in relation to GWS programs, all of which are strongly intersected with each other, looking into the political situation Turkey faces today and its effects on academia and feminist movement will facilitate to position GWS into a broader context.

The political conjuncture in Turkey has affected all social institutions and their relations from family to military, to health, education, economics, and so on. As sources of knowledge and politics, academia and social movements have also their places within this picture. A besieged academia and a targeted feminist movement have naturally and directly defined the position of GWS within academia. As N remarks:

It is not possible to discuss anything without touching on the situation Turkey is in, that is, on context; context is very important for everything. However, in our field, context comes into prominence, and in our field, scientific environment should be free in reality for programs that have such critical perspectives. We clearly see that programs that have a critical perspective are seriously sabotaged in scientific environments which are not free, and this worries us a lot.

(Türkiye'nin içinde bulunduğu duruma değinmeden, yani bağlama değinmeden hiçbir şeyi tartışmak mümkün değil, her şey için bağlam çok önemli. Ama bizim alanımızda bağlam çok daha fazla önem kazanıyor ve bizim alanımızda bu tür eleştirel perspektifi olan programlar için gerçekten bilimsel ortamın çok özgür olması gerekiyor, özgür olmayan bilimsel ortamda eleştirel perspektifi olan programların çok ciddi baltalandığını görüyoruz ve bu bizi çok endişelendiriyor.)

During 13-year-rule of Adalet ve Kalkınma Partisi (AKP)⁵ government, 50 % of the society has found itself excluded from the main discourse of president Tayyip Erdoğan. Not only social relations such as academia but also agents like feminists along with all those “semi-” and “under-” women who refuse to be mothers (BBC, 2016) have increasingly become the target board of the president Erdoğan. Having problems at minimum with the governments of the past periods, GWS programs and their agents have also had their share from this downpour of arrows especially in recent years. According to E,

we were always supported by the government, at least, we got moral support, in other words, all women ministers were in cooperation with us until AKP government came in. They had invited us to their meetings, encouraged us for abroad and had taken us, they had asked for our opinions while creating policies, had invited us to trainings they held and others, both individually and institutionally. Of course, with AKP it broke away dramatically.

(biz hep hükümetten büyük destek gördük, hiç değilse manevi destek gördük, yani AKP hükümetine kadar bütün kadın bakanları bizimle yakın teşrik-i mesai içindeydiler, işte toplantılarına çağırdılar, bizi yurt dışına teşvik ettiler, götürdüler, politika oluşturmakta fikrimizi sordular, bireysel olarak, kurum olarak, ne bileyim training yapıyorlarsa bizi çağırdılar falan. Tabii AKP'yle birlikte bu dramatik olarak koştuk.)

In a political conjuncture where independent and critical thinking has been encumbered with restrictions, coercion, insult and compulsion, not only doing science but also living, taking a breath in the simplest term, happens to be painful. The picture I have been drawing here is not a scratch of a dystopia that I encountered through the pages of a fantastic fiction; actually, we are living, and witnessing it in our daily lives. We have lived it during and aftermath of Gezi Resistance⁶, we have seen it in the faces of our

⁵ Justice and Development Party (JDP) has been the ruling party in Turkey since 2003. I will mention it as *AKP* throughout the study.

⁶ In the spring of 2013, AKP government wanted to destroy Gezi Park in Taksim, Istanbul in order to build artillery barracks in its place. As a reaction to this, a group of people set up tents on guard in the park to prevent the action. However, on May 31, excavators entered the park and destroyed the tents and some trees, as a result of which thousands of people all around the country poured into streets for protests and turned the protest into a resistance for freedom. During the resistance, nine young people lost their

friends who have been wounded, arrested, beaten to within an inch of their lives and killed, we have heard it in the songs and slogans of Peace Meetings⁷ that were bombed, and we have witnessed it in the signatures of Academics for Peace⁸, and in so many more invisible incidents without number. Therefore, it would be far too utopic to imagine a political discipline like GWS who has its origins in the criticism of oppression to come out uninjured from this struggle. As K correlates:

It is gradually tried to hinder the autonomy of university, self-decisions of universities, conduct of these self-decisions, opening up units on its own, and so on... They are talking about a new law of Council of Higher Education (CoHE), these will probably take universities under their control. So, the possibility of carrying over institutional studies regarding women's freedom, feminism, women's movement decreases at the universities, because they have already been turned into institutions where patriarchal thinking and conservative patriarchal culture are dominant; and there were few places we could point as 'last castles', but they are also aimed to be surrendered step by step.

(Üniversitelerin özerkliğinin giderek önüne geçilmeye çalışılıyor, üniversitenin kendi başına karar alması, uygulaması, birim açması, yeni YÖK yasasından da bahsediliyor ya, bunlar herhalde üniversiteleri zapt-u raptı altına alacak. Böyle olunca da üniversitelerde kadının özgürleşmesi, feminizme, kadın hareketine yönelik kurumsal çalışma yapma ihtimali azalıyor, çünkü çok erkek aklın ve muhafazakar ataerkil kültürün hakim olduğu kurumlar haline zaten dönüştü de hani 'birkaç kale' diyebileceğimiz yer kalmıştı, onlar da yavaş yavaş düşürülmeye çalışılıyor.)

lives while more than ten thousand have been wounded. For detailed information: <https://www.amnestyusa.org/sites/default/files/eur440222013en.pdf>

⁷ There arranged two peace meetings in order to maintain solidarity and fraternity between Turkish and Kurdish communities in Turkey in 2015, one of which was in Suruç, Şanlıurfa on 20th July, while the second was on 10th October in Çankaya, Ankara. Both of these meetings were bombed and hundreds of people lost their lives and far more have been wounded. For detailed information: https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/2015_Suru%C3%A7_bombing, https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/2015_Ankara_bombings

⁸ In 2016, 1483 academics and researchers from Turkey and abroad have signed a statement titled "We will not be a party to this crime" as a reaction to terror and violence in Kurdish regions and with the demand of preparing negotiation conditions between the state and the community. However, this statement has been reacted against by the government and 1128 academics from Turkey have confronted legal and/or illegal oppression, as a result. There organized a second sign petition to support the academics and those have also shared this oppression. This is still an ongoing issue. For more and detailed information: <https://barisicinakademisyenler.net>

This political oppression imposed upon women and academics influences both the improvement and naturally the future of GWS programs within academia. First, academics are not detached from their society and the more they are independent in their knowledge production processes, the closer knowledge produced is to reality, and/or vice versa. Second, academia is not an ivory tower; what restricts one social relation affects the other and academia is the place where the knowledge of these social relations are produced, gathered and disseminated. Therefore, as an ordinary discipline within this academia, GWS is naturally impressed by the academic atmosphere that is determined by partly subtle partly overt interferences of political conjuncture. However, mainly due to its political characteristic living on feminist movement and its critical standpoint against all patriarchal social relations, GWS differs from other disciplines, which makes its exposure double-layered by the political situation on one hand, and by the academic atmosphere on the other. As N states,

some things are difficult in Turkey and there are some disadvantages due to the fact that the institution deals constantly with more challenging troubles, that is to say, in Turkey, [university] has serious challenges, due to these challenges it is not willing to come to the forefront in some issues and these issues generally interest us [GWS], we have such a restriction.

(Türkiye’de bazı şeyler zor ve de kurumun sürekli daha büyük dertlerle uğraşiyor olmasının getirdiği bazı dezavantajlar var; yani TR ortamında [üniversite] çok ciddi zorluklar yaşıyor, o yaşadığı zorluklardan dolayı bazı konularda çok fazla öne çıkmak istemiyor ve bu bazı konular da genelde bizi [GWS’i] ilgilendiren konular oluyor, böyle bir sınırimız var.)

Although the situation of the university, broadly academia, is significant, and however the problems and threats it faces are quite real, it is risky to make GWS meaningful within this structural body since it both restricts its subjectivity and beclouds the empowerment of not only GWS but also academia within this already enclosing and alienating political atmosphere. In order to unchain academia and GWS from this purposeful subordination, their subjectivities, their specific goals and wishes are needed to be taken into account bearing in mind the political situation they encounter and an alternative discourse must be developed.

It is clear and cannot be underestimated that

the government has made the issue of women unable to be in contact with institutions like us regarding women's perspective. They have their own agendas of women, their own women groups, their own women academics, their own women ideologists and we are excluded from them in this sense (E).

(Hükümet, kadın konusunu, kadınlara bakış açısı açısından bizim gibi kurumlara ilişkiyle bulunamayacak hale getirdi, kendi kadın agenda'ları var, kendi kadın grupları var ve kendilerinin kadın akademisyenleri var, kendilerinin kadın ideologları var ve biz bu anlamda onlardan dışlandık (E).)

This detachment and exclusion directly reduce academic recognition of GWS, as a result of which university administrations feel themselves in need of being *cautious* about the issues regarding GWS programs. These issues may vary from the foundations of support units against sexual harassment and assault to voluntary student organizations, from joint projects in collaboration with Lesbian-Gay-Bisexual-Transgender (LGBT) organizations to limited- mostly no- tenures, and so on. This state of being cautious reflects as subtle preventions, sometimes mocking, when mentioned issues come into question. No matter how unintentionally and scarcely it occurs, impeding these *sine quibus non* of GWS means to smooth its political nature, that is to 'normalize' it by eradicating its 'extremism', or plainly, to ignore its specificities. And this is not a that simple and ignorable issue:

It is, for sure, quite important not to break with activism. There is a value, a political goal here; otherwise, when it is abstracted from its political goal, it may easily turn into a field of study whose topic is only women and even feminism, and which aims at career. Moreover, the tendency of university to turn into a market place and of professionalization is a challenge for achieving this goal. Therefore, GWS tries to stand and survive by forcing the contrary. Politics is its most important element (S).

(Aktivizmle bağını hiç koparmaması çok önemli bir kere. Burada bir değer var, bir politik amaç var, yoksa politik amacından soyutlandığında burada sadece bir kariyer hedefine yönelik konusu kadınlar olan hatta konusu feminizm olan bir çalışma alanına kolaylıkla dönüşebilir. Kaldı ki üniversitelerin dönüştüğü şey piyasalaşma, profesyonelleşme eğilimi zaten bunu zorlayan bir şey. Dolayısıyla KÇ tam aksini zorlayarak hayatta kalmaya ve ayakta kalmaya çalışıyor. Politika en önemli unsuru (S).)

Politics is the main vein of GWS; it is exactly this main vein that provides it with not only reasons to confront obstacles and difficulties but also resources to survive them. The aim of challenging and transforming the mainstream, and the mission of situating itself into a critical position in every condition to produce an alternative discourse, a third space, compose the political nature of GWS. Eradicating these characteristics of GWS turns it simply into a branch of mainstream. A non-political GWS survives easier within academia than a political one and its marginalization may fade away. However, a GWS decontextualized from its political nature and accordingly constituted specificities cannot realize itself and loses its originality. In addition, this does bring neither recognition nor visibility.

In order to protect its political nature, GWS has to develop a strong collaboration with feminist movement. However, prior to this collaboration, it is necessary to define the relationship between GWS and the movement. As I have mentioned in previous chapters, there had been an inorganic relationship between GWS programs and the movement in the very beginning, it has been improved and strengthened with the efforts of both activist and academic agents in time, although it has not been accomplished fully. R stresses that this relationship is not on an institutional level but of an individual one instead. This is one of the reasons of this semi-accomplished organic relationship. However, it is important to bear in mind that there is a direct link between these two no matter whether it is organic or not, and both influence each other. As C indicates:

I cannot think of GWS independent of feminist movement; when feminist movement rises programs rise, as well or the demand towards them rise; when it falls they drop behind.

(GWS'i ben feminist hareketten bağımsız düşünemiyorum; feminist hareket yükseldiğinde programlar yükseliyor ya da oraya yönelik talep yükseliyor, düştüğünde arka planda geri planda kalıyor.)

It is clear that the situation of GWS programs, the atmosphere they produce knowledge and politics, and the outputs they provide cannot be separated from the general atmosphere that feminist movement breathes within. What happens to the movement

directly influences the programs since the nature of the relationship requires a mutual contribution. H defines this relationship in the form of “communicating vessels” whose strength empowers the other. For E, it is a “symbiotic” one, different from each other but complementary, in terms of both the agents and the transformation of the outputs into politics. As for M, this should be a nested relationship:

Academic activity itself is a part of women’s movement, I do not think that the main women’s movement is outside and the academic activity serves or should serve it. This is an autonomous area, namely an autonomous area of the movement and they aim to contribute to the same cause, let me say, with their own ways, that is, it cannot be central.

(Akademik faaliyetin bizzat kendisi kadın hareketinin bir parçası, onu hani asıl kadın hareketi dışarıda, bu da dışarıdakine hizmet veren, dışı olması gerekir diye düşünmüyorum. Burası da bir özerk alandır, yani hareketin bir özerk alanıdır ve hepsinin amacı aynı davaya diyeyim, kendi bildiğince katkıda bulunmaktır, yani merkezi bir şey olamaz.)

Centralizing the movement or the programs or the research centers means to set a hierarchy. Setting a hierarchy is a patriarchal discourse, it defines the rules and responsibilities that the ‘others’ have to acknowledge. Both feminist movement and GWS programs define themselves to be critical of any kind of oppression and inequality, which takes the possibility of falling into this patriarchal discourse away. As C states,

some of the GWS programs are within feminist movement, that is, they have somehow pioneered feminist movement. It should be kept in mind that in a movement that took place between the years 90-2000s, there are actually a group of academics, there are programs they maintain, and there are students they have raised, and others. However, there are also people who were not here at that period but became feminists and came back. The approach of closing here that much, of “here is such a feminist movement”, “we were within this pool from the very beginning of the movement” and others, sound dangerous to me since I see a hegemony there, and it feels dangerous to me. In other words, it is necessary to open here to new generations that have fresh, new, dynamic and different feminist interpretations and stand somewhere else although they do not fulfil the necessary criteria, according to us. You reproduce hegemony if you do not open it.

(bazı GWS programları feminist hareketin içinde, hani feminist harekete bir şekilde öncülük etmiş. Şunu unutmamak lazım, yani 90-2000 arasında olan bir

harekette, hakikaten orada yer alan akademiden bir grup var, onların devam ettirdikleri programlar var, onların yetiştirdikleri öğrenciler vs var. Ama o dönemde orada olmayıp başka bir yerde olup feminist olup gelen insanlar da var, bu kadar burayı kapatmak, hani burası böyle bir feminist harekettir, işte hareketin başından itibaren biz bu işin içindeydik vs yaklaşımı da tehlikeli geliyor, yani orada bir iktidar görüyorum çünkü o bana tehlikeli geliyor. Yani genç, yeni, dinamik, farklı feminist yorumlamaları olan, bize göre feminist belki kriterleri sağlamadığı halde başka yerde duran yeni nesillere açmak lazım, bunu açmadığımız takdirde iktidarı yeniden üretirsiniz.)

As I mentioned in chapter 5.1.1., when perceptions turn out to be definitions, they become more powerful and may exclude some other meanings. Defining the frame of the movement or the program not only ignores the specificities of the remaining agents but also limits its own capacity and improvement. In addition, neither feminist movement nor GWS programs do have the luxury of reproducing patriarchy as this is completely against their nature. Instead, M states:

There are already many differences within the movement, as well as many disagreements, conflicts may also be, there are different perspectives, therefore that is the true way, there can never be such a question as “why do you not do such a thing?” The movement is partial in itself and academic production has its own value in this partiality.

(Zaten hareket içinde de bir sürü farklılık var, bir sürü uzlaşmaz şey de var, çatışma da olabilir, hani görüş farklılıkları da var, dolayısıyla doğrusu budur, niye böyle bir şey yapmıyorsunuz gibi bir şey de olamaz, hareket de kendi içinde parçalıdır benim algım öyle ve bu parçalılığın içerisinde akademik üretim de kendi özel değerine sahiptir.)

Valuing differences, creating a flexible and free atmosphere to discuss diverse opinions and viewpoints, and decentralizing the action plans are invaluable in the production of knowledge and politics so long as the specific situations, contexts and conditions that things take place are kept in mind. If not, the risk of missing the chance of producing a collective and shared politics may appear. Collective and shared politics enables and requires considering all differences and diverse opinions together and in an active relationship among each other. It is this non-hierarchical, interactive and intersectional viewpoint that leads the relationship to collaboration.

... we see ourselves within women's movement, we should do so, we should not see it as 'women's movement and academia'. As women in academia, we are a part of women's movement, we are a special part of it just like others. Therefore, no one can claim anything on this movement, no one can say here is its real place because it has no such a real place. What is it? Is a real place a party? We don't have a party. Is it an association? There are many associations. Is it parliament activity? It is uncertain. That is, not any subject can claim that "I am the boss here and this is done like that". This is meaningless, I find it meaningless for any political view. It is meaningless for feminism, as well (M).

(kadın hareketinin içinde kendimizi görüyoruz, öyle görmemiz gerekir, kadın hareketi ve akademi diye görmememiz gerekir, bu akademideki kadınlar olarak biz kadın hareketinin bir parçasıyız, özel bir yeriyiz, nasıl başkaları da öyle ise. Dolayısıyla hiç kimse bu hareket üzerinde şey iddia edemez, hani asıl yeri burasıdır diyemez, çünkü öyle asıl bir yer yok. Nedir; bir parti midir asıl yer, öyle bir partimiz yok. Bir dernek midir; bir sürü dernek var. Meclis faaliyeti midir; belirsiz. Yani öyle herhangi bir özne, buranın sahibi benim, böyle yapılır filan diyemez, bu anlamsız, her politik görüş için ben bunu anlamsız buluyorum, feminizm için de anlamsız (M).)

Separating knowledge and politics as 'GWS programs and feminist movement' means to create a dichotomy between the two, and a dichotomous understanding brings the danger of defining one according to the other, and again sets a hierarchy. There is no use in excluding or marginalizing one another since the political conjuncture has already done this heavily for both. Feminist understanding has the potential to criticize these dichotomies and create a third space for itself. GWS programs cannot be separated from the women's movement, neither women's movement from the programs, these are two equally important components of a wider liberation movement and both produce knowledge and politics not only within but also among themselves.

What is beautiful is to organize diverse political activities from all places in all types and to ensure their interaction. If this can be achieved, politics grows up, becomes more beautiful, grows mature, varies and gets more power. It gets fed in terms of both knowledge and activism, and these two can feed one another. Of course, I do not think this feeding is at a good level in Turkey, no, never (M)!

(Güzel olan, her yerden her şekilde, yani değişik, politik faaliyet örgütlemektir ve bunların etkileşimini sağlamaktır. Bu yapılırsa politika büyür, yani güzelleşir, olgunlaşır ve çeşitlenir ve gücü de artar, hem bilgi olarak beslenir hem aktivizm

olarak beslenir ve bunlar birbirini çok besleyebilecek şeyler, tabii ki ben bu beslemenin çok iyi bir düzeyde olduğunu düşünmüyorum Türkiye’de, asla (M)!

While GWS programs struggle to survive, feminist movement has also its own difficulties within this political atmosphere. Although the reasons of these difficulties cannot be reduced to the political conjuncture of the last 15 years, it can be said that all of them are somehow related to it. According to H,

there is also a feminist movement problem in Turkey. Unfortunately, there are a recession and power loss, canalization on different directions, getting lost in projects, failure in transforming the government, stepping back, being unable to establish sufficiently parallel relationships and many other things. Islamist women for example. There was something good at the beginning but later it all faded away. They are totally under the domination of men. Kurdish women are another issue, Kemalist women have already lost it, they are defeated... That is, there are a lot of problems, I believe that feminist movement is in a period of a lot of criticism but it is not made much.

(Türkiye’de bir feminist hareket problemi de var, maalesef bir durgunluk ve güç kaybetme, farklı yönlere kanalize olma, projelere dalma, devleti dönüştürme konusunda başarısızlık, geri adımlar atma falan gibi bir sürü şey var. Yeterince paralel ilişkiler kuramama, yani İslamcı kadınları bir türlü işte başlangıçta iyi bir şey vardı, sonra hepsi gitti, yani onlar topyekün bir erkeklerin tahakkümü altına düşmüş durumdadır, Kürt kadınlar ayrı bir mesele, Kemalist kadınlar tamamen yitirdi zaten, kaybettiler, yenildiler falan.. Bir sürü problem var, yani feminist hareketin bol eleştirisi dönemi olduğunu düşünüyorum ama çok da bu yapılmıyor yani.)

Internal difficulties have much in relation with both political actions and paradigmatic challenges. It would be easy to put the whole blame on current political conjuncture; however, all components of feminist movement have a share within it. Since I would like to analyze this situation from the aspect of GWS programs, I specifically focus on political conjuncture here. During AKP rule, not only feminists but each and every fraction of women have been influenced from the discourse of the president of Turkey and the regulations he proposed. The discourses and regulations on abortion, ‘türban’, motherhood, working conditions, education of women, their ways of living and even dressing and so many more have been in a great contradiction to what feminists work for and imagine to be ‘liberating’.

We see that clearly in Turkey now; the government has completely broken its ties with women's movement and the person at the helm is, of course, somebody who already underestimates everything with insult saying "they do not know their own society" and who does not approach any idea with an idea, which of course encourages the small patriarchy that is waiting in ambush, and as a result violence has become a major topic of our day (R).

(Türkiye'de bunu çok net görüyoruz artık, hükümet kadın hareketiyle tamamen iplerini koparmış durumda ve işte başımızdaki zat "bunlar kendi toplumlarını bilmiyorlar" falan diye zaten her şeyi hakarete götürerek küçümseyen, fikre fikirle yanaşmayan birisi kuşkusuz ama tabii bu da zaten pusuda yatan pek çok o küçük patriyarkı cesaretlendiriyor ve şiddet artık günümüzün belli başlı konusu haline geldi.)

Recognition of GWS programs is in a direct line with the recognition of feminist movement. As feminist movement has its own internal problems along with external pressure and limitations, GWS programs have become destitute of the vital support of the movement, and this is a two-fold trouble in that politically undernourished GWS programs cannot contribute to the movement adequately, either, which soon turns out to be a vicious circle.

Of course, it is difficult to evaluate GWS separately from feminist movement. I think feminist movement could not be a grassroots movement in Turkey. Of course it is about the fact that governmental feminism has been too dominant in Turkey in a period. It is something related with the changing position of the government from women's rights protector to women's rights enemy; however, when this issue of pushing from below, the internalization of feminism, is absent- and since we could not think the scientist as separate from society- it has leaked into GWS programs in a way. In other words, issues like how feminist the university administrations are that they will support these programs come up. Therefore, it is difficult to tell apart these two from each other (C).

(Tabii feminist hareketten çok GWS'i bağımsız değerlendirmek zor bir şey. Feminist hareket Türkiye'de toplumsallaşamadı bence biraz deminki söylediğim meseleyle ilgili olarak biraz tabii bu devlet feminizminin Türkiye'de çok baskın olması bir dönem. Kadın hakları koruyucusu konumunda olan devletin kadın hakları düşmanı haline geçmesiyle de bağlantılı bir şey ama o kökten itme meselesi, feminizmi içselleştirmesi, o olmayınca, bu bilim insanını da toplumdan ayrı düşünemediğimiz için bu GWS programlarına da o yolla bir şekilde yansıdı. Yani üniversite yönetimleri ne kadar feminist ki o programları desteklesin gibi meseleler tabii gündeme geliyor, dolayısıyla bu ikisini birbirinden ayırt etmek çok zor (C).)

Current political conjuncture, the situation of feminist movement, the position of academia and agents within all this chaotic atmosphere are one by one and altogether compose an intersecting factors of oppression not only among themselves but also on GWS programs. Due to its both academic and political nature, GWS has been much influenced from all these factors and found itself marginalized among all. As H indicates,

the developments in this field has slowed down in parallel with Turkey's new general political initiative, liberation, development expectations. In other words, this structure is the one that was thought about, discussed and built 7-8-10 years ago. New steps are not taken on it. Now, we are at the point of maintaining the current situation. I think all units are trying to maintain the current situation. ... We have a list of absences for ourselves but it is not so easy to step into action because neither the political conjuncture nor the academic atmosphere supports such an action now, unfortunately. Academia is not in a process of expansion, on the contrary, it is in the period of shrinkage and decadence.

(bu alandaki gelişmeler yavaşladı, durakladı Türkiye'nin genel siyasal açılım, özgürleşme, gelişim beklentilerine paralel olarak diyeyim. Yani şu andaki yapı yaklaşık 7-8-10 yıl önceki düşünülmüş, tartışılmış, kurulmuş yapı, onun üzerine daha henüz çok fazla yeni adımlar atılmıyor. Biz o mevcut durumu korumak noktasındayız şu anda, sanıyorum bütün birimler mevcut durumu korumaya çalışıyorlar. ... Elimizde bir eksikler listemiz var ama öyle harekete geçmek kolay değil, çünkü gündem, ortam hiç desteklemiyor böyle bir şeyi ne yazık ki. Üniversite bir açılım döneminde değil tam tersine büzüşüp içeri doğru çökme, çürüme döneminde.)

I would like to repeat and highlight the point that all units are working hard to maintain current situation. This is extremely significant in that the decision and action of saving current acquisitions is contextual and this context embodies an opportunity of a shared political action. Moreover, this conjuncture is not permanent, that is, it does not have a linear process. Instead, it is situational, it has its own specificities which are temporary and will soon change both conditionally and contextually, that is why feminist movement and GWS programs must pursue their critical agenda, look for a new way within this atmosphere, a new way, a new discourse which will both affect the prevailing circumstances and protect current acquisitions.

5.1.3. Situated Academic Marginalization

Situating GWS in a historical, political and academic context, I have aimed to draw a general picture about GWS programs in Turkey. As it can be seen from the picture, it is easy for GWS programs to fall into a marginalized sphere within academia. This marginalized sphere mostly contains the negative effects of the situation, the difficulties GWS has to endure, overcome and survive. This is the first layer of the marginalization, that is, GWS confronts and is exposed to these difficulties and preventions from the beginning, it is the situation GWS enters in. However, what is necessary to highlight and strongly emphasize here is that this situation is no surprise for GWS. As a political program whose main objective is to challenge and transform mainstream academic understanding and knowledge production, GWS has to be and remain marginalized. As an outsider within, outsider due to its political nature and within with its knowledge production, GWS has the potential to produce ‘better accounts of reality’ in that it experiences both sides. Therefore, the second layer of this marginalization is to adopt and protect it in that experiences and research agendas of the marginalized bear less partial accounts of the world within themselves (Janack, 1997).

Considering the relationship of knowledge and politics in the background, there exist two significant factors needed to adopt and protect the marginalization of GWS within academia. The first one of these factors is the characteristic of being political, while the other is the feature of being interdisciplinary.

Beginning with the first one, mainstream academia defines itself to be objective and non-political since politics can harm and lead the process of knowledge production and the knowledge produced. As I have recurrently mentioned, as the program of a political movement, GWS has a direct relationship with activism and this characteristic, where the claims of challenge and transformation are based on- not only situates GWS programs into a different and controversial position within mainstream academia but also embodies important differences within and among other GWS programs.

... feminism is a political movement and according to the conventional view (one that is currently under siege from various quarters, however), politics can only obstruct and damage the production of scientific knowledge. (Harding, 2004, p. 1)

This controversy does not mean to be a contradiction; it is true that feminism is a political movement and GWS is its academic reciprocity and is political, as well. However, it is not possible for academia to be non-political, either. Separating academia and feminism categorically as objective and political is a false dichotomy due to the fact that academia cannot be excluded from politics and each discipline from physics to geography is political. As B indicates:

Of course feminism is political, it has to be political by its presence because it is trying to actualize a discourse transformation. I think the notion that academia is out of politics is again something that bourgeois epistemology has imposed. Nobody can be depoliticized, you must have experienced a political decoding due to your education and even due to the language you use, but you may be aware of that or not, these two can be differentiated however academia cannot be depoliticized, it sounds quite naïve, quite naïve to believe that. Therefore, as both of them have political dimensions, I cannot see any discrepancies between them.

(Feminizm tabii ki politiktir, yapısı gereği politik olmak zorunda çünkü bir söylem dönüşümü gerçekleştirmeye çalışıyor, akademinin ise politika dışı olduğu bu da bence yine burjuva epistemolojisinin dayattığı şeylerden birisi. Yani hiç kimse politika dışı olamaz, aldığınız eğitim gereği hatta kullandığınız dil gereği bir politik kodlanma yaşamışsınızdır ama bunun farkındasınızdır ya da farkında değilsinizdir, o ikisinin ayrımı yapılabilir ama akademi politika dışı diye bir şey olamaz, bu çok naif olur, çok naif olur. Dolayısıyla her ikisi de politik bir boyuta sahip olduğuna göre bir çelişki görmüyorum ben aralarında.)

Objectivity, according to Dorothy Smith, is, simply, the separation of knowledge from its practitioners (Harding, 2004, p. 24). Since the scientist is a human being who has feelings and thoughts which cannot be decontextualized from time, place, situation and condition, it is not possible for the scientists to separate the knowledge s/he produces from the self. Methods for producing knowledge may change and vary; however, this does not provide a completely or fully 'objective' knowledge, either, as it is still the scientist who asks the questions and decides which ways to take. Therefore, knowledge,

and accordingly truth, is always partial and the less partial it is the closer it is to reality. Objectivity, then, can be maximized but cannot be generalized, universalized and totalized. As Haraway puts it thoroughly,

We have to learn in our bodies, endowed with primate colour and stereoscopic vision, how to attach our objective to our theoretical and political scanners in order to name where we are and are not, in dimensions of mental and physical space we hardly know how to name. So, not so perversely, objectivity turns out to be about particular and specific embodiment, and definitely not about the false vision promising transcendence of all limits and responsibility. The moral is simple: only partial perspective promises objective vision (2004, p.87).

Objectivity does not mean to be non-political, that is, when a scientist is objective s/he cannot think of being excluded from politics. Subjectivities are embodied within political action and a non-hierarchical and interactive knowledge production process enables these subjectivities to emerge from obscurity. Otherwise, as R states,

as long as academia is out of politics, it means it produces science for science in an ivory tower. I believe that science should have a rather different meaning than this. Of course it is not producing biased and ideological knowledge; however, knowledge is produced exactly from within the society, and science that claims it is disconnected from society is actually in a mystification. Science is political, as anything else is.

(işte akademya politikanın dışında olduğu sürece fildişi kulesinde bilim için bilim üretiyor demektir, ben bilimin bundan daha farklı bir anlamının olması gerektiğini düşünüyorum. Tabii ki orada yanlı ve ideolojik bir bilgi üretmek değil ama bilgi üretimi tam da toplumsal yapının içinden olan bir şey ve ondan kopuk olduğunu iddia eden bilim aslında bir mystification içindedir diye düşünüyorum. Bilim de her şey gibi siyasidir.)

As S furthers the discussion,

who said academia is out of politics?! Even if we are teaching atomic physics here, we are doing something political, knowledge is always political. It is the starting point of feminism that knowledge is not objective, practical and neutral. Knowledge is always political. Whoever produces knowledge has political values and cannot analyze knowledge independent of politics, in other words, cannot approach social reality and produce knowledge. Everything we look at is constituted politically, therefore, politics and academia cannot be separated. If so, a lot of people would not be in struggle today with different difficulties in frame of various political objectives, aims and values.

(kim demiş akademi politika dışıymış?! Yani burada atom fiziği bile anlatıyor olsak politik bir şey yapıyoruz yani, bilgi her zaman politiktir, zaten feminizmin çıkış noktası bilginin objektif, nesnel, yansız olmadığından hareketle çıkar, bilgi her zaman politiktir, bilgiyi üretenin politik değerleri vardır ve o değerlerden bağımsız olarak bilgiye bakamaz, yani toplumsal gerçekliğe yaklaşp bilgiyi üretemez. Baktığımız şey de politik olarak inşa edilmiş bir şeydir, dolayısıyla politika ve akademi birbirinden ayrılamaz. Öyle olsa bir sürü insan bugün çeşitli politik hedefler, amaçlar ve değerler çerçevesinde çeşitli zorluklarla mücadele ediyor olmazdı.)

“Feminist objectivity means quite simply *situated knowledges*” states Haraway (2004, p.86). Situated knowledges require to take not an essential base for all knowledge claims but a specific situation for each one. Defining what is political or not, or drawing a framework for what is academic or not means to totalize the concepts of politics and academia, which excludes some other interpretations and meanings, and falls far behind the reality. Embracing a multiple standpoint, that is, including all meanings and interpretations, does not refer to an endless relativity of different viewpoints; instead, it is all about the ‘situated knowledges’, it is about specific contexts and conditions of each situation embodies.

Accordingly, such a distinction is never an objective distinction. What is political and what is not is not defined in this way. It is not defined as inside or outside, or institutional as well. Politics can be produced anywhere at any time, it is about resisting forms, it is about creating something new, it is about turning some norms upside down, and it has no place, there is not such a thing that “it is done here, it is not done there”. It is possible to behave extremely conformist and in a way reproducing the same thing outside, such behaviors can be exhibited on the street, as well. For example, a press conference; it may be difficult to say it is political to hold a press conference at the same place for centuries; however, it is extremely political when something totally unexpected is produced within class. Therefore, it does not have a place or time; my understanding of politics is not like that. Therefore, I do not see this distinction as a categorical distinction (M).

(Dolayısıyla böyle bir ayrım, nesnel bir ayrım, zaten hiçbir zaman değildir, neyin politik olup neyin olmadığı o şekilde belirlenmez, yani içerisi dışarısı diye belirlenmez, kurumsal olarak da belirlenmez. Politika her an her yerde üretilebilir, yani direngen formlarla ilgilidir, yeni yaratıcı bir şey yapmakla ilgilidir, mevcut bazı normları alt üst etmekle ilgilidir ve bunun yeri yoktur, hani orada yapılır burada yapılmaz diye bir şey yoktur. Dışarıda da son derece

konformist ya da aynı şeyi yeniden üreten tarzlarda davranılabilir, sokakta da bu yapılabilir. Mesela basın toplantısı, aynı yerde yüz yıldır basın toplantısı yapmanın politik bir şey olduğunu söylemek zor olabilir ama mesela bir sınıfta hiç beklenmedik bir şeyin yaratılması son derece politik bir şeydir. Dolayısıyla, yeri, zamanı olan bir şey değildir, benim politika kavrayışım öyle değil. Dolayısıyla bu ayrımı, kategorik bir ayrım olarak görmüyorum (M.)

Being political is also a historically contingent action in addition to its situational, locational, contextual and conditional specificities, which underlines the fact that it cannot be universalized and generalized for every situation even if they are similar in context. The important point here is the uniqueness of experiences of the self within this specific situation, and experiences are partial, as well. That is, experiences and perceptions of persons are different and multiple even within the same situation, that is why they are also partial and such partiality brings intersubjectivity with it. Intersubjectivity requires an empathetic thinking and understanding of different and diverse subjectivities and their collaboration, which can be achieved through non-hierarchical, interactive and reflexive and self-reflexive relationships.

[according to some academics,] feminism is an ideology and it cannot be a scientific field of study. Ours seem a little bit like that because it is ideological and political and the perception is that science cannot include ideology and politics. As we cannot overcome this fusty and mainstream bias, it is already at this very point [GWS differs from other disciplines]. It sounds strange to people that we have an approach based on understanding rather than analyzing and explaining. It sounds strange to our friends that we do not objectivize our research topic and we work in interactive and equal relationship with it (K).

([bazı akademisyenlere göre] feminizm bir ideolojidir ve bu bir bilimsel çalışma alanı olamaz, bizimki de biraz öyle görünüyor, ideolojik, politik olduğu için ve bilimde ideoloji ve politika olmazmış gibi algılandığı için. Hani bu köhne ve anaakım şeyi aşamadığımız için önyargıları, zaten başta o noktada [farklılaşıyor GWS] .. Hani analiz etmek ve anlatmaktan ziyade, anlamak üzerine kurulu bir yaklaşımımız olması insanlara çok tuhaf geliyor, araştırma konumuzu nesneleştirmediğimiz ve onunla eşit ilişki kurup etkileşimsellik içinde çalışmamız bile birçok arkadaşımıza tuhaf geliyor (K).)

It sounds strange for some, says K. It can be argued that this strangeness is also a partial experience; however, experience is meaningful if it is based on practical rationality rather than abstracted rationality (Ecevit M., 2016) in that rationality is not a that

abstract concept and what takes us to conclusion is its functionality. Here, we have seen that explaining and analyzing everything with a “gaze from nowhere” (2004, p. 86) as Haraway calls it, is a patriarchal and hierarchical action which fails to reflect the reality of the experience. Understanding, or trying to understand at least, with a non-hierarchical and interactive approach reveals the agencies of the agents and enables us to see the hidden subjectivities. From this aspect, understanding rather than explaining, provides us with more concrete and functional results. This standpoint prevents the domination of a ruling opinion or exclusion of marginalized groups, and forms an inclusive base for multiple and even conflicting ideas to negotiate. As B understands it:

Of course, both academia and feminism have to be political, otherwise they cannot provide any transformation. If we want to transform the experienced reality, we have to be political, that is to say, we have to be involved in politics. Apolitical academia cannot achieve anything, neither can an apolitical feminism. However, this does not mean that we are intolerant to most of the opinions or different opinions. There should be a place where we can exist together; however, I think academia must have a structure that makes use of politics or rather of ideology; or a structure that problematize ideology. Academia should be aware of political structures that try to develop alternative ideologies or political structures that are repressed and pushed aside. In other words, I cannot think of an apolitical academia, then I think it becomes a utopic thing that is non-related to experience, it is not even academia, it is something else.

(Tabii ki hem akademi hem feminizm politik olmak zorunda, yoksa bir dönüşüm yaşatamazlar, yaşanan gerçekliği dönüştürmek istiyorsak politik olmak zorundayız, yani politikayla iç içe olmak zorundayız aslında. Apolitik bir feminizm nasıl bir şey başaramazsa apolitik bir akademi de bence bir şey başaramaz ama bu çoğu ya da değişik düşüncelere hoşgörüsüz olduğumuz anlamına gelmiyor, birlikte var olabileceğimiz bir ortam olmalı ama bence politikadan daha doğrusu ideolojiden beslenen bir yapısı olmalı akademinin ya da ideolojiyi sorunsallaştıran bir yapısı olmalı, alternatif ideolojiler geliştirmeye çalışan ya da işte bastırılan, arka plana itilen politik yapıların farkındalığını yaşamalı akademi. Yani apolitik bir akademi düşünemiyorum ben, o zaman şey olur herhalde, gene yaşam pratiğiyle ilgisi olmayan ütöpik bir şey olur, o akademi bile olmaz, başka bir şey olur.)

A political academia that welcomes multiplicity and diversity produces knowledge from within life and escapes not only the threat of residing on an ivory tower but also the risk of falling into the trap of a unified and holistic and thus essentialist viewpoint which

excludes marginal views. Such an academia has the potential to change and transform what we are exposed to in our daily lives. As L believes,

family, university, religious institutions and others, each one of them is an ideological device of government; however, it does not mean that there will not be any resistance there and no knowledge will be reproduced there. Of course it is the place where knowledge is produced. This knowledge provides us power for transforming the world. We should prove it, we should prove other worlds, we should prove that ‘another world is possible’, and we can do it.

(aile, üniversite, bilmem dini kurumlar, bunların her birisi devletin ideolojik aygıtları ama bu demek değildir ki oradan direnme çıkmayacak, başka bilgi üremeyecek, elbette ki orası bilginin üretildiği yer, o bilgi bize iktidar sağlıyor dünyayı dönüştürmek için, hani onu üretmeliyiz, başka dünyaları göstermeliyiz, hani ‘başka bir dünya mümkündür’ü gösterebilmeliyiz ki gösterebiliriz de.)

Involving ideological apparatus with politics, that is resistance of university or family or any other social relation, enables us to see their agencies. However, it is relevant not just for academia; no matter how naturally political they are, agents of GWS – instructors, alumni and current students- must protect and perpetuate this characteristic, as well. As A underlines,

the more instructors in GWS programs are involved in women’s movement, the more the program is involved. The program is not independent of instructors; they constitute the program. In other words, a program which is not related to women’s movement and which has been founded as an academic program cannot have any bound with the movement, it does not feel the necessity to build any relationship, and nobody asks why it does not establish any of it, neither.

(GWS programlarındaki hocalar kadın hareketiyle ne kadar ilişkiliyse program da o kadar ilişkilenebilir. Program hocalardan farklı bir şey değil ki hocalar programı oluşturuyorlar. Yani kadın hareketiyle çok az ilişkisi olan, akademik bir program olarak kurulmuş bir program da hareketle hiçbir bağ kurmaz, kurma gereği duymaz, kimse de ona niye kurmadın diye sormaz.)

The stronger the alliance between GWS programs and feminist movement is formed the more powerful the paradigmatic and political transformation can be achieved. Being political, or putting it with a concrete expression, being a feminist is not a given, feminist identity is rather constituted and thus acquired. As C beautifully expresses it,

We should not forget that all of us have constituted our viewpoints, they are not inherent. Since they are not inherent, we have to put an effort in order that those who are not political can constitute their own viewpoints just as how we have done. Nobody is born as a feminist but becomes a feminist. We, therefore, in our classes, in our personal lives and other spheres should think of how they become a feminist.

(Şunu unutmamak lazım, hepimiz bu bakış açılarımızı inşa ettik, doğuştan gelmedi. Doğuştan gelmediği için nasıl inşa ettiyse karşı tarafın da bu bakış açılarını inşa etmesi için uğraşlar vermek lazım, hiç kimse feminist doğmuyor, feminist oluyor ☺ onun için onlar nasıl feminist olur diye düşünmeniz lazım, verdiğiniz derste de gündelik yaşamınızda da vesaire.)

Constituting a feminist identity is in direct relationship with constituting a standpoint and epistemic privilege, both of which are not given and should be acquired through shared political action. Not only academics of GWS but also its students should constitute a political standpoint if they are to criticize, challenge and transform what is constructed on behalf of and in the name of them. As Atakul profoundly identifies students of these programs are people who are somehow in trouble with not only the system but also themselves, their lives and gendered identities (2002, p. 311). Although the backgrounds and interests of GWS students differ from each other, their common characteristics are their political identities and their self-problematized and self-troubled lives. However, this diverse and interdisciplinary background characteristic of them provides a crucial base to constitute a standpoint of intersubjectivity. In order to produce knowledge and politics out of these lives, interrelations between, within and among the students and instructors of all GWS programs must be established. As J indicates, if students involved in political action through non-governmental organizations (NGOs) are affiliated with the program, then the programs can generate a direct interrelationship with feminist movement and politics. Moreover, this profile of students coming from within feminist movement are thus much preferred and demanded one in the programs. As I have mentioned several times throughout the study, as an extension of this political characteristics of both academics and students, the relationship between academics and students should also be critical to the mainstream hierarchical understanding and should be political, as well. F draws the attention that

an academic of GWS must integrate her/his feminist viewpoint into her/his academic life and should convey it to the students. For, you become a model for them, this is extremely important. It is necessary to show them the way through academic researches and the researches you conduct in GWS should be a source of inspiration for them. GWS itself rejects hierarchies actually, just as feminism. It is necessary to apply this approach to students-scholars relationships, to guide students on their own pathways, to constitute non-hierarchical and personal relationships far beyond the classical student-scholar relationship. This point is vital, I think.

(bence tabii ki feminist bakış açısını akademik yaklaşımına entegre etmiş olmak, bunu öğrencilere verebilmek. Çünkü bir model oluyorsunuz, o çok önemli. Araştırmalarla yol göstermek lazım öğrencilere yine KÇ alanında yaptığınız araştırmalar onlar için bir inspiration olmalı bence. KÇ baştan hiyerarşiyi reddeden bir şey aslında, feminizm bütün hiyerarşileri reddeden bir şey aslında, bakış açısı, KÇ da öyle. Bu yaklaşımı da biraz öğrenci-scholar ilişkisine geçirmek lazım. Öğrencilere hani kendi yürüdükleri veya gittikleri alanlara mümkün olduğu kadar yönlendirmek daha böyle guidance vermek, o klasik hoca-öğrenci ilişkisinin biraz ötesine geçip öğrencilerle bence o anlamda daha bire bir ilişki kurmak, non-hierarchical bir ilişki kurmak bence önemli gibime geliyor.)

Such an interrelational standpoint forms the basis of feminist pedagogy and the main difference in the production of knowledge and politics, which contributes not only to understand each other through intersubjective encounters but also to produce remedial solidarities within and among agents.

In parallel with this, the content of the curricula must be involved with politics and accordingly the movement. As R indicates,

there is an important relationship here, while setting the curriculum that dynamism is very important, it is leading... For example, today, conflict is a very important topic of GWS, is there any course on conflict in [GWS] programs?

(orada önemli bir ilişkilendirme var, işte müfredatlar oluşturulurken de o dinamizm çok önemli, o yön veriyor ... Bugün mesela çatışma, KÇ'nin çok önemli bir konusu, acaba [KÇ] programlarında çatışma üzerine bir ders var mı?)

Since the context and conditions change ceaselessly, curriculum of the programs must be updated simultaneously, this enables both to seize the time with the most updated and current issues and to become and remain political. Dynamic curriculum formation

process rather than a stable and structured one is a must for GWS, which upholds socially situated knowledge and displays the specificities of historically contingent conjunctures. As a result, political characteristic of not only academia but also the components of GWS is an important factor in recognition and marginalization of GWS.

Apart from political characteristic of GWS, its interdisciplinary nature adds on this position in that there are some problems in the issue of interdisciplinarity itself. These problems can be summarized as the perception of interdisciplinarity, its non-acknowledgement within mainstream academia and the disadvantages of this non-acknowledgement.

Beginning with the perception of interdisciplinarity, as G. mentions, there are serious problems in the conduct of interdisciplinarity due to its meaning. Interdisciplinarity does not only refer to bringing different disciplines altogether but also underlines the necessity of the combination of these different disciplines on the same subject. As M experiences,

previously, our hypothesis was that Women's Studies was already automatically interdisciplinary, because, it is so in one level, however, you are not able to actualize this unless you establish this interdisciplinary bound in a real and concrete manner.

(daha öncesinde bizim varsayımımız şuydu; KÇ zaten kendiliğinden interdisipliner diyorduk çünkü nitekim bir düzeyde öyledir ama burada reel ve somut olarak o interdisipliner bağı kurmadıkça bunu gerçekleştirmiş olmuyordunuz.)

Bringing different disciplines together forms the base for interdisciplinarity; establishing connections, melting them altogether and creating third spaces is the second and most important phase, and this is about the problematics of GWS and can be achieved by means of the previous phase, that is, by coming together. There exist many programs in Turkey which have difficulty in achieving interdisciplinarity, whose great majority of instructors and thus curriculum is composed of the same discipline. However, the reasons of this difficulty are different from one to another in that the

founding bodies, conditions and opportunities of the programs vary in every one of them.

Then, interdisciplinarity is itself perceived as a reaction to the conventional approach. For me, forming a dichotomy, comparing and contrasting disciplinarity and interdisciplinarity, sounds meaningless since each has its own specificities and as H lays it eloquently bare “they are both good on condition that they are founded on the required place in the proper and right form”. Disciplinarity has the potential of producing in-depth knowledge and the power of transforming it. It provides a vertical advance and is a more institutionalized system. As for interdisciplinarity, it approaches to knowledge with a multiple point of view, eradicates hierarchies and promotes joint researches and shared political agendas. Multiple viewpoints unchain the necessity of an essential base, of a center, and pushes the limits of rigid institutional structures. Richness of different disciplines and of their theories, methods and similar enables to produce the knowledge which is unnoticed due to unilateral point of view. However, as H puts the point,

the future of interdisciplinary area is closed in Turkey, when compared to abroad. It is like that due to the models of institutionalization, staffing, compensation and recruitment policies. Also, in Turkey, disciplinary careers are much more ahead in an egoist way; accordingly, its way was not smoothed, policies of CoHE did not care much about that and university policies did not take it serious.

(disiplinlerarası alanın önu kapalı Türkiye’de, akademik olarak çok şey değil, yurt dışında olduğu gibi önu açık değil. Kurumsallaşma modelleri nedeniyle, kadro, ücretlendirme, istihdam politikaları nedeniyle öyle. Bir de Türkiye’de disiplinler kariyerler çok daha egoist biçimde önde, dolayısıyla çok fazla önu açılmadı onun, yani YÖK politikaları da ona çok şey yapmadı, üniversite politikaları da çok ciddiye almadı.)

This non-acknowledgement of interdisciplinarity makes things much harder for GWS. Lack of permanent academic positions and of a budget, an unstable curriculum in parallel with the absence of these elements, being exposed to a structured system with its flexible nature are main disadvantages that the non-acknowledgement of interdisciplinarity hands down to GWS programs. A GWS program whose

interdisciplinary feature is not supported and maintained bears the risk of ghettoization and cannot achieve its mission.

While it varies from the specificities of a university to another, interdisciplinary and political characteristics of GWS seem to be its common disadvantages that marginalize it within academia. However, according to FST, these disadvantages can be transformed into political, epistemological and scientific advantages.

Each oppressed group can learn to identify its distinctive opportunities to turn an oppressive feature of the group's conditions into a source of critical insight about how the dominant society think and is structured. Thus, standpoint theories map how a social and political disadvantage can be turned into an epistemological, scientific and political advantage (Harding, 2004, p. 7-8).

For example, in a technical university where engineering faculties dominate over social sciences, and the faculties of medicine and law are absent, it can be much harder to achieve interdisciplinarity. Moreover, foreign language-based education system may prevent intercollegiate collaborations due to the foreign language capabilities of the instructors. Also, as it is overtly theory-oriented, the relationships of GWS and of its agents with feminist movement may not be active and continuous. It is quite difficult for a GWS program which cannot live on its political movement to reside itself outside the realm of the mainstream. Within this context, the less interdisciplinary and political characteristics of GWS become apparent and strong, the less is mainstream academia challenged and directly the less is marginalization appeared. Therefore, the less marginalization is appeared and felt, the less is critical insight developed on the mainstream, and epistemological, political and scientific advantage obtained.

However, within a context different from this, where interdisciplinary and political nature of the program are stronger- that is, the program feeds itself with the help of each faculty taking place within the university from medicine to fine arts, from law to communication, and where both instructors and students are active agents of not only feminist movement but also LGBT movement- the power relations of the convention are unraveled and the coping mechanisms are more effectively generated against it. In

direct proportion to this, the marginalization of the program explicitly comes to the fore. Thus, marginalization of GWS cannot be generalized in that the specificities where it emerges are significant and it is only possible to talk about a situated academic marginalization.

CHAPTER 6

CONCLUSION

This very last chapter consists of contributions and limitations of the study as well as recommendations for future studies. Contributions section has three sub-sections as theoretical, methodological and practical contributions, while limitations has two as theoretical and methodological limitations.

6.1. Contributions of the Study

In this thesis, I aimed at understanding current position of GWS programs within current situation of academia in Turkey from the viewpoint of Feminist Standpoint Theory by focusing on the insights of the academics I interviewed from two different universities.

6.1.1. Theoretical Contributions

According to the findings, self-definition and self-valuation are of great importance in understanding the position of GWS in that these two shape the standpoints of GWS programs from the aspects of their missions, visions and attitudes towards academia. Then, it is not possible to situate GWS within academia without looking at the external factors that influence GWS. These factors are initially, the emergence conditions of GWS programs in Turkey in which the existence of U.N. and 1980 coup d'etat have been significant influences from the aspects of organic relationship of GWS with feminist movement and support of an independent academia which cultivates critical thinking. Then, political conjuncture, current situation of academia and current situation of feminist movement follow the factor of emergence conditions of GWS. Within this regard, GWS is now in a position of protecting current acquisitions instead of moving forward due to the facts that political conjuncture does not support any feminist initiation, moreover it prevents and prohibits; academia is not in a period of expansion

but of decadence; and feminist movement is one of the main target boards of the political conjuncture and it has its own problems. These factors situate GWS into a marginalized position within academia. In other words, this is the situation GWS programs face today. However, the adoption of this academic marginalization is situated, that is, it is limited with the specificities of the programs and achievement of their interdisciplinary and political characteristics and thus, it changes from one program to another. The more a program achieves to be political and interdisciplinary the more it feels academically marginalized and this in a direct proportion affects its production of knowledge. The specificities of the programs and universities turn out to be significant in achieving these two characteristics.

To sum up all, in order to understand the position of GWS programs, it is necessary to keep in mind not only the specificities of the programs but also the political situation the country is in now. While general political conjuncture, current situation of academia and of feminist movement situate GWS in an inevitably marginalized situation within academia, specific characteristics of the programs and of the universities they belong to determine the adoption of this marginalization and its transformation into an advantage. All these findings are significant in that they have the potential to enlighten the way GWS is to draw for itself and help GWS to situate itself into a safer position within academia in the long run.

In addition, the academic marginalization of GWS programs from the aspect of FST is a new inquiry. Making self-definitions and taking marginalization as an epistemic advantage contribute not only to the outputs of the programs but also their recognition both within and outside academia, and moreover, prevent them from assimilation and losing their critical standpoints. The last but not the least, it reveals the hidden subjectivities of academia and, in a wider sense, of the social relations, as well and reminds the necessity of producing critical knowledge for a better and much livable world.

6.1.2. Methodological Contributions

Feminist Standpoint Theory does not seem to have much popularity in our days. The reasons of this unpopularity is that it has an ambivalent position between modernity and postmodernity. In other words, it criticizes modernist assumptions to the fullest, it makes use of postmodernity to the fullest as well, but neither completely rejects modernity nor totally acknowledges postmodernity. This “greasy pole” (Ramazanoğlu & Holland, 2002, p. 61) puts FST in a less popular and relevant position while it provides it with insights and sources to work on the main problematic of contemporary social theory. Studying GWS with FST improves the theory in one hand, produces political knowledge for women and gendered identities on the other. Since FST is a developing theory and methodology, studying it contributes to understand its constraints and limitations better.

Moreover, looking from the viewpoints of the agents of the topic, listening to and hearing their own voices and experiencing the reality with their own words make a contribution to situate the standpoint of women as the subject of the knowledge, and moreover to reveal their subjectivities. This has been an interactive and enlightening process also for me.

6.1.3. Practical Contributions

Interviewing the academics of the programs has a political meaning for me. We have created an opportunity to improve the relationships between agents of GWS, we have learnt a lot from each other. This is politics, and solidarity. With the help of this thesis, we have contributed to feminist methodology and feminist politics both during the interviews and with these findings.

Furthermore, there appears now the possibility of self-definition and adoption of marginalization, which has the potential to contribute to a transformation of consciousness in the long term to be discussed in the conferences and symposiums.

6.2. Limitations of the Study

It has been a highly difficult task for me to carry out this research. I will share the reasons of these difficulties in two sub-sections as theoretical and methodological limitations of the study.

6.2.1. Theoretical Limitations

Due to the fact that FST does neither reject modernist assumptions nor admit postmodernist approaches, I have had difficulty in holding on to a specific situation. In other words, the 'greasy pole' has been on stage for me, too. The risk of falling into what I criticize and reproducing the same discourses is an issue about being able to hold on to this greasy pole.

In addition to FST, there have appeared some limitations in the issue of GWS, as well. Limited number of research on the topic has made it even harder to situate academic marginalization of GWS into the existing literature.

Last, since political conjuncture does not support such a critical standpoint and since I have high ethical concerns, I have had to make some restrictions concerning the specificities of the programs and universities I interviewed. This may have caused the analysis to hang in the air or to seem as a bird-eye-view.

6.2.2. Methodological Limitations

During the study, I have had some methodological limitations, as well. Since my field work coincided with the political event Academics for Peace, I felt selfish and thus, timid to call and ask about an interview during such a complicated and demotivating atmosphere. Therefore, I had to limit my field to a number of 17- as many as I could reach. This may have restricted the scope of the study.

Due to the fact that I am a GWS student, interviewing the academics of the programs has been much difficult for me than any other group. No matter how non-hierarchical our relationship was, I could not escape from the thought that they are academics and

they know *everything*. This thought may have prevented me from catching and asking some critical questions during the interviews.

Then, the claim of epistemic privilege has been a crucial issue for me from the very beginning. A broader and more inclusive field work may have been much 'less partial' than this. Including all agents of GWS with its alumni and current students; agents of other disciplines; administrative bodies; and non-academic agents would make it more possible to understand partial knowledge and epistemic privilege much better and in detail with a more intersectional viewpoint. Due to my time limitation, I could not dare this.

Last, as an English Language and Literature gradute, this has been my first, longest and most serious encounter with a sociological research. Interdisciplinary characteristic of GWS makes it harder, on one hand, to hold on the issue from a new discipline, and enables a new mixture, on the other. Therefore, there may have existed some improvable points within the whole process.

6.3. Recommendations for Future Studies

As for future recommentations, I suggest a study with students and/or alumni of GWS programs to understand how they experience marginalization both during and aftermath of their study. From their viewpoint, this marginalization may be harder and tougher, and their insights may be equally critical from the aspect of epistemic privilege and situated knowledge.

In addition, as I mentioned in the limitations section, this study can be conducted with a larger sample among both academics and non-academics in an extended period of time to understand the claim of epistemic superiority better.

The link between academic recognition and social recognition and their contributions to each other; position of GWS programs within current feminist movement; the internalization of feminist movement by not only GWS agents but also society may also be among the salient themes recommended to be taken into consideration.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Allen, B. J., Orbe, M. P., & Olivas, M. R. (1999). The Complexity of Our Tears: Dis/enchantment and (In)Difference In the Academy. *Communication Theory*, 9, 402-429.
- Arat, N. (1996). Women's Studies in Turkey. *Women's Studies Quarterly*, 400-411.
- Atakul, S. (2002). Kadın Çalışmaları Öğrencisi Olmak. In A. Bora, & A. Günel (Eds.), *90'larda Türkiye'de Feminizm*. İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları.
- Benton, T. (2001). *Philosophy of Social Science: The Philosophical Foundations of Social Thought*. Basingstoke: Palgrave.
- Bowell, T. (n.d.). *Feminist Standpoint Theory*. Retrieved June 18, 2015, from Internet Encyclopedia of Philosophy A Peer-Reviewed Academic Resource: <http://www.iep.utm.edu/fem-stan/>
- Cockburn, C. (2010). Gender Relations as Causal in Militarization and War. *International Feminist Journal of Politics*, 12(2), 139-157.
- Collins, P. H. (2004). Learning from the Outsider Within: The Sociological Significance of Black Feminist Thought. In S. Harding, *The Feminist Standpoint Theory Reader: Intellectual and Political Controversies* (pp. 103-126). New York and London: Routledge.

Ecevit, M. (2016). *Feminist Standpoint Theory Seminars*. Ankara.

Ecevit, Y. (1996). Türkiye'de Kadın Çalışmaları: Durum, Sorunlar ve Gelecek. In H. Coşkun, *Akademik Yaşamda Kadın - Frauen in der akademischen Welt* (pp. 319-336). Ankara: Bizim Büro Basımevi.

Ecevit, Y. (2015). *Gender and Women's Studies in Turkey: Evaluation and Predictions*. Ankara: METU Press.

Ege, G. (2002). Turkish Women's Studies: The METU Gender and Women's Studies Graduate Program Experience. In H. Fleßner, & L. Potts (Eds.), *Societies in Transition — Challenges to Women's and Gender Studies* (pp. 147-158). Leske and Budrich.

Ertürk, Y. (2015). *Sınır Tanımayan Şiddet: Paradigma, Politika ve Pratikteki Yönleriyle Kadına Şiddet Olgusu*. İstanbul: Metis Yayıncılık.

Evans, M. (1982). In Praise of Theory: The Case for Women's Studies. *Feminist Review*, 10, 61-74.

Fowlkes, D. L. (1997). Moving from Feminist Identity Politics To Coalition Politics Through a Feminist Materialist Standpoint of Intersubjectivity in Gloria Anzaldua's Borderlands/La Frontera: The New Mestiza. *Hypatia*, 12(2).

Friedman, S. S. (1998). (Inter)Disciplinarity and the Question of the Women's Studies Ph.D. *Feminist Studies*, 24(2), 301-325. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3178699>

- Friedman, S. S. (2001). Statement: Academic Feminism and Interdisciplinarity. *Feminist Studies*, 27(2), 504-509. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3178774>
- Grace, V. (2002). From Feminist Studies to Gender Studies: Challenges to Gender Studies at the University of Canterbury, New Zealand. In H. Fleßner, & L. Potts (Eds.), *Societies in Transition — Challenges to Women's and Gender Studies* (pp. 33-42). Leske and Budrich.
- Griffin, G. (2002). Co-option or Transformation? Women's and Gender Studies Worldwide. In H. Fleßner, & L. Potts (Eds.), *Societies in Transition — Challenges to Women's and Gender Studies* (pp. 13-32). Leske and Budrich.
- Haraway, D. (2004). Situated Knowledges: The Science Question in Feminism and the Privilege of Partial Perspective. In S. Harding (Ed.), *The Feminist Standpoint Theory Reader: Intellectual and Political Controversies* (pp. 81-101). New York and London: Routledge.
- Harding, S. (1991). *Whose Science, Whose Knowledge*. New York: Cornell University Press.
- Harding, S. (Ed.). (2004). *The Feminist Standpoint Theory Reader: Intellectual and Political Controversies* (1st Edition ed.). New York and London: Routledge.
- Harnois, C. E. (2010). Race, Gender, and the Black Women's Standpoint. *Sociological Forum*, 25(1), 68-85.
- Hartsock, N. (1983). The feminist standpoint: Developing the ground for a specifically feminist materialism. In S. Harding, & M. Hintikka (Eds.), *Discovering reality*. Dordrecht: Reidel.

hooks, b. (2000). *Feminist Theory: From Margin to Center* (2nd ed.). Cambridge: South End Press.

Jaggar, A. M. (2004). Feminist Politics and Epistemology: The Standpoint of Women. In S. Harding (Ed.), *The Feminist Standpoint Theory Reader: Intellectual and Political Controversies* (pp. 55-66). New York and London: Routledge.

Janack, M. (1997). Standpoint Epistemology without the "Standpoint"?: An Examination of Epistemic Privilege and Epistemic Authority. *Hypatia*, 12(2), 125-39.

Kandiyoti, D. (2010). Gender and Women's Studies in Turkey. *New Perspectives on Turkey*, 165-176.

Mason, J. (1996). *Qualitative Researching*. London, Thousand Oaks and New Delhi: Sage Publications.

n.a. (2016, June 5). *Erdoğan: Anneliği reddeden kadın, eksiktir, yarımDIR*. Retrieved from BBC:
http://www.bbc.com/turkce/haberler/2016/06/160605_erdogan_kadin

Patterson, A., & Satz, M. (2002). Genetic Counseling and the Disabled: Feminism Examines the Stance of Those Who Stand at the Gate. *Hypatia*, 17(3), 118-142.

Pryse, M. (1998). Critical Interdisciplinarity, Women's Studies, and Cross-Cultural Insight. *NWSA Journal*, 10(1), 1-22. Retrieved from
<http://www.jstor.org/stable/4316551>

- Ramazanođlu, C., & Holland, J. (2002). *Feminist Methodology: Challenges and Choices*. London, Thousand Oaks and New Delhi: Sage Publications.
- Rose, H. (2004). Hand, Brain and Heart: A Feminist Epistemology for Natural Sciences. In S. Harding (Ed.), *The Feminist Standpoint Theory Reader* (pp. 67-81). New York and London: Routledge.
- Sancar, S. (2003). Üniversitede Feminizm? Bağlam, Gündem ve Olanaklar. *Toplum ve Bilim*, 183-216.
- Smith, D. E. (2004). Women's Perspective as a Radical Critique of Sociology. In S. Harding (Ed.), *The Feminist Standpoint Theory Reader* (pp. 21-35). New York and London: Routledge.
- Valadez, J. (2001). Standpoint Epistemology and Women of Color. In D. L. Hoeweler, & J. K. Boles (Eds.), *Women of Color: Defining the Issues, Hearing the Voices* (pp. 69-80). Santa Barbara, CA: Greenwood Press.
- Wylie, A. (2004). Why Standpoint Matters. In S. Harding (Ed.), *The Feminist Standpoint Theory Reader: Intellectual and Political Controversies* (pp. 339-351). New York and London: Routledge.
- Zimmermann, S. (2002). Women's and Gender Studies in a Global-Local Perspective: Developing the Frame. In H. Fleßner, & L. Potts (Eds.), *Societies in Transition — Challenges to Women's and Gender Studies* (pp. 61-77).

APPENDIX A: CASEBOOK

Interviewees	Current Position	Main Department	University
A	Full-Time Affiliated	Sociology	Y
B	Full-Time Affiliated	Literature	Y
C	Full-Time Affiliated	Sociology	Y
D	Full-Time Affiliated	Sociology	Y
E	Full-Time Affiliated	Political Sciences	Y
F	Full-Time Affiliated	Political Sciences	Y
G	Unaffiliated	Communication	X
H	Full-Time Affiliated	Political Sciences	X
J	Full-Time Affiliated	Political Sciences	X
K	Full-Time Affiliated	Communication	X
L	Part-Time Affiliated	Urban Policy Planning	Y
M	Full-Time Affiliated	Political Sciences	X
N	Full-Time Affiliated	Sociology	Y
O	Full-Time Affiliated	Fine Arts	X
P	Retired	Law	X
R	Retired	Sociology	Y
S	Full-Time Affiliated	Political Sciences	X

APPENDIX B: FIELD GUIDELINE

A. Academic Position

A.1. How would you evaluate the current position of GWS considering the *specificities* of its emergence and improvement? (University of X-Y/Turkey/World)

A.2. Which important characteristics of your program in

(a) national

(b) international platforms would you like to mention?

B. Institutional Specificities

B.1. What are your evaluations on the position of your program within academia from the aspects of

(a1) interdisciplinarity vs disciplinarity (specificities of interdisciplinarity),

(a2) its respectability (scientific, by administration and other disciplines),

(b1) specificities of its curriculum,

(b2) minimum characteristics expected from the students in line with the aims of the program,

(b3) salient characteristics expected from the academics,

(c) career opportunities of the alumni?

B.2. How would you evaluate the importance of the foundation of GWS programs with the collaboration of academics from different disciplines?

B.3. What would you like to express about the advantages/disadvantages of GWS programs in comparison with disciplinary departments?

B.4. How would you evaluate the view that GWS programs are to a large extent under the roof of a particular social science discipline?

B.5. What kind of reactions/evaluations do you experience (both within academia and in your personal life) when you mention that you are a GWS scholar and/or you carry out studies related to the issue of women?

C. Knowledge and Politics Relationship

C.1. To what extent do you think gender-based academic knowledge reflects the experiences of women?

C.2. With which features do you think GWS programs differ from mainstream academia?

C.3. To what degree do you think the approach of your program criticizes modernity and postmodernity?

C.4. (a) What would you like to express about the view that your curriculum should be based on feminist theories?

(b) What would you like to share about the current differentiation of feminist theories?

C.5. What kind of a relation/contradiction do you observe between the views that feminism is 'political' and academia is 'non-political'?

C.6. What would you like to share on the importance of 'feminist' identities and/or different feminist standpoints of GWS academics in the sight of academia?

C.7. What kind of a relationship do you think there exists between GWS programs and feminist/women's movement?

C.8. What kind of a relationship (similarity/difference) do you think there exists between GWS programs and Women's Research Centers?

D. Views Towards Future

What would you like to share about the position that GWS programs are to take in the future?

APPENDIX C: SAHA YÖNERGESİ

A. Akademik Konum

A.1. Kadın Çalışmaları programının bugün ulaştığı aşamayı kuruluşunun ve gelişiminin *özgünlüklerini* dikkate alarak nasıl değerlendirmektesiniz? (X-Y Üniversitesi/Türkiye/Dünya)

A.2. X-Y Üniversitesi'ndeki KÇ Lisansüstü programının,

(a) ulusal

(b) uluslararası düzlemde *önemli gördüğünüz* hangi özelliklerinden bahsetmek istersiniz?

B. Kurumsal Özgünlükler

B.1. KÇ'nin akademi içerisindeki konumunun

(a1) disiplinlerarası program vs. bölüm ayrımı (disiplinlerarası olmanın özgünlüğü),

(a2) saygınlığı (bilimsel, üniversite yönetimi, diğer disiplinler),

(b1) müfredatın özgünlüğü,

(b2) programın amaçları doğrultusunda öğrencilerden beklenen asgari özellikler,

(b3) öğretim elemanlarından beklenen belirgin özellikler,

(c) mezunların kariyer konumları açısından değerlendirmeleriniz nelerdir?

B.2. KÇ programlarının farklı disiplinlerden gelen öğretim üyelerinden oluşmasının önemini nasıl değerlendirirsiniz?

B.3. KÇ programlarının bölüm temelli programlara göre avantaj / dezavantajları hakkında neler söylemek istersiniz?

B.4. KÇ programlarının büyük ölçüde belirli sosyal bilim disiplinlerinin çatısı altında olduğu düşüncesini nasıl değerlendirmektesiniz?

B.5. KÇ öğretim üyesi olduğunuzu ve feminizm veya kadın konusu ile ilgili çalışmalar yürüttüğünüzü söylediğinizde (akademik ortamda ve toplumun genelinde) ne tür değerlendirmelerle (tepkilerle) karşılaşmaktasınız?

C. Bilgi ve Politika İlişkisi

C.1. Kadın odaklı akademik bilgi sizce ne dereceye kadar kadınların yaşam pratikleri ile örtüşmektedir?

C.2. Sizce KÇ programı anaakım akademi anlayışından hangi yönleriyle farklılık göstermektedir?

C.3. KÇ programınızın akademik yaklaşımının modernite ve postmodernite anlayışına ne dereceye kadar eleştirel baktığını düşünüyorsunuz?

C.4. (a) KÇ program içeriğinizin feminist kuramdan beslenmesi gerektiği düşüncesi hakkında neler söylemek istersiniz?

(b) Feminist kuramın bugün geldiği aşamadaki farklılaşması hakkında neler söylemek istersiniz?

C.5. Feminizmin 'politik', akademinin ise 'politika dışı' olduğu düşünceleri arasında nasıl bir ilişki/çelişki görüyorsunuz?

C.6. Akademi odağında KÇ öğretim elemanların 'feminist' olup / olmamalarının veya farklı feminist duruşlara sahip olmalarının önemi üzerine neler söylemek istersiniz?

C.7. KÇ programları ile Feminist / Kadın Hareketi arasında nasıl bir ilişki olduğunu düşünüyorsunuz?

C.8. KÇ programları ile Kadın Araştırma Merkezleri arasında ne tür bir ilişki (benzerlik / farklılık) olduğunu düşünüyorsunuz?

D. Geleceğine Yönelik Düşünceler

KÇ programlarının ileride alacağı konum hakkında neler söylemek istersiniz?

APPENDIX D: INTERNALS

Type	Name	Memo Link	Nodes	References	Created On	Modified On
Document	1- A	Yes	74	147	31-May-16 11:33 AM	04-Jun-16 3:18 PM
Document	2- B	Yes	48	79	31-May-16 11:33 AM	05-Jun-16 2:37 PM
Document	3- C	Yes	55	94	31-May-16 11:33 AM	07-Jun-16 9:39 PM
Document	4- D	Yes	38	60	31-May-16 11:33 AM	06-Jun-16 3:01 PM
Document	5- E	Yes	54	94	31-May-16 11:34 AM	05-Jun-16 3:33 PM
Document	6- F	Yes	38	56	31-May-16 11:34 AM	06-Jun-16 8:39 AM
Document	7- G	Yes	33	48	31-May-16 11:34 AM	05-Jun-16 4:46 PM
Document	8- H	Yes	58	95	31-May-16 11:34 AM	07-Jun-16 6:58 PM
Document	9- J	Yes	33	49	31-May-16 11:34 AM	06-Jun-16 9:52 AM
Document	10- K	Yes	52	105	31-May-16 11:34 AM	09-Jun-16 12:37 AM
Document	11- L	Yes	37	53	31-May-16 11:34 AM	08-Jun-16 3:36 PM
Document	12- M	Yes	43	69	31-May-16 11:34 AM	08-Jun-16 3:36 PM
Document	13- N	Yes	31	43	31-May-16 11:34 AM	08-Jun-16 12:08 PM
Document	14- O	Yes	42	61	31-May-16 11:34 AM	07-Jun-16 9:41 PM
Document	15- P	Yes	34	53	31-May-16 11:34 AM	07-Jun-16 11:23 AM
Document	16- R	Yes	39	53	31-May-16 11:34 AM	06-Jun-16 4:04 PM
Document	17- S	Yes	41	54	31-May-16 11:34 AM	05-Jun-16 11:43 PM

APPENDIX E: FREE NODES

Type	Name	Sources	References	Created On	Modified On
Free Node	3P	3	5	06-Jun-16 3:45 PM	09-Jun-16 12:36 AM
Free Node	3rd space	2	2	08-Jun-16 3:29 PM	08-Jun-16 3:30 PM
Free Node	academic otherness	2	8	07-Jun-16 6:42 PM	09-Jun-16 12:36 AM
Free Node	achievement of transformation	3	4	03-Jun-16 2:13 PM	05-Jun-16 4:30 PM
Free Node	acknowledgment of GWS in academia	4	5	03-Jun-16 1:40 PM	05-Jun-16 9:44 PM
Free Node	active agency	7	13	04-Jun-16 1:06 PM	09-Jun-16 12:36 AM
Free Node	advantages of interdisciplinarity	16	41	03-Jun-16 3:27 PM	09-Jun-16 12:36 AM
Free Node	advantages of multiplicity	3	3	04-Jun-16 10:55 AM	07-Jun-16 9:21 PM
Free Node	alumni	14	17	03-Jun-16 4:03 PM	09-Jun-16 12:36 AM
Free Node	approach of administration	9	13	03-Jun-16 11:02 PM	09-Jun-16 12:36 AM
Free Node	U.X. WS on international platform	5	6	05-Jun-16 5:21 PM	09-Jun-16 12:36 AM
Free Node	challenge	4	5	03-Jun-16 1:49 PM	06-Jun-16 3:58 PM
Free Node	characteristics of GWS in TR	3	4	03-Jun-16 1:54 PM	06-Jun-16 3:58 PM
Free Node	collectivity	2	2	03-Jun-16 10:54 PM	07-Jun-16 9:37 PM
Free Node	commitment	5	5	03-Jun-16 2:01 PM	06-Jun-16 2:18 PM
Free Node	conformism	1	2	08-Jun-16 7:02 PM	09-Jun-16 12:36 AM
Free Node	constituting a feminist identity	3	4	04-Jun-16 4:47 PM	09-Jun-16 12:36 AM
Free Node	contributions of GWS to academia	3	4	04-Jun-16 8:40 AM	05-Jun-16 11:28 PM

Free Node	correspondence of knowledge with experience	15	17	03-Jun-16 4:36 PM	08-Jun-16 2:46 PM
Free Node	criticism of mainstream academia	7	14	04-Jun-16 10:23 AM	09-Jun-16 12:36 AM
Free Node	criticism of modernity	16	36	03-Jun-16 4:41 PM	09-Jun-16 12:36 AM
Free Node	criticism of postmodernity	7	11	03-Jun-16 4:41 PM	08-Jun-16 11:49 AM
Free Node	criticism of scientific knowledge-production-process	4	5	04-Jun-16 10:20 AM	09-Jun-16 12:36 AM
Free Node	criticism of the movement in TR	1	2	05-Jun-16 9:31 PM	05-Jun-16 9:44 PM
Free Node	current situation of academia	4	7	03-Jun-16 2:44 PM	05-Jun-16 11:28 PM
Free Node	current situation of feminism	10	16	05-Jun-16 4:37 PM	09-Jun-16 12:36 AM
Free Node	current situation of GWS	4	8	04-Jun-16 1:47 PM	08-Jun-16 2:35 PM
Free Node	current situation of GWS in TR	9	14	03-Jun-16 2:25 PM	08-Jun-16 2:56 PM
Free Node	danger of flexibility in academia	1	1	03-Jun-16 2:43 PM	04-Jun-16 7:32 AM
Free Node	dichotomy	3	3	07-Jun-16 6:55 PM	09-Jun-16 12:36 AM
Free Node	differences of GWS from mainstream academia	17	32	03-Jun-16 4:52 PM	09-Jun-16 12:36 AM
Free Node	differentiation of feminist theories	11	13	04-Jun-16 10:49 AM	08-Jun-16 3:11 PM
Free Node	disadvantages of interdisciplinarity	11	20	03-Jun-16 3:27 PM	09-Jun-16 12:36 AM
Free Node	disadvantages of multiplicity	3	4	04-Jun-16 10:55 AM	09-Jun-16 12:36 AM
Free Node	diversity	2	3	08-Jun-16 1:26 PM	09-Jun-16 12:36 AM
Free Node	effect of conservatism on GWS	10	13	03-Jun-16 2:39 PM	09-Jun-16 12:36 AM

Free Node	effect of liberalism on GWS	1	1	03-Jun-16 2:36 PM	04-Jun-16 7:32 AM
Free Node	emergence of GWS	2	2	04-Jun-16 1:44 PM	08-Jun-16 9:19 AM
Free Node	emergence of GWS in Canada	1	2	04-Jun-16 1:46 PM	04-Jun-16 10:37 PM
Free Node	emergence of GWS in England	1	1	04-Jun-16 7:06 AM	04-Jun-16 7:32 AM
Free Node	emergence of GW at U.Y.	7	10	04-Jun-16 7:10 AM	08-Jun-16 11:49 AM
Free Node	emergence of GWS in the USA	1	2	04-Jun-16 7:05 AM	04-Jun-16 7:32 AM
Free Node	emergence of GWS in TR	7	12	03-Jun-16 2:23 PM	06-Jun-16 3:09 PM
Free Node	emergence of WS at U.X.	3	5	05-Jun-16 4:49 PM	09-Jun-16 12:36 AM
Free Node	exclusion of GWS students from public institutions	3	3	04-Jun-16 12:33 AM	08-Jun-16 2:43 PM
Free Node	feminism perception	3	5	04-Jun-16 9:58 AM	05-Jun-16 11:28 PM
Free Node	feminist curiosity	1	1	08-Jun-16 9:28 AM	08-Jun-16 9:28 AM
Free Node	feminist ethics	2	2	05-Jun-16 6:36 PM	08-Jun-16 10:08 AM
Free Node	feminist methodology	3	6	08-Jun-16 9:21 AM	09-Jun-16 12:36 AM
Free Node	feminist pedagogy	3	7	07-Jun-16 10:51 AM	09-Jun-16 12:36 AM
Free Node	foreign language-based education	4	4	04-Jun-16 8:00 AM	06-Jun-16 9:12 AM
Free Node	FST	9	21	03-Jun-16 4:39 PM	09-Jun-16 12:36 AM
Free Node	future of GWS	17	24	03-Jun-16 5:14 PM	09-Jun-16 12:36 AM
Free Node	gender mainstreaming	1	1	06-Jun-16 3:57 PM	06-Jun-16 3:57 PM
Free Node	ghettoization of GWS	2	2	07-Jun-16 10:44 AM	08-Jun-16 2:35 PM
Free Node	harmony within the GWS entity	4	4	03-Jun-16 4:27 PM	07-Jun-16 11:04 AM
Free Node	ideal profile of GWS instructors	13	19	03-Jun-16 3:40 PM	09-Jun-16 12:36 AM

Free Node	ideal profile of GWS students	16	21	03-Jun-16 3:37 PM	09-Jun-16 12:36 AM
Free Node	individual international connections	6	8	03-Jun-16 3:16 PM	08-Jun-16 9:19 AM
Free Node	inner dynamics of U.Y. GWS	4	8	04-Jun-16 12:25 AM	06-Jun-16 8:23 AM
Free Node	institute of GWS	1	2	07-Jun-16 8:47 PM	07-Jun-16 8:50 PM
Free Node	institutionalization of feminism	1	1	03-Jun-16 10:38 PM	04-Jun-16 7:32 AM
Free Node	instructor profile of U.X. WS	5	8	05-Jun-16 6:34 PM	09-Jun-16 12:36 AM
Free Node	interaction	3	6	08-Jun-16 9:24 AM	09-Jun-16 12:36 AM
Free Node	interdisciplinarity	11	18	03-Jun-16 3:19 PM	08-Jun-16 2:35 PM
Free Node	interdisciplinarity vs disciplinarity	7	10	05-Jun-16 6:20 PM	08-Jun-16 2:42 PM
Free Node	interdisciplinarity vs multidisciplinarity	1	1	04-Jun-16 4:28 PM	04-Jun-16 10:37 PM
Free Node	interdisciplinarity vs supradisciplinarity	1	2	06-Jun-16 3:22 PM	06-Jun-16 3:42 PM
Free Node	interdisciplinarity vs transdisciplinarity	1	1	08-Jun-16 9:33 AM	08-Jun-16 9:33 AM
Free Node	intersectionality	8	14	04-Jun-16 10:27 AM	09-Jun-16 12:36 AM
Free Node	joint research	3	6	03-Jun-16 3:10 PM	08-Jun-16 9:19 AM
Free Node	lack of journals	1	2	08-Jun-16 8:43 AM	08-Jun-16 9:19 AM
Free Node	Existence of WRCs in GWS	1	4	08-Jun-16 8:48 AM	08-Jun-16 9:32 AM
Free Node	marginalization of GWS within academia	2	4	05-Jun-16 4:22 PM	09-Jun-16 12:36 AM
Free Node	masculinities	1	1	05-Jun-16 11:33 PM	05-Jun-16 11:33 PM
Free Node	misuse of GWS	1	1	05-Jun-16 6:22 PM	05-Jun-16 9:44 PM

Free Node	modernity	4	8	03-Jun-16 4:37 PM	06-Jun-16 2:49 PM
Free Node	moneymaking program	1	1	04-Jun-16 7:58 AM	04-Jun-16 7:58 AM
Free Node	multiplicity	6	7	04-Jun-16 10:50 AM	08-Jun-16 2:51 PM
Free Node	non-hierarchical	5	8	04-Jun-16 11:22 PM	09-Jun-16 12:36 AM
Free Node	objectivity	3	3	04-Jun-16 10:56 PM	09-Jun-16 12:36 AM
Free Node	U.Y. GWS in international platform	6	10	03-Jun-16 3:17 PM	06-Jun-16 2:18 PM
Free Node	outsider within	2	3	03-Jun-16 7:00 PM	07-Jun-16 7:50 PM
Free Node	partial knowledge	1	1	08-Jun-16 7:30 PM	09-Jun-16 12:36 AM
Free Node	political characteristic of GWS	4	6	03-Jun-16 1:43 PM	09-Jun-16 12:36 AM
Free Node	positive discrimination to GWS in academia	1	1	05-Jun-16 2:09 PM	05-Jun-16 2:50 PM
Free Node	postmodernity	2	2	04-Jun-16 10:28 AM	05-Jun-16 4:34 PM
Free Node	practical & strategical benefit	1	1	08-Jun-16 9:47 AM	08-Jun-16 9:47 AM
Free Node	profile of U.Y. GWS instructors	4	6	04-Jun-16 8:49 AM	06-Jun-16 3:40 PM
Free Node	profile of U.Y. GWS students	7	13	03-Jun-16 3:38 PM	08-Jun-16 12:03 PM
Free Node	queer studies	2	2	05-Jun-16 11:31 PM	05-Jun-16 11:31 PM
Free Node	readiness	1	1	07-Jun-16 10:37 AM	07-Jun-16 10:37 AM
Free Node	reasons of low- growing of GWS in TR	7	10	03-Jun-16 2:34 PM	09-Jun-16 12:36 AM
Free Node	reasons of the difficulty in achieving interdisciplinarity	15	22	03-Jun-16 4:21 PM	09-Jun-16 12:36 AM

Free Node	recognition	16	44	03-Jun-16 3:33 PM	09-Jun-16 12:36 AM
Free Node	reducing GWS to v.a.w	1	2	06-Jun-16 7:43 AM	06-Jun-16 8:28 AM
Free Node	reflexivity	1	1	08-Jun-16 7:07 PM	09-Jun-16 12:36 AM
Free Node	rejection of modernity	1	1	04-Jun-16 10:28 AM	04-Jun-16 10:28 AM
Free Node	representation problem of GWS	1	1	04-Jun-16 3:34 PM	04-Jun-16 10:37 PM
Free Node	requirements of interdisciplinarity	4	5	04-Jun-16 4:25 PM	08-Jun-16 11:49 AM
Free Node	risk of reproduction of patriarchy	5	7	04-Jun-16 11:16 PM	09-Jun-16 12:36 AM
Free Node	self-definition	3	4	07-Jun-16 7:49 PM	07-Jun-16 7:49 PM
Free Node	shared politics	2	3	04-Jun-16 12:57 PM	05-Jun-16 2:50 PM
Free Node	situated knowledge	12	32	04-Jun-16 11:46 PM	08-Jun-16 2:35 PM
Free Node	specificities of U.X. WS	7	29	05-Jun-16 4:50 PM	09-Jun-16 12:36 AM
Free Node	specificities of U.X. WS curriculum	6	14	05-Jun-16 11:05 PM	09-Jun-16 12:36 AM
Free Node	specificities of GWS	2	5	03-Jun-16 1:45 PM	05-Jun-16 3:26 PM
Free Node	specificities of U.Y.	3	3	06-Jun-16 12:41 PM	08-Jun-16 11:49 AM
Free Node	specificities of U.Y. GWS	9	31	03-Jun-16 1:58 PM	08-Jun-16 11:49 AM
Free Node	specificities of U.Y. GWS curriculum	7	12	03-Jun-16 3:37 PM	08-Jun-16 11:49 AM
Free Node	specificities of WRCs	2	3	03-Jun-16 5:10 PM	04-Jun-16 11:49 PM
Free Node	structural problems influencing GWS	10	15	04-Jun-16 3:53 PM	08-Jun-16 11:49 AM
Free Node	student profile of U.X. WS	4	5	05-Jun-16 4:13 PM	09-Jun-16 12:36 AM
Free Node	subjectivity	3	5	03-Jun-16 4:38 PM	09-Jun-16 12:36 AM
Free Node	the difference btw GWS and WRC	1	2	07-Jun-16 10:29 AM	07-Jun-16 11:21 AM

Free Node	the entrance phases of GWS into academia	1	1	04-Jun-16 7:12 AM	04-Jun-16 7:32 AM
Free Node	the importance of BILAR in the development of GWS	1	1	03-Jun-16 2:17 PM	04-Jun-16 7:32 AM
Free Node	the importance of conjuncture	9	17	04-Jun-16 12:53 AM	08-Jun-16 3:35 PM
Free Node	the importance of criticism	5	9	05-Jun-16 6:23 PM	08-Jun-16 2:45 PM
Free Node	the importance of disciplinarity in GWS	2	3	05-Jun-16 6:15 PM	08-Jun-16 2:35 PM
Free Node	the importance of feminist identity	5	6	04-Jun-16 10:09 AM	07-Jun-16 10:58 AM
Free Node	the importance of feminist standpoint in GWS	17	28	03-Jun-16 2:27 PM	09-Jun-16 12:36 AM
Free Node	the importance of gender awareness	5	5	03-Jun-16 1:59 PM	07-Jun-16 11:00 AM
Free Node	the importance of the first students of GWS	1	1	07-Jun-16 10:35 AM	07-Jun-16 10:35 AM
Free Node	the importance of the founders of GWS	8	9	03-Jun-16 1:56 PM	08-Jun-16 2:35 PM
Free Node	the importance of WRC	3	4	05-Jun-16 5:17 PM	07-Jun-16 9:49 AM
Free Node	the necessity of feminist theory in GWS	13	14	03-Jun-16 4:54 PM	08-Jun-16 10:01 AM
Free Node	the necessity of interdisciplinarity	6	7	03-Jun-16 6:21 PM	07-Jun-16 7:49 PM
Free Node	the need for a GWS organization	1	2	06-Jun-16 3:19 PM	06-Jun-16 3:44 PM
Free Node	the need for PhD programmes of GWS	4	4	04-Jun-16 11:09 AM	08-Jun-16 11:49 AM
Free Node	the need of protecting the current acquisitions	2	3	03-Jun-16 2:41 PM	05-Jun-16 9:44 PM

Free Node	the question of GWS as a department	6	6	04-Jun-16 11:09 AM	06-Jun-16 3:24 PM
Free Node	the relationship btw academia and politics	16	24	03-Jun-16 4:57 PM	09-Jun-16 12:36 AM
Free Node	the relationship btw GWS and movement in TR	17	34	03-Jun-16 5:00 PM	09-Jun-16 12:36 AM
Free Node	the relationship btw GWS and positive sciences	3	3	04-Jun-16 4:33 PM	09-Jun-16 12:36 AM
Free Node	the relationship btw GWSs and WRCs	13	18	03-Jun-16 5:08 PM	09-Jun-16 12:36 AM
Free Node	the relationship btw movement and curriculum	3	7	05-Jun-16 6:29 PM	08-Jun-16 3:11 PM
Free Node	the relationship btw political conj and GWS	2	5	08-Jun-16 2:45 PM	09-Jun-16 12:36 AM
Free Node	the relationship btw the representatives of GWS and recognition	3	3	04-Jun-16 8:58 AM	06-Jun-16 8:23 AM
Free Node	the relationship btw theory and practice	5	9	04-Jun-16 9:18 AM	09-Jun-16 12:36 AM
Free Node	the relationship btw university and feminism	4	4	05-Jun-16 4:12 PM	09-Jun-16 12:36 AM
Free Node	the relationship of GWS instructors with the movement	4	4	03-Jun-16 10:34 PM	06-Jun-16 2:18 PM
Free Node	the situation of GWS in a technical university	3	4	04-Jun-16 9:05 AM	06-Jun-16 2:18 PM
Free Node	transformation	7	7	03-Jun-16 2:03 PM	08-Jun-16 9:41 AM
Free Node	transformation of university to the market	2	2	04-Jun-16 7:53 AM	05-Jun-16 11:28 PM
Free Node	weak point of feminist theory	1	1	05-Jun-16 3:03 PM	05-Jun-16 3:03 PM

APPENDIX F: TÜRKÇE ÖZET

TOPLUMSAL CİNSİYET VE KADIN ÇALIŞMALARI: KONUMLANDIRILMIŞ AKADEMİK MARJİNALLİK

Toplumsal Cinsiyet ve Kadın Çalışmaları (TCKÇ) Anabilim Dalı dünyada 1970'ler, Türkiye'de ise 1980'li yıllardan itibaren feminist hareketin akademik ayağı olarak akademide kendine yer açmıştır. Temel amacı ataerkil kurumlara meydan okumak ve onları dönüştürmek olan feminist aktivistler bu iddialarını öncelikle ve özellikle bilgi üretimine müdahale ederek gerçekleştirebileceklerini görüp kendilerini akademide var ve görünür kılmayı amaçlamışlardır. Politik olarak, disiplinlerarası bilgi üretimi yaklaşımını benimseyen TCKÇ bu özelliğiyle kadın gerçekliğinin tek boyutlu anlaşılamayacağını ve birden çok disiplinin bir araya gelerek ve çoklu ve birbirini içerisinde harmanlanarak gerçekliğin daha doğru anlaşılabilir ve anlatılabilir olduğunu savunmuştur. Bu bağlamda akademiye yerleşen ilk kadın feminist akademisyenler bilginin kadın için, kadınlar tarafından ve kadınlarla üretilmesi gerektiğini savunmuş, mevcut ataerkil bilginin kadının gerçekliğini anlatmadığını, kadını görünmez kıldığını ve hakim olanın, yani erkeğin hakkını koruduğunu savunmuş ve hem kendi ana disiplinlerinde hem de TCKÇ anabilim dallarında kadınlık bilgisini üretmişlerdir. Bu programların müfredatları *Kadın ve Toplum*, *Kadın ve Siyaset*, *Kadın ve Din* ve benzeri şekillerde oluşturulmuş olup daha çok kadınlarla ilgili bilgi birikimine katkıda bulunmuş ve TCKÇ anabilim dallarının temelini oluşturmuşlardır. Sonrasında ortaya atılan toplumsal cinsiyet kavramıyla kesişimsellikler tartışmaya dahil edilmiş ve feminist teori ciddi bir tıkanıklıktan kendini kurtarmış ve tüm sosyal bilimleri etkileyen bir açılım sağlamıştır.

TEORİK ÇERÇEVE

Teorik olarak bu ilk yaklaşım etnik köken, toplumsal cinsiyet, ırk, sınıf ve benzeri farklılıkları göz ardı ettiği, kadınları tek bir kategori olarak ele aldığı ve aralarındaki farklılıkları görünmez kıldığı, mevcut akademik sistemdeki dikotomik anlayışı kadın-

erkek dikotomisiyle yeniden ürettiği ve kadını doğrudan dikotominin zayıf ayağına yerleştirdiği gibi sebeplerle katı bir şekilde eleştiriye uğramıştır. Bu ikinci yaklaşıma göre, kadın-erkek diye bir ikilik yaratmaktansa kadınları kendi aralarında ve kendi içlerinde farklı özgünlüklere sahip bireyler olarak değerlendirmek, ikilikleri bir kenara bırakmak, ırk, etnik köken, toplumsal cinsiyet, sınıf, cinsel kimlik ve benzeri kesişimsellikleri de göz önünde bulundurarak bilgi üretmek bizi hem gerçekliğe ulaştıracak hem de kadınların güçlenmesine katkıda bulunacaktır. Ancak bu ikinci grup da her ne kadar sosyal teorinin ikilik anlayışına köklü eleştiriler getirirse de kendine teorik bir zemin yaratamadığı ve bu iddialarını kanıtlayacak kavramsal çerçeveyi oturtamadığı gerekçeleriyle Feminist Duruş Kuramı (FDK) teorisyenleri tarafından yoğun eleştirilere maruz kaldılar. Üstelik, ikinci grup feminist anlayış FDK tarafından bilgiye ve gerçekliğe bütüncül yaklaştığı sebebiyle de zeminsizleştirildi. Güç ve bilgi arasındaki ilişkiyi sorunsallaştıran bir kuram olan FDK'ye göre gerçeklik algısı hiçbir zaman tam olarak anlaşılabilir ve aktarılamaz, gerçeklik de gerçeklik bilgisi de taraftır, konumsaldır, içinde bulunduğu yer, zaman, bağlam, koşul ve benzeri özgünlüklere içkindir ve tüm bunlara göre de sürekli değişir. Dolayısıyla, genellenmesi, kendi içinde bir öz aranması, bir mantık temeline oturtulması anlamsızdır, gerçeklikten uzaktır. Duygu ve normlardan arındırılmış nesnellik epistemolojisiyle gerçekliğe ulaşılacağı iddiası bir yanılsamadan başka bir şey değildir. Bu bağlamda, sadece öznelliklerin değil, çoklu öznelliklerin çoklu özgünlüklerini dikkate almak ve bilgiyi konumlandırmak bizi tam olarak gerçekliğe götürmese de daha güçlü bir nesnellik epistemolojisiyle doğruya daha az taraflı olacak şekilde daha çok yaklaştıracaktır. FDK'ye göre, bu daha az taraflı bilgiye işe marjinal olanın bilgisiyle ve hiyerarşik olmayan ve interaktif bir bilgi üretim süreci yöntemiyle ulaşılabilir. Kendi öznellikleriyle baskın olanın dilini konuşan gruplar olarak marjinal bireyler çemberin hem içinde hem dışında yer alma özellikleriyle baskın olandan farklı olarak çift vizyona sahip olan bireylerdir. Bu çift vizyona sahip olma özellikleri, FDK'ye göre, kendilerine gerçekliği deneyimleme ve anlamada epistemik bir öncelik kazandırır, o yüzden bilgiyi marjinal olandan, marjinal olanın yaşam deneyimlerinden almak anlamlıdır, daha az taraflı bilgiye ve daha güçlü nesnellığe

götürendir. Ancak bu marjinal-baskın ikiliği yaratmak ve marjinal olana öncelik atfederek klasik modernitenin katı bir biçimde eleştirilen tuzağına düşmek anlamında değerlendirilmemelidir. FDK'ye göre, sorun ikilik anlayışında değil, ikilik anlayışındaki hiyerarşik ilişkilene ve birini diğerinden farklılığına göre tanımlama biçimindedir. Bir diğer deyişle, FDK ikilik anlayışını reddetmemekte, taraflardan birini üstün görme ve diğerinden farklılaştıran özelliğiyle tanımlama eylemine karşı çıkmaktadır, bunun yerine öznelliklerin ve öznelliklerin özgünlüklerinin dahil edildiği ve tarafların özgürleştiği ilişkilene biçimlerini desteklemektedir. Marjinal olanın önceliği konusundaki eleştirilere ise bunun verili bir özellik olmadığı, politika ve kolektif direnme formlarıyla kazanılması gereken bir duruş olduğu savıyla karşılık vermektedir. Modernitenin tüm bu varsayımlarını köküne kadar eleştirmesinin yanı sıra, postmodernitenin öznellik epistemolojisi, çoğulculuk ve parçalılık anlayışından da esinlenen FDK bu anlamda iki arada bir derede kalmış bir duruşa sahip oluşuyla da eleştirilebilir. Ancak burada vurgulamak gerekir ki postmodernite moderniteyi reddeden bir yaklaşımken FDK postmoderniteden yararlanmasına rağmen moderniteyi reddetmeyen ve fakat kökten eleştiren bir duruştur. Postmodernist söylemin totolojik görelilik yaklaşımına düşmekten de kendini taraflı ve konumsal bilgi iddiasıyla kurtarır.

METODOLOJİ

Bu teorik çerçeve içerisinde, tezimde Türkiye'deki TCKÇ anabilim dallarının akademi içerisindeki konumunu FDK bakış açısıyla epistemik öncelik, konumlandırılmış ve taraflı bilgi, çemberin içinde ve dışında olma konumu, güçlü nesnellik kavramları üzerinden tartışmayı amaçladım. Buna göre, TCKÇ anabilim dallarının akademi-TCKÇ ikiliği içerisinde marjinal olma konumunu; öztanımlama ve misyon ve vizyon ilişkisi; politik ve disiplinlerarası özellikleriyle çemberin dışında, mevcut akademik yapı içerisinde bilgi üretmeye yönelik akademik bir birim olma özelliğiyle çemberin içinde olma pozisyonu ile çift vizyona sahip olması; bu çift vizyonla daha az taraflı ve daha güçlü nesnellikte bilgi üretme becerisi arasındaki ilişkileri sorunsallaştırdım. Bilgiyi akademik alanın aktif üreticileriyle birlikte üretmeye ve interaktif ve hiyerarşik olmayan

bir bilgi üretim sürecine olanak sağlayacağından nitel araştırma yöntemlerinden derinlemesine mülakat yöntemini tercih ettim. Bu amaçla, Türkiye’de tarihsel olarak yakın artalanlara sahip özgünlükler bakımından birbirinden oldukça farklı iki üniversite programının akademisyenleriyle derinlemesine mülakatlar yaptım. Alanın aktif üreticileri olarak akademisyenleri seçme sebebim hem programın kurucuları ve yürütücüleri olmaları hem de feminist hareketin içinde yer almış ve alıyor olmalarından kaynaklandı. Buna ek olarak, kendim bir TCKÇ öğrencisi olduğum için araştırma konuyla arama bir mesafe koymak hissini duyduğumdan öğrencileri araştırmanın dışında tuttum. Etik kaygılarım nedeniyle üniversite programlarını X ve Y, kendileriyle görüştüğüm 17 tane akademisyeni ise A’dan S’ye alfabetik olarak kodlamayı tercih ettim. Akademisyenlerin kişisel ve akademik özellikleri emeklilik durumlarından, TCKÇ anabilim dallarında kurucu veya seçmeli ders hocası olma durumlarına, yaşlarından, ana disiplinlerine kadar birçok farklı başlıkta farklılıklar barındırmakta. Görüşmeler çoğunlukla akademisyenlerin kendi odalarında, sessiz sakin ve samimi ortamlarda gerçekleşti. 17 tane görüşmeden toplam 28 saatlik ses kaydı ve 300 sayfalık deşifreler çıktı. Bu deşifreleri QSR NVivo 8 nitel araştırma analiz programı aracılığıyla analiz ettim. Buna göre 300 sayfalık deşifrelerden 140 adet serbest kod üretmiş olup bunların arasından marjinalizasyon, tanınırlık, politik olma, disiplinlerarası olma, politik konjonktür, mevcut akademik anlayış, mevcut feminist hareket kodlarında yoğunlaşan ilişkileri sorunsallaştırdım.

ANALİZ

Analiz sonuçlarına göre, Türkiye’deki TCKÇ anabilim dallarının öncelikle bir öztanımlama yapmaları gerektiği, çünkü yaptıkları bu öztanımlamaların aldıkları isimlerden misyon, vizyon, müfredat oluşumları ve özdeğerlenmeye kadar eyleyciliklerini doğrudan etkilediği ve şekillendirdiği ortaya çıkmıştır. Buna göre, X Üniversitesi akademisyenlerinin kendilerini iddialı ve kesin bir biçimde “TCKÇ değil de KÇ” olarak tanımladığı ve bu tanımlamanın onları bir çatı altında fedakarlık, adanmışlık ve sağaltıcı bir güçle bir arada tuttuğu ve bu bir aradalık üzerinden

kendilerine ait oldukları bir ortam yarattıklarını gözlemledim. Bundan farklı olarak, Y Üniversitesi akademisyenlerinin kendilerini “Y Üniversitesi TCKÇ” programı olarak tanımladığı ve bu tanımlama üzerinden programla üniversitelerini eşit seviyede sahiplendikleri ve ikisi için ortak bir eşsuygınlık inşası oluşturduklarını gözlemledim. Ancak burada belirtmeliyim ki öztanımlama kodu sahadan gelen bir kod olduğu için buna özel veya bununla ilgili sorularım olmamıştır ve bu tanımlamalar her bir akademisyen tarafından ayrı ayrı yapılmamıştır. Buna ek olarak, Türkiye’deki TCKÇ anabilim dallarının akademik marjinalliğine sebep olan tarihi ve dışsal faktörlerin varlığı analizde yoğun bir biçimde gözüme çarptı. Bunlara göre, TCKÇ programlarının ortaya çıktığı 1980’li dönemlerde Birleşmiş Milletler’in etkisi ve 1980 darbesi önemli bir yer tutmaktadır. BM aracılığıyla kurulan programlar feminist hareketle olan bağlarındaki organikliği süreç içerisinde kurmaya çalışırken 1980 darbesi akademinin eleştirel düşünce ortamına ket vurmuş ve TCKÇ gibi son derece eleştirel programların akademiye girişine olmasa da akademiye görünürlüğüne ve kabulüne ciddi derece ket vurmuştur. Bu sağlıksız temelin yanı sıra, günümüz politik konjonktürü, mevcut akademinin durumu ve mevcut feminist hareketin durumu TCKÇ programlarının akademik marjinalliğini katmerleyen dışsal faktörler olarak analizde ortaya çıkmıştır. AKP hükümetinin kadın ve feminizm konularına yaklaşımı, Cumhurbaşkanı Tayyip Erdoğan ve destekleyicilerinin konuyla ilgili söylem ve pratikleri TCKÇ programlarının akademik konumunu doğrudan ve keskin bir biçimde etkilemiştir. Muhafazakar ve eleştiriye kapalı tutum ve söylemlerin akademiye içine kapatmasına ve özgür düşünce ortamına vurduğu sert darbeye ek olarak, akademinin piyasalaşması, profesyonelleşmesi ve kariyere dönük işlemeye başlamış olması da TCKÇ gibi kariyerizm söylemlerinden uzak, politik bir programın akademik konumuna doğrudan dokunan başka bir faktör olarak görünüyor. Son olarak, feminist hareketin hem bu söylemler sonucunda hem de hareketten kaynaklı kendi iç dinamiklerinde yaşadığı problemler sebebiyle TCKÇ programları politik ayaklarının desteğinden mahrum kalmış olarak akademiye tutunmaya çalışıyor. Tüm bu faktörler TCKÇ programlarını akademik olarak zorunlu bir marjinalliğe doğuruyor. Bu marjinallik sadece eyleyicilerin

maddi, fiziksel, akademik, manevi hak marjinalliğini değil, üretilen bilginin içerilmesi, tüketilmesi, yaygınlaştırılması ve üretimine katkıda bulunulmasını da içinde bulunduruyor. Ancak, tezde asıl vurguladığım TCKÇ'lerin bu marjinal konumlarının zaten bir sürpriz olmaması gerçekliği. Ana çıkış iddiası meydan okumak ve dönüştürmek olan bir programın anaakım olması ya da marjinal olmaması zaten beklenemez, beklenmemeli. Aksine, bu marjinallik ikili bir vizyona sahip olunması özgünlüğüyle epistemik bir avantaj sağladığından benimsenmeli, içerilmeli ve korunmalı. Buna göre bir program ne kadar marjinal olursa o kadar iddialarını gerçekleştirmiş ve gerçeklik bilgisine dair kritik öngörülerini iki tarafı da deneyimlediği için o kadar derinden gözlemlemiş ve etkili bir biçimde bilgiye dönüştürmüş oluyor. Fakat bu ikinci düzey akademik marjinalliğin benimsenmesi TCKÇ'lerin politik ve disiplinlerarası olma özelliklerinin güçlülüğüyle doğrudan bağlantılı olarak ortaya çıkıyor. Bir programın içinde bulunduğu üniversite ne kadar politik ve politik olmaya elverişliyse, ne kadar disiplinlerarasılığı destekleyen ve gerçekleştirilmesine olanak sağlayan esnek bir yapıya sahipse programlar da bu özelliklerini o kadar rahat ve güçlü bir biçimde eyleme dökabiliyorlar. Ancak bu yalnız yapıya değil eyleyicilerin eyleyiciliklerine de bağlı. Programın hoca ve öğrenci profili feminist hareketle ne kadar doğrudan ilişkilendirirse, politik özelliklerini programa ne kadar taşırlarsa, program içinde ne kadar aktif olurlarsa, müfredat oluşumuna ne kadar ortak katkıda bulunur ve müfredatları güncel politik konjonktürden beslenir kılarılarsa programlar da o kadar politik ve dönüştürücü güce sahip oluyorlar. Buna ek olarak, hem hoca hem öğrenci profili ne kadar farklı disiplinlerin bilgilerinden yararlanır ve bunu kendi içinde harmanlarsa çeşitlilik, zenginlik, farklılık özellikleri o kadar gerçekleştirilmiş ve başarılı oluyor. Örneğin, Hukuk, Tıp, Güzel Sanatlar ve benzeri fakültelerin olmadığı, mühendislik fakültelerinin yoğunluk ve ağırlık kazandığı teknik bir üniversitede disiplinlerarasılığı sağlamak zor olduğundan ve sadece TCKÇ programının değil genel olarak sosyal bilim dallarının etkisinden söz etmek zorlaşabilir. Buna benzer bir şekilde, eyleyicileri politik hareketten uzak, güncel tartışmaları müfredatına entegre etmeyen, teoriden ve bağlamdan beslenmeyen bir TCKÇ'nin çıkış iddialarını

gerçekleştirmesi o kadar zorlaşıyor ve marjinallikten uzaklaşıp asimilasyona yaklaşıyor. Üstelik, üniversite yönetimlerinin hem kişisel hem akademik tutumları bu özelliklerin başarıyla harekete dökülmesinde önemli derecede etkiye sahip olarak ortaya çıkıyor. Disiplinlerarasılığı desteklemeyen, politik kararların alınmasına olanak tanımayan yönetimler TCKÇ programlarının gelişimine ket vurmaktadır. Dolayısıyla, akademik marjinallik programdan programa, üniversitenin sağladığı koşullardan ülkenin genel politik durumuna kadar birçok farklı açı göz önünde bulundurulduğunda öznel olarak değerlendirilmek durumunda. Genelilebilir, soyutlanabilir bir akademik marjinallikten bahsetmek programların özgünlüklerini kaybetmesine sebep olmasına ek olarak gerçekliklerini de yansıtmakta da yetersiz kalacaktır.

SONUÇ

Tüm bu bağlam içerisinde tez TCKÇ programlarının akademi içerisindeki konumunu FDK bakış açısıyla konumlandırılmış akademik marjinallik üzerinden tartışmıştır. TCKÇ literatüründe marjinallik tartışmaları sınırlı ölçüde yer almasına karşın marjinalliğin olumlu bir anlamda ele alınmasını bir yenilik olarak sunmuş ve TCKÇ programlarının eyleyicileri bakış açısından akademik konumu anlamaya çalışmıştır. Bu tartışma böylelikle sadece TCKÇ literatürüne değil FDK tartışmalarına da bir yenisini ekleyerek katkıda bulunmuştur. Üstelik, TCKÇ programlarının öztanımlama, özdeğerlenme yapma gereksinimlerini hatırlatmış, bunun misyon ve vizyonlarıyla doğrudan bağlantılı olduğunu göstermiştir. Mevcut politik ortam, akademinin ve feminist hareketinin mevcut durumlarının TCKÇ programlarına yansımalarını tartışmış, konumlandırılmış akademik marjinalliğin programlara nasıl epistemik öncelik sağlayabileceğini sorunsallaştırmıştır. Katkılarının yanı sıra, tezimde birtakım sınırlılıklar da baş göstermiştir. Öncelikle, saha sürecimin Barış İçin Akademisyenler soruşturmasına denk gelmesi sebebiyle akademisyenlerden bu zor zamanlarında görüşme randevusu talep etmek kendimi bencil hissettirdiğinden görüşmeleri ayarlamak benim için çok zor oldu. Görüşme sayısı, zamanı ve süreleri bu zorluktan paralel olarak etkilendi. Sonrasında, FDK'nin postmodernite ve modernite arasındaki yağlı çubukta

sürekli kaygan pozisyonlarda bulunmak hali veriyi üretme, yorumlama, yazma süreçlerinde de beni sürekli kaydırdı, tutunmakta zorlandım. Bunlara ek olarak, benim öğrenci pozisyonum, akademisyenlerin de hoca pozisyonu her ne kadar hiyerarşisiz ve etkileşimsel bir ilişki kurmayı becerebilsek de kafamın içinde bu insanların sonuçta ‘hoca’ oldukları ve benden çok şey bildikleri fikrinden kurtulmamı zorlaştırdı, öğrencilerle görüşseydim bu kadar zor olmayabilirdi. Son olarak, benim tez için yeterli zamanım olmadığı için kapsamı hocalarla sınırlı tuttum. Ancak, epistemik öncelik savını biraz daha detaylı ve derinlemesine sorunsallaştırabilmek için bu çalışmanın sadece TCKÇ hocalarıyla değil, öğrenci ve mezunlarına da ek olarak TCKÇ dışından olan disiplinlerin eyleyicileri, üniversite yönetimleri, feminist hareket aktivistleri ve programı hiç bilmeyen insanlarla da yapılması çalışmayı hem daha kapsayıcı hem de daha derinlemesine inceleme şansını tanır.

APPENDIX G: TEZ FOTOKOPİSİ İZİN FORMU

ENSTİTÜ

Fen Bilimleri Enstitüsü	<input type="checkbox"/>
Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Uygulamalı Matematik Enstitüsü	<input type="checkbox"/>
Enformatik Enstitüsü	<input type="checkbox"/>
Deniz Bilimleri Enstitüsü	<input type="checkbox"/>

YAZARIN

Soyadı : Dayan

Adı : Cansu

Bölümü : Toplumsal Cinsiyet ve Kadın Çalışmaları Anabilim Dalı

TEZİN ADI (İngilizce) : Gender and Women's Studies: Situated Academic Marginalization

TEZİN TÜRÜ : Yüksek Lisans Doktora

1. Tezimin tamamından kaynak gösterilmek şartıyla fotokopi alınabilir.
2. Tezimin içindekiler sayfası, özet, indeks sayfalarından ve/veya bir bölümünden kaynak gösterilmek şartıyla fotokopi alınabilir.
3. Tezimden bir (1) yıl süreyle fotokopi alınamaz.

TEZİN KÜTÜPHANEYE TESLİM TARİHİ: