The Report on the Present Situation of
FOREIGN MIGRANT WORKERS
in Seasonal Agricultural Production in Turkey

POVERTY, RIVALRY
and
ANTAGONISM
The Report on the Present Situation of
FOREIGN MIGRANT WORKERS
in Seasonal Agricultural Production in Turkey

POVERTY, RIVALRY
and
ANTAGONISM
This study has been carried out with financial contributions from the Matra Programme of the Embassy of the Kingdom of the Netherlands in Turkey.

This document is public property. The report can be cited by providing the necessary reference. The report may be printed and distributed in part or full without prior permission. It may be photocopied and shared. It may be copied in a digital medium and shared.
# TABLE OF CONTENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Section</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Acknowledgements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Foreword</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Executive Summary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>INTRODUCTION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Foreign Migrant Workers in Seasonal Agricultural Production in Turkey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Research Methodology and Fieldwork</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Definitions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>CHAPTER 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Migration Waves, Migration Theories and Migrants in Seasonal Agricultural Production</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>1.1 Global Migration Trends and Dynamics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>1.2 Migration Theories and International Seasonal Agricultural Migration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>1.3 Migrant Labour in Seasonal Agricultural Production</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>CHAPTER 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Migratory Movements and Labour Migration Towards Turkey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>2.1 Turkey’s Changing Migration Regime and Policies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>2.2 Foreign Immigrants in Turkey and Labour Migration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>2.3 Migrant Workers in the Labour Market</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>CHAPTER 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rivalry of the Poorest? Seasonal Agricultural Labour and Migrant Workers in Turkey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>3.1 Social Change in Turkey and Migrant Seasonal Agricultural Work: Rural Encounters over Ethnic Identity</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER 4
Findings of the Present Situation of Foreign Migrant Workers in Seasonal Agricultural Production in Turkey Study

4.1 Foreign Migrant Labour Supply in Seasonal Agricultural Production: Source Countries and Migration Movements

4.2 Demand for Foreign Migrant Labour in Seasonal Agricultural Production: A Product-Based Analysis

4.3 Working Conditions of Foreign Migrant Workers in Seasonal Agriculture

4.4 The Social Organisation of Labour in Agricultural Production and Social Transformation

4.5 Perceptions of Migrant Workers: Georgians, Azerbaijanis and Syrians

CHAPTER 5
Conclusion

References

Appendix 1: Organisations and Persons Interviewed

Appendix 2: Field Study Questions
Table 1. Entries and exits of citizens of selected countries to Turkey (2000-2014)

Table 2. Numbers of irregular migrants apprehended by year

Table 3. Applications for International Protection by year (2000-2014)

Table 4. Entries and exits of Georgians from Turkey (2000-2014)

Table 5. Entries and exits of Azerbaijanis from Turkey (2000-2014)

Table 6. Tea production and production area in Turkey by year (1991-2014)

Table 7. Volume of apricot production and production areas for Turkey and the province of Malatya (1996-2014)

Table 8. Heads of cattle in Turkey and in the provinces of Kars, Ardahan, Iğdır and Ağrı, and the share of the region in the total (2010-2014)

Table 9. Heads of sheep and goats in Turkey and in the provinces of Kars, Ardahan, Iğdır and Ağrı, and the share of the region in the total (2010-2014)

Table 10. Amount of unginned cotton production and area cultivated in Turkey and in the province of Adana by year (2000-2014)

Table 11. Citrus production in Turkey and the provinces of Adana-Mersin by year (1996-2014)
145 / **Table 12.**
Greenhouse vegetable production in Turkey and the provinces of Adana-Mersin by year (1996-2014)

168 / **Table 13.**
Daily wage rate for seasonal agricultural workers in 2015

57 / **Graph 1.**
Numbers of irregular migrants apprehended by year (2000-2014)

58 / **Graph 2.**
Distribution of Syrians under Temporary Protection by top ten provinces of residence

87 / **Graph 3.**
Number of entries by land at the Artvin-Sarp Border Crossing (2014-2015)

93 / **Graph 4.**
Number of entries by land at the Iğdir-Dilucu Border Crossing (2014-2015)

102 / **Graph 5.**
Number of work permits issued to Syrians in Turkey

103 / **Graph 6.**
Sectors in which registered Syrian owned firms in Turkey concentrate

111 / **Graph 7.**
Tea production by year (1991-2014)

116 / **Graph 8.**
Hazelnut production by country (2014-tonnes)

117 / **Graph 9.**
Unshelled hazelnut production of major hazelnut provinces in Turkey (tonnes) and area of land cultivated (hectares) (2014)

32 / **Map 1.**
Products and provinces included in the study

39 / **Map 2.**
Global migration flows
Map 3.
Syrians under Temporary Protection living in Temporary Accommodation Centers in Turkey (2016, March)

Box 1.
Sarp Border Crossing

Box 2.
One Nation, Two States: “We are Brothers, Turkey is the Father of the Turks”

Box 3.
Tea Leaves and Social Transformation

Box 4.
Foreign Migrant Workers in the Tea Harvest

Box 5.
Hasan the Butcher Becomes a Seasonal Agricultural Worker

Box 6.
Ardahan: Fodder Cutting Azerbaijanis

Box 7.
Riza’s Syrian Shepherd is a Music Teacher

Box 8.
Agricultural Labour Intermediaries

Box 9.
The Georgian Agricultural Labour Intermediary

Box 10.
The Agricultural Labour Intermediary from Adana

Box 11.
Morning for Seasonal Agricultural Workers

Box 12.
Georgian Nüyra
## ABBREVIATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ÇAYSİAD</td>
<td>Association of Tea Manufacturer Businessmen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EU</td>
<td>European Union</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GNAT</td>
<td>Grand National Assembly of Turkey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ILO</td>
<td>International Labour Organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IOM</td>
<td>International Organisation for Migration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>İŞKUR</td>
<td>Employment Agency of Turkey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KEİG</td>
<td>Women’s Labour and Employment Platform</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>METİP</td>
<td>Project for the Improvement of Working and Social Lives of Migrant Seasonal Agricultural Workers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAWP</td>
<td>Seasonal Agricultural Workers Programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TURKSTAT</td>
<td>Turkish Statistical Institute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNHCR</td>
<td>United Nations High Commission for Refugees</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Many provinces were visited for this study and the opinions of many people have been used. More organisations and people than we could hope to list the names of have contributed directly or indirectly to the study. Among them are public institutions and their representatives, representatives of NGOs and professional organisations, academics, international organisations, owners of fields and orchards, livestock farmers, foreign migrant seasonal agricultural workers from Georgia, Azerbaijan and Syria, agricultural intermediaries and village foremen. Almost all of them shared their information and experiences with sincerity during the research period. Without their contributions, it would not have been possible to complete such a study.

This study has been financially supported by the Embassy of the Kingdom of the Netherlands in Turkey. With such support, we have tried to put one of the most invisible sections of society into somewhat plainer sight.

Like any other, this study too is the result of a collective effort. Many volunteers at the Development Workshop have contributed significantly to the preparation, presentation and dissemination of the report. We thank them all.

Peter Stalker emphasised the causes and effects of international labour migration, and reminded us that migration is a means for losers to seek other lands where they might win, when he wrote, “In a world of winners and losers, the losers do not simply disappear, they seek somewhere else to go.”¹ This report has been written in order to reveal the difficult working and living conditions of foreign migrant seasonal agricultural workers in Turkey, who are a living embodiment of the effort to which Stalker refers.

This study is dedicated to all migrants undertaking a journey of hope. We wish to express our belief in a world and a labour regime in which no one has to migrate, either for a better life or out of mortal danger, and in which those people who migrate to work meet with working and living conditions that are in keeping with human rights and dignity.

Development Workshop
May 2016, Ankara

This report has been prepared to analyse the Present Situation of Foreign Migrant Workers in Seasonal Agricultural Production in Turkey. Aside from the analysis of the present situation, the report seeks to answer questions regarding how the participation of foreign migrant workers in seasonal agricultural production affects agricultural production and work in Turkey.

Since the beginning of the 2000s, foreign migrant workers have been taking part in agricultural production in Turkey as a significant component of the workforce. In eastern provinces such as Kars, Ardahan and Iğdır, migrants generally work in fodder cutting and animal care, while in the Black Sea, Eastern Anatolia, Southern Anatolia, the Aegean and Central Anatolia, foreign migrant workers are employed as seasonal agricultural workers in the growing and harvest of hazelnuts, tea, cotton, apricots, legumes, sugar beet, citrus, peanuts, grapes, pistachios and vegetables. Azerbaijani migrants are employed intensively in livestock raising and Georgian migrants in tea and hazelnut harvesting. Meanwhile, since they have begun arriving in Turkey in 2011, Syrian migrants have come to replace the local workforce in the production of many agricultural goods.

In Turkey, as around the world, the use of foreign migrant workers in seasonal agricultural production is widespread. Due to the conditions created by the migration regime in Turkey and the active use of short-term work permits for agricultural employment, foreign migrant workers who engage in agricultural production are employed informally. Turkey’s liberal visa practices for the citizens of some countries act as short term agricultural work visas. However, as these are actually tourist visas, migrants are not given a work permit and they are not covered by social security. In addition to those foreign migrant workers who enter Turkey with a visa, many of the approximately 3 million Syrians who have fled the war in their country and are staying in Turkey under temporary protection status are also employed informally in the production of many agricultural goods. In summary, foreign migrant workers are engaged in agricultural production as vulnerable workers without security.
ALL MIGRANTS UNDERTAKING
A JOURNEY OF HOPE...
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This report has been prepared to analyse the Present Situation of Foreign Migrant Workers in Seasonal Agricultural Production in Turkey. The study has two overlapping objectives. The first is to identify the present situation of the foreign migrant labour engaged in agricultural production in Turkey. The second is to answer the question of how agricultural production and agricultural labour in Turkey have been affected by the participation of foreign migrant workers, including child workers, in seasonal agricultural production.

The field study was carried out in the 13 provinces of Ordu, Giresun, Trabzon, Rize, Artvin, Malatya, Kars, Ardahan, Adana, Mersin, Gaziantep, Şanlıurfa and Ankara between July and November 2015. A total of 110 interviews were conducted with various parties involved in the production of such goods as hazelnuts, tea, animal products, apricots, citrus fruits, cotton, vegetables and pistachios. Interviewees included representatives of state organisations and non-governmental organisations, field and orchard owners, agricultural intermediaries and local and migrant agricultural workers.

In parallel with the field study, the present situation of migrant workers in agricultural production was examined making use of reports in Turkey's media from 2010 to 2015, research previously conducted by various institutions, organisations and academics, and the studies carried out by the Development Workshop Cooperative in the past.

In Turkey, as elsewhere in the world, the employment of foreign migrant labour in seasonal agricultural production is widespread. The conditions created by Turkey’s present migration regime, and by the fact that short-term work permits are not actively used in agricultural production, mean that most foreign migrant workers who are employed in agricultural production are working informally. The visas issued to citizens of some countries for which a liberal visa regime applies serve as short-term agricultural work permits. However, as these are tourist visas, they do not allow migrants to obtain a work permit or provide them with any security. Other than migrants who enter Turkey with a visa, more than two million Syrians who have fled the war in their own country and have been afforded temporary protection in Turkey have joined the ranks of those working informally in agricultural production. As a result, foreign migrant workers are engaged in agricultural production as vulnerable and insecure workers.
FOREIGN MIGRANT WORKERS: GEORGIANS, AZERBAIJANIS AND SYRIANS

The field study identified three main migrant groups who supply seasonal labour for agricultural production in Turkey. The first among these are Georgian workers. In 2014, 1,755,289 people entered Turkey from Georgia and most entries were processed at the Sarp border crossing. In 2014, entries via the Sarp border crossing were at their highest during May and August. It has been observed that the rising number of entries in May and August coincides with the tea and hazelnut harvests, and that some of the Georgians who enter Turkey on a visa work in seasonal agricultural production.

The second group consists of Azerbaijani workers. In 2014, 657,684 Azerbaijani citizens entered Turkey. Of these, the number entering from the Nakhchivan Autonomous Republic via the Dilucu border crossing was 206,000. Entries by land were highest in the summer. Although not all those entering Turkey through the Dilucu border crossing may be connected to agricultural production, the peak in August coincides with the grass harvesting season for coarse animal feed, especially in the Kars and Ardahan region.

Syrian immigrants form the third main group supplying foreign migrant labour for seasonal agricultural production. The number of Syrian migrants fleeing from the war in their own country and taking refuge in Turkey has risen constantly since 2011. According to data from the Ministry of the Interior’s Directorate General for Migration Management, dated March 4th 2016, the number of Syrians under temporary protection in Turkey was 2,733,284. Only 272,670 are housed in temporary accommodation centres¹. Syrians are generally engaged in seasonal agricultural work in almost all parts of Turkey. Those employed in sectors other than agriculture work in manufacturing, construction and services. This group of migrants, whose numbers and activities in the labour market indicate that they will settle permanently, forms an important pool of labour for seasonal agricultural production. Under the Regulation on Work Permits for Foreigners Who Have Been Extended Temporary Protection (no. 2016/8375) which was published in the Official Gazette and came into force on January 15th 2016, those foreigners who have been given temporary protection and who wish to work in seasonal jobs in agriculture and animal husbandry may be exempted from the need to obtain a work permit. Applications for exemption are to be handled by provincial governorates in accordance with the quotas which they are to set. The Regulation also stipulates that the Ministry of Labour and Social Security can establish limits on employment of Syrians by province and by quota, and that they can be employed by applying to the regional directorates of the labour agency İŞKUR. These developments are expected to lead to a further increase in the number of Syrian migrants working in seasonal agricultural production in the years to come.

In order to examine the nature and dimensions of demand for agricultural labour in Turkey, the research focused on activities like animal husbandry and shepherding, tea and hazelnut growing and the production of citrus fruits, vegetables, pistachio nuts, greenhouse products and cotton in various provinces. The employment of foreign migrant workers during the harvest and processing periods indicates that the socioeconomic transformation in agriculture in recent years has led to a rise in the need for paid agricultural labour.

**Tea**

The social change experienced in the eastern Black Sea region has transformed the tea production processes and the form of labour used in tea production. The tea harvest in the region is almost exclusively carried out by Georgian labourers. The gradually falling share of tea production in household income, migration, and the sub-division of landholdings due to inheritance have made paid labour the most widespread form of labour in use. As a consequence of intensive migration out of the region to urban areas and other countries, the local population has aged and therefore requires paid labour to continue tea production. With the local population withdrawing from the harvesting process, demand for migrant labour has increased. Georgians are undoubtedly the dominant source of seasonal migrant labour for the tea harvest. Tea is produced in their country too and they have the necessary experience for the harvest. At harvest time, an influx of Georgian workers to the region takes place. The fact that the tea is clipped almost exclusively by Georgians, and that they are not in competition with any other workers, has resulted in relatively high daily wages compared to the other products examined for this study.
Hazelnuts

The hazelnut is the primary crop in the provinces of Ordu, Giresun, Samsun, Sakarya, Düzce, Zonguldak and Trabzon and their environs. It is also an important product in terms of international trade. The socioeconomic transformation experienced in the eastern Black Sea region has had a strong impact on the forms of production and labour. Migration to major cities and abroad, urbanisation, rising educational levels, alternative opportunities for employment and the division of landholdings due to inheritance have caused the demise of the traditional form of production based on household labour and the labour of poor forest villagers living nearby, and a large part of the production process is now carried out by seasonal migrant labour. This leads to high numbers of seasonal agricultural labourers arriving in the region at harvest time. Accordingly, large numbers of labourers from south eastern Anatolia and southern provinces arrive in the region, particularly during the harvest. Georgian workers have also been observed to be widely employed in the hazelnut harvest.

Apricots

Malatya is world-famous for apricot production and the fruit is the symbol of the province. Apricot production is the main economic activity for many households. The apricot harvest also provides income for tens of thousands of seasonal agricultural migrant labourers. Migratory seasonal agricultural workers from south east Anatolia constitute the main source of labour for the apricot harvest in Malatya. However, the number of Syrian migrants has been increasing in those provinces from which the seasonal agricultural migrant labour is sourced, as well as in Malatya itself. This points to a radical change in the outlook for seasonal labour. In addition to a migrant camp, the province of Malatya hosts Syrian immigrants who arrived and settled there with help from their relatives during the fighting in Kobane.

Animal Husbandry and Shepherds

Animal husbandry and supporting activities such as grass gathering for fodder are the primary agricultural activities in the Kars and Ardahan region. The use of paid labour in the agricultural sector has been made necessary by the ageing population, migration to urban areas and the declining interest shown by the better-educated younger generation in agricultural activities. The demand for labour in animal raising and sheep and goat farming in the provinces of Kars and Ardahan is mostly met by
Azerbaijani workers arriving from neighbouring Nakhchivan. The main trigger for this migration of Azerbaijanis is the fact that some Azerbaijanis are already settled in the region and have relations of kinship with the Azerbaijanis in Nakhchivan. Azerbaijanis speak Turkish, which plays an important role in directing Azerbaijani migration towards Turkey and ensuring that the migrants are accepted by the locals. The findings of the study indicate that much of the agricultural work in Ardahan is carried out by Azerbaijanis. The Azerbaijanis are said to arrive in April and stay until the first snowfall. Azerbaijani migrants who enter Turkey via the Diluçu border crossing in the province of Iğdır can be found working in various jobs in Kars and Ardahan.

Shepherding activity - the management of flocks to ensure their control, security and grazing – has been observed to involve increasing numbers of Syrian migrants in recent years. In the highlands of Malatya in particular, Syrians have come to be employed widely as shepherds, whereas traditionally shepherds from Şanlıurfa and Diyarbakır were employed. Syrian shepherds are paid less than local shepherds because they are not fully competent in herd management and cannot milk the animals. Meanwhile, citizens of Central Asian countries, Syrians, Afghans and Georgians are all employed in caring for livestock in the Çubuk district of Ankara, which is specialised in cattle farming.

Citrus Fruits, Vegetables and Cotton

In the Çukurova region around Adana, the production of cotton, citrus fruits and vegetables are the main economic activities. Agricultural work used to be done by the poorer local population, who in time gave way to migrant labour from south eastern Turkey, especially Şanlıurfa and Adıyaman. In recent years the employment of Syrian migrants for agricultural work has become widespread. The large numbers of Syrian migrants in Mersin and Adana work mostly in vegetables, greenhouse production and the harvest of citrus fruits. The settling of Syrian migrants in the region has had a positive effect on agricultural production, as lower labour costs have led to increased output. In the provinces of Gaziantep and Şanlıurfa, Syrian workers are employed to harvest vegetables, pistachios and cotton. In the cotton harvest, the cotton that is left behind by mechanised harvesters is collected by all members of a household, including the children, for sale on their own account.
WORKING CONDITIONS AND PRACTICES OF FOREIGN MIGRANT WORKERS

The Present Situation Report on Foreign Migrant Workers in Seasonal Agricultural Production in Turkey contains findings regarding the working conditions of foreign migrant workers. The report indicates that similar working conditions are encountered by almost all migrant groups and other agricultural workers, and that the social exclusion faced by workers in seasonal agricultural production is created by structural conditions.

Agricultural Intermediaries

Foreign migrant workers employ a diverse range of strategies, as well as different institutional practices such as agricultural intermediaries, to access seasonal agricultural work. The migration of almost every group of foreign workers to Turkey begins through kinship. While this is a particularly significant factor for Azerbaijani and Georgian workers, some Syrian migrants have also been observed to begin to take part in seasonal agricultural labour migration through relatives in Turkey.

Agricultural intermediaries play a crucial role in enabling almost every group of foreign migrant workers to access seasonal agricultural work. While some migrant groups have produced their own agricultural intermediaries, others have developed ties with the local agricultural intermediaries through the intercession of individuals from within their own ranks. In seasonal agricultural production, agricultural intermediaries are commonly depicted as people who exploit the workers’ labour and who, within a system of patronage, leave workers desperate and dependent on themselves. The high level of commissions they receive and the cuts they make from workers’ wages for food supplies and transportation tend to back up this characterisation. However, the presence of the agricultural intermediary in seasonal agriculture also serves a function of creating security and trust for both the workers and the employers.

Working Periods and Hours

In seasonal agricultural production, the period of production is generally limited to the harvest time of the crop. The duration of the harvest varies for each crop. For example, while tea is harvested in three rounds over three months, the hazelnut harvest lasts 45 days at most. The apricot harvest is completed within 25-30 days. In the Çukurova region, however, agricultural work in one crop or another may be available all year round. The daily working hours of workers in seasonal agricultural production are usually between 10 and 12
hours, although there are variations in the times of day when the labour takes place. Long working days apply for all agricultural workers and the working day often starts at dawn and ends at dusk. The harvest of some products, such as citrus fruits, begins before sunrise and ends in the afternoon.

Housing Conditions

Migrants usually take shelter in locations provided by the owner of the field or orchard or in plastic or cloth tents which they set up around the field or the orchard. For workers to be accommodated near the field is the most advantageous option for both the workers and the field owners, since it allows for savings on time and cost of travel. There is a relationship between the housing options available to migrants and the duration of their employment. Those workers who work for different employers on a daily wage tend to make their own housing arrangements. Those engaged in construction in rural areas and Azerbaijanis engaged in fodder gathering have been observed to stay mostly in jointly rented accommodation. For workers who will work for one employer or village for a longer period, employers tend to provide accommodation, which they prefer to keep close to the fields or orchards.

Wages

Wages paid to migrant workers vary by product. The most important factor that determines the wage level is whether there is competition among the seasonal agricultural workers. Competition tends to arise over ethnic background, and if the labour market for a particular kind of produce is closed to other groups of workers, wages in that area tend to be high. While daily wages for the tea harvest and fodder gathering in 2015 approached TRY100 (USD35) in 2015, they were only TRY40-45 (USD15) in the apricot and hazelnut harvest. Georgian workers exclusively supply labour for the tea harvest, and Azerbaijani migrants are the single most important provider of labour for fodder gathering. In the hazelnut harvest, however, domestic workers from south eastern Anatolia are employed as well as Georgian workers, in separate orchards, and for the apricot harvest Syrian workers tend to work side by side with local labourers. In Gaziantep and the Çukurova region, where the agricultural labour wage is at its lowest, Syrian workers are more widespread. These differences in wages can be seen as a strong indicator of the degree of social acceptance and hierarchical perceptions of foreign migrant workers from the different ethnic groups working in seasonal agricultural production in Turkey.
The predominant place of women both in migration and in agricultural production is also apparent among the foreign migrant workers engaged in seasonal agricultural production that are examined in this study. In every case examined, with the exception of the Azerbaijani workers in the provinces of Ardahan and Kars, women have a prominent presence in agricultural production. Syrian migrant women form the main body of workers in the harvesting and stoning of apricots, Georgian women in the tea and hazelnut harvests. In addition, Syrian women contribute to their families’ struggle for a living by picking cotton, citrus fruits and vegetables in Adana and Mersin, pistachios in Gaziantep, and red peppers and cotton in Şanliurfa. This is all part of their efforts to look after their families and children in difficult circumstances and to ensure a better future for them.

Migrant female labour is one of the most important components of agricultural production. Traditionally, it is widely accepted that tea is a female occupation, and the image of the hardworking Black Sea woman is widely recognised. Picking, stoning and packing apricots are also women’s jobs, carried out not just by migrant women but also traditionally by female labour within the household. The traditional gender division of labour in agricultural production has survived largely intact, with jobs being shared out between migrant women and men based on existing patterns.
Child Workers

This study has shown that child labour is most prevalent among Syrian migrants. Child labour is widespread because the basic condition for Syrian families to survive under very difficult circumstances is for as many family members to work as possible, so as to increase total household income. Child labour is widely used in the production of apricots, citrus fruits, vegetables, pistachios and cotton. In particular, it is the children of Syrian families, and of the poorest local families, who collect the cotton that is left over in the fields after the mechanised harvester has been through, for sale on their own account.

Among Syrian migrants who work as a family in seasonal agriculture, children just over the age of 10 can be seen working. In Adana, children were among the groups of young workers observed transporting heavy baskets of citrus fruits to collection points and from there to the trucks. The Syrian migrants generally consider agriculture to be work for young people, too heavy and rapid for an older person.

School enrolment rates are low among the children of Syrian migrants, who have difficulty in accessing educational services. As a result, the only option for these children is to work in fields and orchards, in rural areas, or on the streets in towns and cities. Even if there were a rise in schooling capacity, these children would be too busy earning an income to attend school.
THE SOCIAL ORGANISATION OF SEASONAL AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTION IN TURKEY AND SOCIAL TRANSFORMATION

Migrant Social Networks and Seasonal Agricultural Production

Relationships and social networks play the most important role in facilitating foreign migrants’ participation in seasonal agricultural production. These networks are established differently for different migrant groups. The presence of these networks makes it possible for migrants to work in the production of certain goods. At the heart of such networks are relations of kinship between migrants and the locals. Relations of kinship are significant for all three of the groups of migrants studied as part of this report. It is by way of such relationships that migrants are able to access their initial area of migration and the jobs they can do in the region. The main reasons why Georgians arrive in the eastern Black Sea region in large numbers are the concentration of Georgian inhabitants in the region and its close proximity to Georgia. The arrival of Azerbaijanis in Kars is also linked to a relationship of kinship and acquaintance with the local population. Syrian migrants tend to begin seasonal migratory agricultural work through relatives in and around Şanlıurfa. Adana, Gaziantep and Mersin.

The Rivalry of the Poor and Changing Face of Poverty in Turkey

In Turkey migrant seasonal agricultural labour has always been carried out by the poorest segment of society. While paid agricultural production has traditionally been carried out by landless peasants and the urban poor, this is a dynamic area which is affected by urbanisation and social transformation. As those situated at the lowest end of the income scale move upwards in time, the poverty shift which they cease to occupy is filled up by other social groups. Migrant seasonal agricultural labour may be regarded as a poverty stop. This stop has been occupied by different social groups at different points in time. Most recently it was occupied by those migrating from rural areas in south eastern and eastern parts of the country due to the armed conflict and settling in the towns without any land or property. The main source provinces of this population are Şanlıurfa, Adıyaman, Van, Siirt, Batman, Mardin, Diyarbakır and Şırnak. Now their position is slowly being taken up by Syrian migrants. The greatest impact of these new actors on the seasonal agricultural labour market in Turkey has been the competition they have entered into with the local workforce.

The employment of migrant workers in seasonal agricultural production has had some basic consequences for the analysis of poverty and the la-
The biggest impact which Syrian migrants have had on the seasonal agricultural labour market in Turkey is the competition they have entered into with the local workforce.
bour market in Turkey. One of these is the changing appearance of poverty in Turkey. Instead of the poorest groups handing over the poverty shift to other groups in time, what is being witnessed now is that the poorest of different social groups are engaged in a rivalry of the poor for access to the same jobs. This competition has been entered into by people of different nationalities as well as ethnic backgrounds, which has made it all the fiercer.

Ethnic Encounters and Antagonism in Rural Areas: Social Transformation

Antagonistic relationships thought to be unique to urban areas in Turkey are observed to have been transplanted into rural areas with previously more homogenous social structures as a result of migrant seasonal agricultural labour. The rural areas where the competition of the poor takes place, and the domain of seasonal agriculture in particular, have become points of encounter among different ethnic, religious and cultural groups, which were previously only thought to encounter one another in urban areas. A locus of encounter among local workers, migrant workers and the local population, seasonal agricultural labour remains a dynamic area of society, and is being transformed further, as an arena where different ethnic groups meet. The ethnic confrontation which previously occurred between migrant workers from south eastern Anatolia and land-owning local people is now being re-lived among many different ethnic and cultural groups in rural Turkey. This situation, which may be termed rural antagonism, brings with it the risk of conflict among various groups. Rural areas where only two different ethnic and cultural groups used to confront one another have now become zones in which many ethnic groups meet and compete over the same jobs.
FOREIGN MIGRANT WORKERS IN SEASONAL AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTION IN TURKEY

INTRODUCTION
Over the last few years, Turkey has been facing the greatest flow of migration in its history. From 2011 onwards, Turkey has come to host nearly 3 million Syrian citizens. Even before this development, from the early 1990s onwards, Turkey’s position in the international migration system had been established as a receiving, host country. The most obvious indicator of this change in status is the inclusion of foreign migrant workers from neighbouring countries in the Turkish labour market. The large informal sector of the country offers many job opportunities to these immigrants who mainly arrive without a work permit and cross the border with a tourist visa. With the intensive migration that has occurred and still continues after the Syrian crisis, the presence of foreign migrant workers in the labour market has been consolidated and has become one of the most striking aspects of societal change in recent years.

According to studies of the position of migrants in Turkey’s labour market, migrant labour is mainly observed in the services sector (tourism, recreation, retail sale and domestic work), in ready-to-wear manufacturing and in the construction sector. However, these studies either completely omit foreign migrant workers and their work practices in the agricultural sector or their approach to the subject is limited to some observational data. This prevents a deeper analysis and assessment of the issue. Yet, as well as being the sector with the greatest rate of informal employment, in Turkey, agriculture is one of the sectors with the greatest propensity to employ the foreign labour, reflecting its dynamic structure. In addition, processing of agricultural goods employs migrant labour and some workers migrate daily or seasonally from nearby districts as well as far off provinces to join the local workforce in production. These factors point to the potential of the agricultural sector for employing foreign migrant workers. In this context, this study intends to identify the present condition of the foreign migrant labour in seasonal agricultural production in Turkey and to examine the living and working conditions of the foreign migrant workers who are employed in seasonal agricultural production.

Migrant agricultural work in Turkey has been an income earning activity which the poorest have engaged in as part of their struggle to survive. While the geographical origins, identities and cultural backgrounds of mi-
grant agricultural workers have changed in the process of social transformation, the fact remains that migrant agricultural labour is the occupation of the poorest. Since the 1990s, seasonal agricultural work has been the basic occupation of landless villagers who have settled in cities after being forced to abandon their villages in the east of the country (Hayata Destek, 2014). This report intends to add to this limited literature on migrant seasonal labour by investigating how agricultural work has been affected by the increasing number of foreign migrants in recent years and what kind of changes in agricultural production have created demand for foreign migrant labour.

The Report on Present Situation of Foreign Migrant Workers in Seasonal Agricultural Production in Turkey has two overlapping aims. The first is to identify the present situation of the foreign migrant labour employed in agricultural production in Turkey. The produce for the production of which foreign migrant workers are employed, their countries of origin and their legal status in Turkey are the fields which will be taken up in the analysis of their present situation. An effort has been made to identify the present situation of foreign migrant workers employed in livestock raising, tea, hazelnuts, apricots, cotton, pistachios, citrus fruits and vegetables in Turkey through a field study involving 110 interviews in 13 different provinces of Turkey, carried out between July and November 2015. In addition, the present situation of foreign migrant workers in agricultural production has been analysed through a review of media coverage in the period 2010-2015, of study reports prepared by various institutions, organisations and academics, and of data from the field studies carried out by the Development Workshop Cooperative in the past.

The second aim of the report is to answer the question how the participation of foreign migrant workers in agricultural production in Turkey affects agricultural production and agricultural employment in Turkey. Viewing migrants as a dynamic factor of societal change, an attempt has been made to analyse the social transformation in Turkey by focusing on the adjustment problems and social exclusion faced by those engaging in agricultural production, on rural ethnic encounters and on relations between different worker groups.

The basic findings of the Report on Present Situation of Foreign Migrant Workers in Seasonal Agricultural Production in Turkey, in keeping with its aims may be summarised as follows: From the 2000s onwards, foreign migrant workers have supplied a significant amount of labour to seasonal agricultural production in Turkey. In eastern provinces such as Kars, Arda-
han and Iğdır, migrants generally work in fodder cutting and animal care, while in the Black Sea, Eastern Anatolia, Southern Anatolia, the Aegean and central Anatolia, foreign migrant workers are employed as seasonal agricultural workers in the growing and harvest of hazelnuts, tea, cotton, apricots, legumes, sugar beet, citrus fruit, peanuts, grapes, pistachios and vegetables. Azerbaijani migrants are employed intensively in livestock raising and Georgian migrants in tea and hazelnut harvesting. Meanwhile, since they have begun arriving in Turkey in 2011, Syrian migrants have come to replace the local workforce in the production of many agricultural goods.

Almost all foreign migrant workers who are employed as seasonal agricultural workers in Turkey are irregular migrants and work informally without work permits. Azerbaijani and Georgian citizens enter Turkey through visas they obtain at border crossings. The said visas are for tourists and do not provide work permits. However, in practice, these visas act as a kind of seasonal agricultural work visa. Meanwhile, although they may be registered under temporary protection status in Turkey, the Syrian citizens do not have legal work permits. Although many foreign migrant workers who work in seasonal agricultural work in Turkey have entered the country legally, they do not have legal work permits. Nevertheless, it is common knowledge that many Syrians are employed informally in various sectors in Turkey and that a significant number of entries from Azerbaijan and Georgia are intended for purposes of joining the labour market in Turkey.

What makes seasonal agricultural work the occupation of the poorest in Turkey is bad pay and working conditions. This fact alone creates a significant circle of poverty and social exclusion for those engaged in this work, regardless of their

---

2 Irregular migrant worker: Most foreign migrant workers in Turkey work without necessary permits as irregular migrant workers in the labour market. Irregular migrant workers arrive in the labour market in Turkey from two sources. The first group consists of those who enter Turkey on a tourist visa without a work permit. The second group is made up of those who are temporarily protected migrants, like Syrian migrants and those under international protection status. The subject, aim and scope of this study is to examine the involvement of those people who are not citizens of the Republic of Turkey, who have arrived in Turkey through any form of migration and who stay in Turkey for a period of time in migrant seasonal agriculture, the discrimination and rights violations they face in Turkey and their living and working conditions. Therefore the terms “irregular foreign migrant worker/irregular migrant worker/migrant worker” will be used for Syrians with temporary protection status, persons entering Turkey with a tourist visa and those who arrive through any other form of migration.
ethnic, religious or cultural backgrounds. The presence of foreign migrant workers in seasonal agricultural production has further created a “rivalry of the poorest” for access to and retention of jobs among the poorest groups in society. This is observed especially clearly in apricot, citrus, hazelnut, pistachio, cotton and vegetables production, in which different groups of workers are employed. The inclusion of Syrians in agricultural production has pushed some local workers out of production and has put downward pressure on wages.

The phenomenon which we have called “the rivalry of the poorest” also offers significant clues to the dimensions of poverty in Turkey today. The period of social mobility in which one social group passes poverty over to more “marginal” groups with lower incomes has come to an end. In this context, at least for the different poor groups which include seasonal agricultural workers, competition is necessary to access the same jobs.

Seasonal agricultural work has facilitated encounters and conflicts among different ethnic and cultural groups in rural Turkey. This phenomenon, which is experienced during certain months the year when field/orchard owners who are mostly of Turkish origin come together with migrant seasonal agricultural labourers from South Eastern provinces such as Şanlıurfa, Mardin and Adıyaman, is actually the rural form of the encounters and conflicts in towns which are called “urban antagonism”. It is distinguished from its urban form in that rural areas, which were previously thought to have had a more homogenous social structure. With the inclusion of foreign migrant workers in seasonal agricultural production, the said encounters have come to include greater numbers of different ethnic, religious and cultural groups. This has led to a structure which, from time to time, can lead to tensions and conflicts. As a result, it has been observed that the homogenous rural social structures are transforming into heterogeneous social structures with more ethnic, religious and cultural layers. In this sense, migrant agricultural work in Turkey carries the potential for present and future encounters and conflicts among agricultural workers, as well as for tensions between the local population and migrant workers of different ethnic backgrounds, in locations of agricultural production.

In this sense, migrant agricultural work in Turkey carries the potential for present and future encounters and conflicts among agricultural workers, as well as for tensions between the local population and migrant workers of different ethnic backgrounds, in locations of agricultural production.
RESEARCH METHODOLOGY AND FIELDWORK

Qualitative data collection methods have been employed for the study that is the source of the Report on Present Situation of Foreign Migrant Workers in Seasonal Agricultural Production in Turkey. Qualitative data collection methods are preferred over quantitative techniques in fields which have been relatively less researched and where the object of the study is less visible, in terms of the results they yield. The paucity of quantitative data regarding migrant seasonal agricultural work in Turkey and of studies regarding the migrant labour, and the difficulty of reaching the target population under current conditions, have resulted in the choice of qualitative methodology for examining the social conditions surrounding these two phenomena.

In this context, the choice of provinces to be included in the study was made over a sample based on agricultural produce. The identification of sample provinces and agricultural produce was carried out using the review of media coverage carried out before the study as well as a map of seasonal agricultural produce for which foreign migrant workers are employed based on the Development Workshop Cooperative’s experience of seasonal agricultural production in Turkey.

The Development Workshop Cooperative has encountered foreign migrant workers in the projects it has run on migrant seasonal agricultural labour in arable farming and livestock rearing ever since 2002. Academic studies, research by NGOs and professional organisations and media coverage all also indicate that the employment of foreign migrant workers is widespread in this sector.

Map 1. Products and provinces included in the study
The foreign migrant workers most often encountered include Georgians, Azerbaijanis and Syrians in the hazelnut harvest, Georgians in the tea harvest, Syrians in the apricot harvest, Azerbaijanis, Iranians and central Asians in hay collection and animal care and Afghans and Syrians in shepherding. The present situation map showing provinces and produce was prepared at the onset of the present study to determine which groups of foreign migrant workers undertake what kind of work in which provinces. The map was prepared using reports, articles, unpublished study findings, a review of media coverage of foreign migrant workers in agricultural production since 2010 and face-to-face meetings with agricultural intermediaries. At least one case was identified and traced on the map for each province where the employment of foreign migrant workers was detected.

From the basic findings displayed on the map, the 13 provinces for the field study were identified and a study of foreign migrant workers in agriculture was conducted in these provinces. The provinces and agricultural produce included in the scope of the field study are as follows: Kars, Ardahan and Ankara (fodder cutting and livestock raising), Malatya (apricots and shepherding), Ordu and Giresun (hazelnut harvesting), Artvin, Rize and Trabzon (tea harvesting), Adana and Mersin (citrus, vegetables and cotton production), and Şanlıurfa and Gaziantep (cotton, vegetables and pistachios production). The most significant factors in the choice of these provinces were that migrant seasonal agricultural labour is used commonly in agricultural production and that the produce in question occupies an important place in the agricultural output of Turkey. Products such as hazelnuts, apricots, citrus, vegetables and cotton are not only intended for domestic production, but are important export goods.

The institutions and individuals who were interviewed during the field study were asked open-ended questions on the situation and dimensions of the use of foreign migrant labour in agricultural production in Turkey that were intended to reveal the working and living conditions of these workers. With the subject not having been researched before, the number of interviewees was intended to form a wide base that would represent, as far as possible, the relevant parties to the matter. To this end, public institutions, international organisations, NGOs, field/orchard owners, agricultural intermediaries and domestic and foreign migrant agricultural workers were interviewed and the fields or orchards where the workers are employed were visited. 110 interviews were carried out as part of the study. Appendix 1 contains the list of interviews carried out during the field study, while Appendix 2 contains the interview questions.
DEFINITIONS

- **Migration:** The movement of a person or a group of persons, either across an international border, or within a State. It is a population movement, encompassing any kind of movement of people, whatever its length, composition and causes; it includes migration of refugees, displaced persons, economic migrants, and persons moving for other purposes, including family reunification. (IOM 2009: 22).

- **Migrant Worker:** The term “migrant worker” refers to a person who is to be engaged, is engaged or has been engaged in a remunerated activity in a State of which he or she is not a national. (International Convention on the Protection of the Rights of All Migrant Workers and Members of Their Families, Article 2(1), 1990).

- **International labour migration:** The movement of persons for work, permanently or temporarily to a certain country, from their country of origin or from a third country where they had been resident.

- **Asylum seeker:** A person who seeks safety from persecution or serious harm in a country other than his or her own and awaits a decision on the application for refugee status under relevant international and national instruments. In case of a negative decision, the person must leave the country and may be expelled, as may any non-national in an irregular or unlawful situation, unless permission to stay is provided on humanitarian or other related grounds. (IOM 2009: 49).

- **Refugee (mandate):** A person who meets the criteria of the UNHCR Statute and qualifies for the protection of the United Nations provided by the High Commissioner, regardless of whether or not he or she is in a country that is a party to the Convention Relating to the Status of Refugees, 1951 or the 1967 Protocol Relating to the Status of Refugees, or whether or not he or she has been recognized by the host country as a refugee under either of these instruments. (IOM 2009: 42).

- **Protection:** Protection given to a person or a group by an organization, in keeping with a mandate conferred either by international instruments, in application of customary international law, or by the activities of the organization. Such protection has as its aim to ensure respect for rights identified in such instruments as: 1951 Refugee Convention, 1949 Geneva Conventions, and 1977 Protocols, right of initiative of the International Committee of the Red Cross, de facto protection by the International Organization for Migration, International Labour Organization Conventions, human rights instruments. (IOM: 2009: 58).

- **Temporary protection status:** An exceptional procedure intended to afford urgent and temporary protection to persons arriving en masse from situations of conflict or generalized violence without the possibility of return to their countries of origin, under circumstances where there is a risk of not managing the asylum system without compromise. (IOM 2009: 19).

- **Irregular migrant:** A person who, owing to unauthorized entry, breach of a condition of entry, or the expiry of his or her visa, lacks legal status in a transit or host country. The definition covers inter alia those persons who have entered a transit or host country lawfully but have stayed
for a longer period than authorized or subsequently taken up unauthorized employment (also called clandestine/undocumented migrant or migrant in an irregular situation). (IOM 2009:15). In the context of this report, the term “irregular migrant” has been used for foreign migrant workers employed in seasonal agricultural production without work permits, whatever their legal status in Turkey may be.

- **Antagonism:** This report uses the term antagonism to denote cases of encounter, conflict and recognition among groups with different ethnic, cultural and religious identities who have not cohabited before. Although the term “antagonism” is often used to refer to conflict in which one group tries to destroy or otherwise remove another, here it is also thought of as a process in which different groups get to know one another and try to find a common way for cohabitation.

- **Seasonal agricultural production:** Activities carried out by month or season from planting to the harvest in arable agriculture. For livestock, it also denotes animal care and fodder cutting.

- **Migrant seasonal agricultural worker:** A person who leaves their place of permanent residence to take part in arable agriculture, livestock raising, beekeeping, forestry or fishery activities at least for a day for purposes of earning income but who does not permanently work in that job (Development Workshop, 2014).

- **Local seasonal agricultural work:** This term does not appear in any official definitions. In the context of this report, it has been used to denote the activities of those individuals who do not leave their place of permanent residence, and who take part in arable agriculture, livestock raising, beekeeping, forestry or fishery activities at least for a day for purposes of earning income but who do not permanently work in that job (Development Workshop, 2014).

- **Agricultural labour intermediary:** Denotes real persons engaged in finding jobs or workers for agricultural activities with a permit from the Labour Agency of Turkey (İŞKUR) or without a permit. (Development Workshop, 2014).
CHAPTER 1

MIGRATION WAVES, MIGRATION THEORIES AND MIGRANTS IN SEASONAL AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTION
Historically, the fundamental motivation for migration has been the search for opportunities for a better life. There are many causes of the migration phenomenon. The underlying aim of getting material opportunities for a better life sometimes includes ensuring healthy and secure living conditions for the families which the migrants leave behind. Others are forced to migrate against their will due to war, famine, human trafficking and natural disasters. Even under such circumstances, migration is seen as the key to a wealthier, happier and more productive life.

“International labour migration” is the term used to describe the movement of populations from one country to another with the aim of working. According to data from the International Organisation for Migration (IOM), 105 million people are currently working in a country other than that they were born in (IOM 2016). Although labour migration is not a new event, it is considered to have intensified and accelerated with globalisation. IOM data also show that in 2011, migrant workers generated USD440 billion for the global economy and remitted USD350 billion to developing countries (IOM 2016). Behind the scenes of such benefits lie the risks migrant workers undertake during migration and the insecurity they suffer at work.

The engagement of migrants in agriculture in their target countries is problematic throughout the world. In the migrant-receiving countries, agricultural production is seen as a low-paid and low-qualified field of work in which the domestic population does not want to be employed, and is therefore a sector which heavily employs migrants. In this chapter of the report, before examining the forms and conditions of the use of foreign migrant workers in seasonal agricultural production in Turkey, an outline will be sketched of global migration waves, migration theories and forms of foreign migrant labour used in agricultural production around the world. The examination of these general dynamics is important for understanding the phenomenon of migration in general and to form a roadmap for the present report.
1.1 GLOBAL MIGRATION TRENDS AND DYNAMICS

While different classifications and categories have been proposed at the global level to account for the direction of migration currents and the individuals involved, the IOM’s World Migration Report 2013 examines migration patterns in terms of four routes.

**Map 2. Küresel Göç Akımları**

These are:

**The North-North Route:** Involves migration from developed countries to developed countries, including migration currents from Germany to the USA and from the UK to Australia, Canada and the USA.

**The South-North Route:** Involves migration from developing countries to the developed North, such as from Mexico to the USA, Turkey to Germany and China, India and Pakistan to the USA.

**The South-South Route:** Involves migration corridors within the global South such as from Ukraine to the Russian Federation, from the Russian Federation to Ukraine, Bangladesh and Kazakhstan or from Afghanistan to Pakistan.
The first three chapters of the report draw upon the findings of a unique source of data – the Gallup World Poll, looking at outcomes on six core dimensions of well-being and subjective well-being.

The report sheds new light on how migrants rate their lives, whether they live in a high-income country in the North, or a low or middle income country in the South. Traditionally the focus has been on those migrating from lower income countries to more affluent ones; this report considers movements in all four migration pathways and their implications for development i.e. income countries to more affluent ones. The report highlights the well-being of migrants worldwide for the first time. Third, the report sheds light on the migrant, and on how migration affects a person’s quality of life and the money that migrants send back home. This report takes a different approach, exploring how migration affects a person’s well-being. Many contributions to the global debate on development, with reference to the inclusion of migration in the post-2015 initiatives to monitor migrant well-being and the impact of migration on their human development across a broad range of dimensions. Second, the report draws upon the findings of a unique source of data – the Gallup World Poll, looking at outcomes on six core dimensions of well-being and subjective well-being.

The final part draws conclusions and makes recommendations for future well-being across the four migration pathways.

In 2013, a second High-level Dialogue on International Migration and Development will be held, presenting the international community with a critical opportunity to focus its attention on how to make migration an integral component of the global development framework.

In 2013, the United Nations General Assembly will consider an international agenda for global development as we approach the target year of the Millennium Development Goals in 2015. A high-level meeting on international migration and development is scheduled for September 2014, a significant moment in the process to identify the next steps for migration and development. In 2013, the international community will also meet for the third time to discuss the United Nations Global Compact for Migration.

Perceptions of migrants and migration are often very negative. A range of factors, including the media, are contributing to this image. In particular, the public perception of asylum seekers and refugees is a critical challenge. With each new international crisis and humanitarian emergency, the public perception of migrants tends to experience another downturn. Helping the international community and migration-affected countries to gain a greater understanding of the lives of these migrants and the contribution they make is an important step towards reversing these perceptions.

The same report indicates that of all the routes, only in the North-North route do female migrants outnumber male migrants. Although the number of men is higher in all other routes, women still account for almost half of all migrants. Findings regarding the age of migrants indicate that those heading South are younger, with migration towards the South characterised by people under 24 years of age, while migration to the North generally involves those in the working age group of 25-49. Data regarding the qualifications of migrants show that 44 per cent have low qualifications, 33 per cent have medium-level qualifications and only 22 per cent hold high level qualifications (IOM 2013).

The IOM report also states that of all the routes, only in the North-North route do female migrants outnumber male migrants. Although the number of men is higher in all other routes, women still account for almost half of all migrants. Findings regarding the age of migrants indicate that those heading South are younger, with migration towards the South characterised by people under 24 years of age, while migration to the North generally involves those in the working age group of 25-49. Data regarding the qualifications of migrants show that 44 per cent have low qualifications, 33 per cent have medium-level qualifications and only 22 per cent hold high level qualifications (IOM 2013).

The same report indicates that the overwhelming proportion of refugees move from the South to other countries of the South. According to World Bank data for 2010, four out of every five asylum seekers were born in the global South and continue to live in the South. They make up 81 per cent of global refugees. The North houses far fewer refugees than commonly believed at around 1 per cent of asylum seekers. As a proportion of the total migrant stock, 10 per cent of South-South migration consists of refugees (IOM 2013: 68).

It is clear that global migration affects many countries significantly. Therefore, it will be useful to look at the phenomenon itself and the theories used to describe and explain it. This will be followed by a discussion on a framework for migration and migrants for agricultural production that makes use of different migration theories.
The term “Age of Migration” covers the process of globalisation during which migration has become more visible at the international level. This process has also been one of more diverse and more clearly problematic movements of peoples over borders. From the historical perspective, the economic motivation for migration has often been emphasised. For this reason, there is a significant and inseparable relationship between international migration and labour markets. The economic activities and employment of migrants in their target countries has been the subject of many studies. Whether be it through external or international migration, or through domestic migration, work in seasonal agriculture is an important field for migrants. In recent years especially, agricultural production, with the demand for labour it gives rise to, has become an economic activity that tends to increase international labour migration.

It is important to see how international seasonal agricultural migration may be conceptualised in keeping with theories of migration and to what extent this conceptualisation can explain foreign migrant labour in seasonal agriculture in Turkey in order to furnish a theoretical background to this form of labour. It may be said that the theory of “push-pull factors” is the theoretical framework most frequently used to explain international mi-
migration. This theory attests that people move from densely populated to sparsely populated areas and from lower income areas to higher income areas. Push factors include demographic growth, low living standards, lack of economic opportunities and political oppression, while some pull factors are demand for labour, attractive economic opportunities and political freedom. This theoretical approach fundamentally emphasises that international migration movements result from wage differences between countries and that migration will not take place where there is no such difference (İçduygu, 2009). The implication of this theory is that labour moves from traditional sectors to better paid jobs in modern sectors and that migration movements result from the unequal distribution of labour and capital. Looking at foreign migrant labour in seasonal agriculture, it may be said that migrants are attracted by the higher wages and noted that they send back their relatively high earnings to their countries of origin. However, this case is inconsistent with the assertion that migration takes place from traditional sectors to modern sectors. Migrant seasonal agricultural labour is usually employed in non-mechanised labour-intensive activities.

A significant number of migration theories assume migrants to be rational and calculating individuals and assume that individuals decide to move from their place of birth to other locations as a result of a cost-benefit analysis. Thus the individual is assumed to take the decision to move as a result of comparative analysis and in order to achieve expectations for higher pay and living standards expectations. In other words, the decision to migrate is taken if the individual’s expectations of higher pay and living standards in the target destination is higher than the costs (cost of travel and moving, learning a new language, adjustment and psychological difficulties etc.) they will incur by migrating (İçduygu 2009). According to neo-classical theory, these decisions are a form of investment in human capital. This it is stressed that migration increases human capital. From this perspective, even if migrants do carry out rational cost-benefit analysis, to say that those who work in seasonal agriculture are investing in human capital would be an incomplete assessment. Some of the migrants so employed cannot work in jobs suitable to their qualifications because of their migrant status, even if they have received higher education. They have no choice but to take part in agricultural activity which is in effect a kind of devaluation of their human capital.

The theories of migration systems and migrant networks look beyond individual decision-making for migration at relations and relational networks of migrants in sending and receiving countries. The theory of migration systems holistically analyses the relationship between actors of migration (source
and receiving countries and the migrant) and emphasises that countries are connected by a flow and counter-flow of people. This theory also underlines past relations between countries in terms of colonialism, political interaction, trade, investment and cultural ties. The presence of such systems provides important clues as to the development of current migration patterns. Fawcett and Arnold (1987, 456: 7) have classified these connections as inter-state relations, popular culture, familial and societal ties and activities of immigration agencies while Kritz, Lim and Zlotnik (1992) have identified historical, cultural, colonial and technological relations as the dynamics shaping migration patterns and have claimed that these have different impacts at the social, political, economic and demographic levels in receiving and sending countries.

The theory of migration networks similarly emphasises that migration is shaped by relations among migrants. The concept of “migration networks” may be defined as ties which connect those who are on the move, those who have moved and those who are stationary in sending and receiving countries (Taylor 1986, Massey 1990, Tilly 1990). These networks of relations occur at the formal and the informal level. For example, some institutions which act at the formal level (employment agencies, travel agencies and subcontractor firms) may facilitate the relations between migrants and state institutions while informal networks cover complex relations with families who have been left behind, friends and compatriots as well as community links and solidarity (Taylor 1986, Massey 1990). Informal networks are a form of social capital which migrants can turn to in order to receive help and to find work.

These networks which link migrants and non-migrants alike through a complex web of social roles and impersonal relations also serve to lower the cost and risks of migration (Boyd 1989:639). For example, family connections provide the cultural and financial capital which enables migration, and with the arrival of a pioneer migrant a route starts to form between the sending and receiving countries. Once this movement comes into being, migrants use these “thoroughfares” and receive the help of relatives and friends who are already settled in the receiving area. The networks of family and friends aid in finding shelter and jobs, dealing with the bureaucracy and resolving personal issues. These social networks make the migration process safer and more controllable for migrants and their families. Once migration movements begin, they become self-sustaining socio-economic processes. Migrant networks also prepare the ground for settling down and community formation in migrant destinations. Migrant networks...
groups form their own social and economic infrastructures among which one may count places of worship, associations, shops, cafes and professional or other services such as medical doctors and lawyers. As the duration of stay lengthens, initial migrants bring their spouses and children to their new country or start new families, processes which are sped up by migrant networks. Thus migrants continue their lifestyles in the country to which they have migrated.

While theories of migration help to explain certain aspects of seasonal agricultural labour migration, the concepts of migration systems and migrant networks offer us a more comprehensive framework for taking up the forms of migration and work of migrants employed in seasonal agricultural production in Turkey. Migrants from three source countries are heavily employed in agricultural production in Turkey. The access to work and working conditions of these migrants is established through the relations they establish with the domestic population and their relatives/acquaintances. Azerbaijanis, Georgians and Syrians are the main foreign actors of migrant seasonal agricultural labour. Each group accesses the jobs they take through the use of certain networks and ensures the continuity of employment through the same networks and relationships. The opportunities presented to migrants by these networks and the ease of access to certain jobs they allow leads to the creation of hierarchy and different statuses among migrants.

An important source of international labour migration to Turkey is the Autonomous Zone of Nakhchivan of Azerbaijan (Dedeoğ-
lu and Ekiz Gökmen 2011). In seasonal agricultural production, Azerbaijani workers are encountered in various types of work, especially in livestock raising and fodder cutting. In the provinces of Kars and Ardahan in particular, a significant amount of livestock based production is carried out by Azerbaijani labour. The fact that they speak Turkish and the presence of a local population of Azerbaijani background make it easier for Azerbaijani migrants to obtain precedence in employment. Azerbaijani migrants often emphasise that they “see Turkey as their homeland” and state that Turkey and Azerbaijan are “one nation, two states.” Through this discourse they create a sentiment of fraternity and virtual kinship. Similarly, the presence of a domestic Georgian population in the Black Sea region is an important factor for the employment of Georgians in the hazelnut and the tea harvest. The present networks among related Georgians intensified after the opening of the Sarp border crossing in 1996 and resulted in Georgians arriving from across the border taking various jobs in the region, headed by seasonal agricultural work. Employers tend to avoid employing migrants with whom they do not have established relations and seek either a common acquaintance or experience of having worked with the same person in the past.

Analysed from this perspective, it looks difficult for migrants to access seasonal agricultural jobs without being involved in a certain network of relations. The case that best exemplifies this point is that of Syrians, whose number in Turkey is close to 3 million. With their numbers increasing rapidly, Syrians in Turkey prefer to seek opportunities outside of refugee camps. Among the sample provinces of the Present Situation analysis, the number of Syrians who have arrived in Kars, Ardahan, Ordu, Giresun and Trabzon by their own means is low, and yet they are considered undesirable by the local population and are forced out of the provinces through various means. On the other hand, Syrians are among the workers who arrive from south eastern provinces to take part in seasonal agricultural work in the hazelnut harvest, and in Malatya. The migration of these migrants for seasonal agricultural work is organised by agricultural intermediaries engaged in the seasonal agricultural labour market in provinces like Şanlıurfa and the Syrians work alongside workers from Turkey in the hazelnut and apricot harvests.

If foreign migrants who are engaged in seasonal agricultural work in Turkey are able to find a place in social networks and relations, they come to be accepted by the local community and can access higher-paid jobs. These relations also serve as a shield for migrants against controls by the au-
thorities and allow them to work in various jobs despite their lack of work permits. This creates a hierarchy among migrants with respect to which migrant group gets to do which work and which migrants will be concealed and protected from the authorities. While Azerbaijani and Georgian workers who have ethnic and familial ties come at the top of the hierarchy, at the bottom come Syrians under temporary protection status who have arrived in Turkey due to the civil war in their country and who are not even allowed to collect aid in the street.

1.3 MIGRANT LABOUR IN SEASONAL AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTION

Agricultural production was a major event in human history and has played and continues to play a key role in the continuation of human life. According to ILO estimates, 1.3 billion people in the world are employed in agricultural production. In some parts of the world especially developed regions, the agricultural workforce consists mainly of migrant workers. For example, in California, USA the proportion of migrant workers in agriculture is almost 90 per cent (Svensson et al., 2013).

Although countries take various measures to make it difficult for migrants to enter irregularly hundreds of thousands, if not millions, of irregular migrants are present in many countries and are employed informally in various kinds of work. The agricultural sector tops the list of sectors in which undocumented/irregular migrants are employed. One of the attractions of the agricultural sector for migrants is the difficulty of regulating workers and implementing legal measures in the sector. This makes it harder for the authorities to detect or identify irregular migrants working in agriculture.

Recent studies show that despite attempts at regulating irregular migrant labour in agricultural output in countries such as Germany, Italy and Spain, their presence in the sector remains vital (Hess 2006, Hartman 2008). While migrants from central and eastern Europe are employed informally with low pay in the agricultural sector in Germany, the same is the case for migrants from Romania and Albania in Spain and Italy. Despite being widely employed in agricultural production, migrants face serious problems, taking up low-paid jobs with poor working conditions and high health and safety risks without any security or guarantees.

Even the Canadian Seasonal Agricultural Workers Programme (SAWP), which is often cited as the best in the world, is alleged to leave workers largely unprotected. It has been pointed out that workers do not have
the right to choose their employers, cannot leave their jobs, are unable to decide on their own places of residence and are not allowed to leave the fields where they engage in agricultural production (Tomic et al., 2010). The fact that the legal status of migrant workers is dependent on their employers leaves them unprotected and fragile. Inadequate controls cause employers to avoid their legal obligations and result in greater exploitation and harassment of workers.

In addition to the difficulties they encounter due to their working conditions and legal status, migrant workers also face discrimination in the labour market and in daily life in their destination countries. Compared to the domestic population, migrant workers are more often the victims of racism, ethnic discrimination, bad treatment and poor working conditions. The experiences of migrants can impact on their bodily and psychological wellbeing. In the USA which has the highest number of migrant agricultural workers in the world, migrant workers face a series of unfavourable living and working conditions. Living in fear of deportation, and as victims of ethnic discrimination and social exclusion, they work under conditions that present high health and safety risks and have limited access to institutional services (Svensson et al., 2013).

The Present Situation of Foreign Migrant Workers in Seasonal Agricultural Production in Turkey tries to contribute to the research briefly mentioned above by analysing the situation of foreign migrant workers in agricultural production in Turkey. In addition, the report Lessons Learned: Employment of Foreign Migrant Workers in Agricultural Production and Produce Processing (Turkey, Britain, Italy, Spain, France), which has been produced as part of this study, exemplifies migration management practices implemented towards foreign migrant workers in agricultural production in Turkey and Europe.
CHAPTER 2
MIGRATORY MOVEMENTS AND LABOUR MIGRATION TOWARDS TURKEY
Turkey’s position and significance within migration currents has changed radically over recent years. While in the 1960s, Turkey was a typical source country, by the 1990s it had transformed into a receiving country in its region. The radical change experienced has created change and transformation in Turkey’s migration regime and policies and has had a significant impact on the labour market. The migration regime, which had been structured around accepting migrants of Turkish origin or background, has started to exhibit a tendency towards migration management with loose visa regimes and the temporary protection status afforded to Syrians arriving in Turkey.

The basic dynamic which determines the impact of migration to Turkey on labour markets is that most migrants in Turkey join the labour market as irregular migrants. This pushes foreign migrant workers into informal and precarious employment. Visas obtained at border crossings can sometimes act, in effect, as work permits for seasonal agricultural work but do not afford any protection to migrant workers and make their position even more fragile. This chapter of the report will focus first on Turkey’s changing migration regime and the relationship between these changes and the labour market and then on the situation of the increasing numbers of irregular migrants in Turkey in the labour market.
2.1 TURKEY’S CHANGING MIGRATION REGIME AND POLICIES

Since the founding of the Republic of Turkey, migration has been seen as an important component of the nation state building project. In the early years of the Republic, the migration to Turkey of groups with affinities with Turkish culture and language was encouraged. Other than Muslims arriving in Turkey from Greece as part of the population exchange, Turks from Bulgaria and groups from diverse ethnic backgrounds and communities (e.g. Bosniacs, Pomaks, Circassians and Tartars), who had been subjects of the Ottoman Empire, migrated to Turkey and were known as muhacir (subjects of forced migration) (Toksöz, Kaşka and Erdoğan 2012). Between 1923 and 1997 around 800,000 individuals migrated from Bulgaria and 400,000 from Greece to Turkey. Muslims and Tartars from Caucasia also arrived in Turkey. It is estimated that more than 1.6 million migrants settled in Turkey between 1923 and 1997 (İçduygu and Biehl 2009: 93, Özgür 2012:204-205).

This migration system was governed by the Treaty of Lausanne of 1924 and the Settlement Law of 1934. The law made Turkish descent and possession of Turkish culture a requirement for acceptance into Turkey. It was also made possible for Muslim groups to be accepted as muhacir. Although the
definitions of who was to be considered Turkish or Muslim changed in time and according to the international situation, the Settlement Law made it easier for those of Turkish descent and culture to obtain citizenship. More importantly, the body of law only defined those of Turkish culture and descent as “migrants”, while all other ethnic groups migrating to Turkey were categorised as “foreigners” (Erder 2007: 7-8, İçduygu 2007: 206). İçduygu emphasises that the law made Turkish descent and culture the sole condition for migration out of a concern for establishing a homogenous nation-state (İçduygu 2010:32-33). Sema Erder describes the migration regime of Turkey as having been “designed without foreigners” and says that until the 2000s the basic characteristic of the migration regime was that it defined immigrants as muhacir and emigrants as gurbetçi (expatriates, exiles) (Erder 2007).

With globalisation, the migration map of Turkey has undergone significant changes and both emigrants and immigrants have diversified. From the end of the 1980s onwards, Turkey began to attract immigrants from central and eastern European countries as well as the states of the former USSR as a result of the upheavals in the socialist countries. In addition to being a traditional receiving country and a source country for western Europe, Turkey also became a new recipient and transit country from the 1990s onwards. With the EU adjustment process, and as a result of the diversity of migration towards Turkey, new legal regulation became a necessity in the 2000s. Among the new legislation, the 1994 Guideline for Asylum, the 2003 Law on Work Permits for Foreigners, the 2005 Turkey National Action Plan for Asylum and Migration and the 2006 Settlement Law, though not ground breaking, were indicators of a changing trend in Turkey’s migration regime (İçduygu 2010: 32). The 1994 Guideline for Asylum allowed Turkey - which was a party to the 1951 Geneva Convention with a geographical condition; that is, on condition of accepting asylum seekers from Europe only - to extend the right of temporary asylum to refugees from Iran and Iraq and to send them to third countries with the status of refugee without lifting the geographical condition. The 2005 Action Plan promised to lift the geographical condition by 2012. However, the geographical condition continues to remain in force.

The new Settlement Law of 2006 was expected to be a less limiting piece of legislation compared to its predecessor due to the EU adjustment process, but according to İçduygu it was prepared with the nation-state motivation and its content carries the same limitations as the former law. In the new legislation, migrants are described as “those persons who are of
Turkish descent and attached to Turkish culture, who have arrived in Turkey individually or in groups for settlement and who have been accepted in keeping with the stipulations of this Law” (İçduygu 2010: 34). Thus the ethnic limitation in Turkey’s migration regime has remained unchanged and legally, only people of Turkish descent may be granted the right to citizenship.

Although the EU membership process and work on the adoption of the acquis communautaire have played a determinant role in the diversification of migration policies, the underlying influence, according to Kirişçi, has been the process of transformation of the state that can be dated back to the 1980s. Turkey’s foreign policies have increasingly come to be determined by trade concerns and as a result of major developments in trade and investment with neighbouring countries, the state of Turkey has transformed into a “trade state” which aims at amassing economic power in its region (Kirişçi 2009, 2011).

The strongest signals of the transformation into a “trader state” are to be found in the trend towards liberalisation in visa policy. Toksöz, Kaşka and Erdoğdu (2012) have shown that especially since the collapse of the USSR, Turkey has begun implementing a pragmatic and flexible visa system towards countries along the Black Sea, in Central Asia and in the Middle East. They note that source countries fall into one of three categories: (a) countries whose citizens can enter Turkey and stay for 1-3 months without a visa; (b) countries whose citizens need to apply for a visa at overseas missions of Turkey before travelling to Turkey and (c) countries whose citizens can purchase a visa at Turkey’s borders at a rate which differs from country to country.

With the flexible visa regime, Turkey has aimed at developing trade ties with Russia, the former republics of the USSR and Arab countries such as Tunisia, Morocco, Saudi Arabia and Jordan. The border gate visa system has allowed citizens of many countries to obtain their visas at border crossings and ports. Today the citizens of 117 countries are either exempt from Turkish visa requirements or can buy an “e-visa” online.

Meanwhile, political and economic developments in countries neighbouring Turkey have also caused migration flows to turn towards Turkey. Refugees from Iran, Iraq, Afghanistan and Palestine who have arrived as a result of instability in the Middle East and irregular migrants from Russia, Ukraine, Georgia, Romania, Moldova, Azerbaijan, Uzbekistan and Turkmenistan following the collapse of the Eastern Bloc have put Turkey on the migration
map as a target and a transit country. Geographical factors - Turkey’s position between Europe and Asia and its difficult-to-control borders have combined with its proximity to regions of instability and conflict to give migrants many points of entry into the country by land and sea. This has made Turkey a transit country for migrants arriving from Asia, the Middle East and North Africa.

Current developments in Turkey’s migration policies are mostly determined by negotiations with the EU and various steps are being taken in this framework. The Law on Work Permits for Foreigners which entered into effect in 2003 was intended to regulate the work permits of immigrants. As will be examined in greater detail in the following chapters, this law in effect regulates the work permits of highly qualified foreign professionals in Turkey rather than the informal work of foreigners. Foreign migrant workers who work informally and sometimes undertake low-paid work (such as domestic care services) which locals do not want, or are employed in low-paid labour-intensive occupations like agriculture, construction and textiles) are left outside the scope of this legislation. The law forbids the unpermitted employment of foreigners and is intended to close off Turkey’s labour market to unqualified foreign labour (Yıldız 2007).

In 2005, the Turkey National Action Plan for the Adoption of the EU Acquis in the Field of Asylum and Migration was approved. The national action plan constituted a seven-year road map including the legislative changes necessary for adjustment to the EU acquis, and the investment and other measures and precautions necessary for the completion of the necessary administrative structure and infrastructure.

As a result of the work on bringing Turkey’s migration legislation into line with the EU acquis, there have been two significant recent developments in Turkey’s migration policies. The first was the signing of the Readmission Agreement on December 16th 2013. The Readmission Agreement provides for the return of persons found to be in violation of conditions of entry, stay or residence in Turkey or an EU country to the relevant country in keeping with the rules and conditions stipulated within the agreement. In this context, Turkey is to start reaccepting citizens of third countries who have travelled to EU countries through Turkey within three years of the signing of the agreement. The Turkey-EU Reacceptance Agreement is not binding on all EU countries, with Denmark, the UK and Ireland being exempt. With the implementation of the agreement, one of the obligations of the Visa Exemption Roadmap for the visa-free travel of Turkish citizens to the EU will have been fulfilled. Other conditions of the Roadmap are
the design of travel documents according to EU standards (biometric passports) and ensuring the security of ID cards and other documents; ensuring adequate controls and oversight over borders and adjustment to and effective implementation of the EU acquis for international protection and the processing of foreigners.

The second important development was the adoption of Law No. 6458 on Foreigners and International Protection which entered into effect on April 11th 2014. Law No. 6458 was passed to meet the obligations for the Visa Exemption Road Map. The law states that the short, medium and long term migration policies of Turkey will be established by the Migration Policies Board, which will consist of undersecretaries from relevant ministries and be presided over by the Minister for the Interior.

In summary, it may be said that Turkey’s migration policies have developed in parallel with membership negotiations with the EU and that recent legislation has mainly encompassed arrangements for refugees and combating irregular immigration. It has to be said that Turkey has so far been unable to put a well-planned migration policy into place. In future, the Migration Policies Board of the Ministry of the Interior needs to be able to produce policies which honour Turkey’s obligations arising from the Readmission Agreement, the UN Convention on Migrant Workers and other international conventions on human rights and migrants to which Turkey is a party as well as meeting the needs of the labour market while affording effective protection of workers’ rights.

2.2 FOREIGN IMMIGRANTS IN TURKEY AND LABOUR MIGRATION

In general, the exclusive migration regime which does not accept persons who are not of Turkish origin or culture as migrants is inadequate in regulating migration towards Turkey. In practice, the main elements of the migration regime that determine the situation of irregular migrants in the labour market are liberal visa policies and bilateral agreements. In addition, some new legislation adopted in recent years in order to bring Turkey into line with the EU acquis has affected the working and residence conditions of foreigners and the migration management of refugees. Meanwhile, migration towards Turkey has been increasing. Besides these flows of regular and irregular migrants, the numbers of transit migrants and refugees has increased. Finally, nearly three million Syrian refugees have also entered the country in recent years.
There has been a very significant increase in the number of foreigners entering Turkey in recent years. While nearly 10 million people entered Turkey in 2000, this figure rose to 29 million in 2011 and 35 million in 2014 (Migration Administration, 2015). The majority of these people arrive for touristic purposes. Table 1 gives figures for arrivals from various countries, excluding those from Western countries, who are assumed to come and go mainly as tourists. The figures offer very general information regarding the number and movements of the migrants who are more likely to seek work in the labour market and offer an outlook on the potential irregular migration movements which could affect the labour market.

As can be seen from the table below, there has been a significant increase in the number of arrivals in Turkey. For example, while the number of entrants from Georgia was 180,000 in 2000, it had become 1.7 million by 2014. Similarly, entries of citizens of Azerbaijan, Ukraine, Kazakhstan, Turkmenistan, Moldova, Uzbekistan, Armenia and China have risen. While the most significant increase in the number of entrants came among those

### Table 1. Entries and exits of citizens of selected countries to Turkey (2000-2014)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Iran</td>
<td>404,148</td>
<td>345,394</td>
<td>1,879,034</td>
<td>1,863,657</td>
<td>1,590,664</td>
<td>1,581,120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulgaria</td>
<td>378,329</td>
<td>375,870</td>
<td>1,488,425</td>
<td>1,485,094</td>
<td>1,693,591</td>
<td>1,695,504</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>180,480</td>
<td>166,748</td>
<td>1,149,362</td>
<td>1,138,870</td>
<td>1,755,289</td>
<td>1,736,134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syria</td>
<td>123,787</td>
<td>121,411</td>
<td>970,163</td>
<td>962,076</td>
<td>1,176,490</td>
<td>968,340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ukraine</td>
<td>153,650</td>
<td>146,360</td>
<td>588,406</td>
<td>585,411</td>
<td>657,051</td>
<td>654,935</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Azerbaijan</td>
<td>182,124</td>
<td>153,319</td>
<td>576,230</td>
<td>563,022</td>
<td>657,684</td>
<td>651,007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romania</td>
<td>267,108</td>
<td>253,476</td>
<td>383,681</td>
<td>383,994</td>
<td>426,585</td>
<td>426,731</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iraq</td>
<td>21,433</td>
<td>13,137</td>
<td>369,093</td>
<td>356,135</td>
<td>857,246</td>
<td>796,825</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kazakhstan</td>
<td>40,733</td>
<td>39,175</td>
<td>315,644</td>
<td>314,072</td>
<td>437,971</td>
<td>436,459</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkmenistan</td>
<td>11,115</td>
<td>10,645</td>
<td>137,472</td>
<td>128,939</td>
<td>180,395</td>
<td>174,104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moldova</td>
<td>65,112</td>
<td>53,735</td>
<td>100,852</td>
<td>99,686</td>
<td>132,338</td>
<td>131,167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>21,599</td>
<td>19,556</td>
<td>92,820</td>
<td>93,225</td>
<td>199,746</td>
<td>194,663</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uzbekistan</td>
<td>21,728</td>
<td>20,535</td>
<td>84,962</td>
<td>80,367</td>
<td>143,354</td>
<td>135,987</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armenia</td>
<td>17,704</td>
<td>14,518</td>
<td>72,349</td>
<td>71,825</td>
<td>67,198</td>
<td>66,973</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,569,523</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,408,313</strong></td>
<td><strong>11,685,494</strong></td>
<td><strong>11,655,494</strong></td>
<td><strong>14,454,651</strong></td>
<td><strong>14,132,337</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

from the Russian Federation, it is known that most of them have arrived as tourists. The visa regime directed at these countries has played a significant role in the increase. Citizens of Iran, Bulgaria and Georgia are exempt from visa requirements for stays of up to 90 days, and citizens of the Russian Federation, Ukraine, Azerbaijan, Uzbekistan, Kazakhstan and Turkmenistan are exempt for stays of up to 30 days. Moldovan and Armenian citizens can obtain a thirty-day visa at border crossings. Chinese citizens are required to apply for a visa at Turkish missions abroad. There is little doubt that the 30- and 60-day exemptions from visa requirements of citizens of certain countries travelling on ordinary passports has increased cyclical migration for work from these countries (Toksöz, Kaşka and Erdoğdu 2012).

Although there is no detailed data available regarding labour migration to Turkey, the data above and regarding figures for migrants apprehended for unlawful entry or stay shed a quantitative light on the presence of migrants in the labour market, who have mostly been studied qualitatively.

The number of those deported is very low compared to the number entries and has fallen over the years. The 2012 study by Toksöz, Kaşka and Erdoğdu identifies the offences leading to deportation as visa violations, undocumented entry and exit or as work without work permits, showing that these account for between two thirds and three quarters of cases of deportation. The fall in the number of deportations has been explained in terms of the liberal visa regime, the increase in the number of countries whose citizens have been made exempt from visa requirements over the years, and the consequent fall in the number of those crossing

**Table 2. Numbers of irregular migrants apprehended by year**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Numbers of irregular migrants apprehended</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>94,515</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>57,428</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>34,345</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>32,667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>44,415</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>47,510</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>39,890</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>58,647</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


**Graph 1. Numbers of irregular migrants apprehended by year (2000-2014)**

the border unofficially. Even if migrants work without the necessary permits, workplace inspections are very limited, so most migrants working informally may be considered to be invisible and their real numbers can be assumed to be much higher than the number of deportations would indicate.

Those persons who take refuge in Turkey under international protection or those applying for passages to third countries are also potential workers in the labour market. Table 3 shows that the number of such people has increased over the years. Those who apply for asylum in Turkey usually come from countries such as Iran, Iraq, Afghanistan and Somalia. The low number of asylum applications may be the result of the geographical reservation Turkey exercises over the Geneva Convention of 1951 (Toksöz, Kaşka and Erdogdu 2012). According to this condition, Turkey does not grant refugee status to applicants from outside of Europe, instead keeping them under protection for a period or granting them temporary protection status as in the case of Syrians.

One of the most important developments affecting the presence of migrants in the labour market in Turkey has been the arrival of Syrian citizens, who have been given temporary protection status, since the start of the Syrian Civil War in 2011. According to data from the General Directorate for Migration Management, there were 2,733,284 Syrian citizens living in Turkey under the Regulation on Temporary Protection as of March 4th 2016. Of these, only 272,670 live in temporary shelter centres (Migration Management, 2016)⁵, while the rest live especially in the Mediterranean and South Eastern Anatolia regions of Turkey and large towns, as will be discussed in detail later in this report.

### Table 3. Applications for International Protection by year (2000-2014)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Number of Applications</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>2,935</td>
<td>2,935</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>3,550</td>
<td>6,485</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>5,882</td>
<td>12,367</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>12,002</td>
<td>24,369</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>6,792</td>
<td>31,161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>8,932</td>
<td>40,093</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>17,925</td>
<td>58,018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>29,678</td>
<td>87,696</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>30,311</td>
<td>118,007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>34,112</td>
<td>152,119</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


### Graph 2. Distribution of Syrians Under Temporary Protection by Top Ten Provinces of Residence⁴

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Province</th>
<th>Number of People</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ş. Urfa</td>
<td>399,481</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>İstanbul</td>
<td>391,698</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hatay</td>
<td>386,313</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. Antep</td>
<td>324,827</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adana</td>
<td>148,788</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mersin</td>
<td>137,407</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kilis</td>
<td>128,539</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mardin</td>
<td>97,491</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bursa</td>
<td>95,678</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>İzmir</td>
<td>90,054</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


---


2.3 MIGRANT WORKERS IN THE LABOUR MARKET

The extent of the informal economy in Turkey offers widespread opportunities for employment to migrants. Demand for migrant labour in the labour market arises in two forms: the first is when the domestic labour is inadequate or does not supply sufficient labour, such as in the domestic care and tourism sectors in which jobs are not considered desirable by local workers. The second form of demand for foreign migrant labour is in fields in which domestic and migrant labour compete. This is the case in the textiles, construction and agriculture sectors. Subcontracting, which makes it easier to slip into informality, is commonplace in these sectors and irregular foreign migrant workers have come into the picture as a reserve labour forces vis-à-vis the domestic labour, the wages of which have risen (Akpinar 2010).

Migrants are concentrated in sectors which are labour-intensive and low-paid. In Turkey, they work as labourers in the manufacturing sector, especially in leather, clothing and food processing. They are also employed in construction, agriculture, tourism, entertainment, sex work, domestic and care services. It may be assumed that in all fields other than construction, women outnumber men. Workers in domestic and care services, entertainment and sex work are exclusively female, while both women and men are employed in food and restaurants in various capacities in tourism, and in agriculture - especially in the Black Sea region. The survival of small firms in garment manufacturing, in various aspects of tourism and in construction depends on the employment of cheap foreign migrant labour (Toksöz, Kaşka and Erdoğdu 2012).

Among the activities in which migrants engage in the labour market, the most frequently studied has been the employment of women for domestic services. Female migrants, especially from the republics of the former USSR, seem to have adapted to the informal economy and the nature of employment in this field. Demand for women’s labour in this field is explained in terms of the welfare regime in Turkey. The basic dynamic of this regime is that care for children, the elderly and the sick is met within the family, with institutional services being very inadequate. In cases in which members of the family cannot deliver care services, labour needs to be hired from the market. To this end, foreign migrant woman workers are widely employed, as shown by many studies.

As Kaşka emphasises in her study of Moldovan migrants working in domestic services, demand for foreign women to work in domestic care has
increased over the years and firms which organise these activities and procure workers have appeared, although they are informal. Demand for migrant woman workers, who arrive in Turkey to work for a certain period, especially to meet the care and domestic work needs of urban middle class households, has risen over time and become a “custom”, according to Kaşka. Thus over recent years, Moldovan woman migrants have joined migration movements, driven mostly by geographical proximity, flexible visa practices, the informal labour market and the increase in demand for foreign migrant women who will work in domestic services (Kaşka 2006).

Present studies show that female foreign migrants in Turkey form a heterogeneous group. Although they are mostly associated with sex work, recent studies have shown that these women work in all fields, other than construction, in which foreign migrant workers are widely employed, such as the luggage trade, domestic services, entertainment, tourism, textiles, restaurants, food and agriculture (Erder and Kaşka 2003, İçduygu 2004, Kaşka, 2005).

The relatively high education and work discipline of migrants, their way of working without causing problems for the employer, and their complete lack of legal rights and potential for unionisation make them attractive to employers. The most basic factor which leads to their lack of protection is that they reside in Turkey “undocumented” or even if they are officially resident, they do not have work permits. They are afraid of being caught and deported and in order to prevent this they try to exit and re-enter regularly as part of “circular migration”. Study findings concerning their situation have established that the wage level of the migrant labour are not lower
than that of the domestic labour in absolute terms. However, as they work under conditions which domestic workers would not accept, without social security or overtime pay, for long working hours and bereft of rights such as annual paid leave, the overall cost of migrant labour is relatively low compared to domestic labour, which is why it is preferred by employers. The greatest perceived injustice among the migrants, which makes them feel the most desperate, is that employers sometimes fail to pay their earned wages, in case of which they have no opportunity of recourse to any institution.

CONCLUSION

Turkey’s migration regime only considers those of Turkish descent to be migrants and all other groups are considered foreigners. Migrant status is important for access to citizenship and other social rights. This very exclusive and limiting migration regime has been undergoing a transformation since on the one hand Turkey has become an attractive destination for migrants from neighbouring countries through a liberal visa regime and on the other the arrangements made for the growing number of Syrian refugees in recent years have started to become institutionalised.

Despite the apparent transformation of the migration regime, migrants are generally employed informally in the labour market. Migrant workers are found in many fields of production in Turkey. This report examines foreign migrant workers in seasonal agricultural production. Important changes are needed in Turkey’s migration regime if the foreign migrant workers in the country’s informal sector, whose numbers now run into missions, are to be protected and to be given a secure status.
CHAPTER 3
RIVALRY OF THE POOREST? SEASONAL AGRICULTURAL LABOUR AND MIGRANT WORKERS IN TURKEY
The employment of seasonal migrant workers have been a widespread form of agricultural labour in Turkey for many years. Once thought bound to disappear with the increasing mechanisation of agriculture, migrant seasonal agricultural labour has not only not disappeared, but has transformed and spread to almost all regions of Turkey. In this process, the problems with migrant seasonal agricultural work, their prevalence of agricultural production throughout the country and the poor living conditions of the labourers have made seasonal agricultural work and labourers an important field of study and social policy. Since the 1990s in particular, a growing number of publications and studies have focused on the problems of seasonal agricultural workers, their families and the issue of child labour, and there have been attempts at developing policy measures which are expected to have comprehensive effects in this field.

The aim of this chapter is to provide an overview of the existing literature on workers engaged in seasonal agricultural production in Turkey and to analyse the dynamics of seasonal agricultural work. The life experiences of seasonal agricultural labourers will be described in light of the studies carried out so far. This chapter will try to bring together the issues of international labour migration and migrant seasonal agricultural work – two subjects which have been treated separately in Turkey up to now. The debate on the dimensions of the involvement of foreign migrant workers in migrant seasonal agricultural work will be summarised and their situation will be compared with that of domestic migrant seasonal agricultural workers. The existing studies and cornerstones of work in this field will be identified, and current findings regarding the position of foreign migrant workers in seasonal agricultural work will be summarised on the basis of the limited data and research available.
SOCIAL CHANGE IN TURKEY AND MIGRANT SEASONAL AGRICULTURAL WORK: RURAL ENCOUNTERS OVER ETHNIC IDENTITY

Turkey has been experiencing rural-to-urban migration for over half a century and towns have long been witness to communication and conflict among people from different ethnic, religious and cultural backgrounds. These encounters are termed urban antagonism, and have been studied by Sema Erder in the case of Pendik, Istanbul. Over time, different mechanisms (intermediary institutions such as schools and mosques) have emerged for lowering tensions and bringing different groups closer together (Erder 1997). While urban spaces have witnessed encounters between groups from different ethnic, religious and cultural backgrounds, rural areas have been thought of as more homogenous social structures. These homogenous structures survived until the late 1990s, when migrant seasonal agricultural work became a widespread labour activity and an inseparable part of agricultural production in Turkey. In this sense, migrant seasonal agricultural work has been a factor of social change which has led to groups from different ethnic, religious and cultural backgrounds meeting each other in rural space and living together, if only for a certain period of the year.

Migrant seasonal agricultural work is a form of labour with significant ethnic characteristics, as it is highly associated with workers coming from provinces in the South Eastern Anatolia region, who are termed “easterners”. Recent studies have indicated that the labour market in Turkey features increasing differentiation and segregation by ethnic group (Lordoğlu and Aslan 2012). Migrant seasonal agricultural work appears as the domain in which rural antagonism is experienced most obviously, and goes beyond the Turkish-Kurdish/Arab encounters. To these encounters one must add the interaction between the Kurdish/Arab labourers who join the hazelnut harvest in the Black Sea region and the local people as well as the interaction between these two groups and the Georgian labourers who come for the tea harvest and finally the Syrian migrants. Given that agricultural production in Turkey has in recent years begun attracting foreign migrant labour, it has come to feature encounters beyond the Kurdish/Arab-Turkish divide, and emerged as an area in which different nationalities and identities meet. This report will also treat the tensions and encounters as a form of dynamism and process of social change brought on by agricultural production.

The next part of the report focuses on migrant seasonal agricultural work, working conditions and relations identifying problem areas and mapping
out on the basis of existing studies the foreign migrant labour which has become attached to this form of production and to its problems.

**What is Migrant Seasonal Agricultural Work; Who are Migrant Seasonal Agricultural Workers?**

One of the most important consequences of urbanisation and population movements on agricultural production has been that paid labour has had to be employed, at least partially, for production which used to employ members of the household. In this context, migrant seasonal agricultural work has become a more visible issue and has come to affect a significant proportion of the population, headed by the workers, field/orchard owners and members of the local population. In the Report of the Parliamentary Research Commission Established for the Study of the Problems of Seasonal Agricultural Workers of the Grand National Assembly of Turkey (GNAT), a seasonal agricultural worker is defined as follows:

---

*A seasonal agricultural worker is someone who is a citizen of the country or a migrant who works permanently or temporarily by season on his/her own or another owner’s agricultural production unit, with or without a contract and in exchange for wages/daily pay or payment in kind in any stage of agricultural production including planting, growing, pesticide application and harvesting. (GNAT 2012: 12-13)*

---

In addition it is further possible to separate seasonal agricultural work into local and migrant components. Local seasonal agricultural workers are generally those who take part in arable farming, livestock keeping, bee-keeping, forestry and fishery activities in the area where they live for at least one day to earn income, but who do not practice this form of labour as a permanent occupation. Migrant seasonal agricultural workers may be defined as those who travel away from their place of residence to another location to engage in agricultural production in the listed fields (Development Workshop, 2014).

The need for paid labour in agriculture which used to be met from local supply has gradually come to be supplied by a seasonal labour which migrates from the eastern and south eastern provinces of the country and on average works for four to five months of the year. Migrant seasonal agricultural work takes place in many regions of Turkey. The regions and produce highlighted by studies are hazelnuts in the Black Sea region, fresh vegetables in the Aegean, citrus fruits, fresh vegetables and cotton in the Çukuro-
va region and onions, legumes, sugar beet and apricots in Central Anatolia. Seasonal agricultural workers generally work in hoeing and in picking and drying the produce and spreading it out in the sun (MIGA 2012).

Household labour force data from the Turkish Statistical Institute (TURKSTAT) show that in 2014, 5.4 million workers in Turkey were engaged in agricultural production and that 485,000 people were employed temporarily seasonally for wages or daily pay in agriculture. According to TURKSTAT household labour force data, while there is no evidence that those who define themselves as seasonal agricultural workers have migrated for purposes of engaging in agricultural work, various reports put the population who work in seasonal agricultural work and those who are affected by this form of work at one million at the least (MIGA 2012, Support to Life [Hayata Destek] 2014). A larger pool of information has been forming regarding migrant seasonal agricultural workers in recent years and new studies are providing detailed analyses of the workers and their families. According to a study by the Support to Life Association carried out in 2014 and involving 1,353 individuals, 49.7 per cent of seasonal agricultural workers are women and 50.3 per cent are men. Findings regarding household size and age distribution indicate that families are large and the population is young. Study findings show that the average household size is seven, with 50 per cent of households consisting of seven or fewer members. The fact that a quarter of the households interviewed consisted of 10 or more members may indicate that the number of children per mother in families migrating for seasonal agricultural work is high or that close relatives come together to form a single familial unit for purposes of seasonal agricultural work. The report also points out that, apart from large families, migrant seasonal agricultural workers comprise a young population. While 35 per cent of the total population of the 168 households covered by the study were be-
tween the ages of 19 and 45, only 11 per cent were over the age of 46. The average age of household members was 22. Among this young population, the proportion of the under-25 population to the total was found to be 68 per cent for both men and women.

Studies show that seasonal agricultural work is a source of income for a significant proportion of the population in Turkey and involves the migration of workers and their families from eastern and south eastern provinces for temporary work. This movement of population, which may be deemed a particular form of migration, also transports, in a sense, the encounters between people from different ethnic and religious backgrounds which had already been experienced through urbanisation into rural areas, and makes urban antagonism a feature of rural production. Aside from the ethnic and identity-based encounters which came to the fore in the 1990s following the forced relocation of the Kurdish population, migrant seasonal agricultural work and many informal and manual jobs have come to employ ethnic Kurds predominantly, lending an ethnic layer to the working class. The process of increased ethnic layering of the working class has coincided with more work in informal, insecure jobs with poor working conditions. Migrant seasonal agricultural work appears in this respect as a stinted form of labour employment that is bereft of many legal guarantees and forms of security.

Working Relations, Conditions and Regulations

Legislation regulates migrant seasonal agricultural work inadequately and has rendered it invisible until recent years. Being outside the scope of regulations, lack of protection and security are some of the foremost indicators of migrant seasonal agricultural work. However, in recent years small but important steps have been taken through raised awareness resulting from traffic and workplace accidents and the work of international organisations to make labour used in the agricultural supply chain comply with human and worker rights. The Prime Ministerial Circular for the Improvement of Working and Social Lives of Migrant Seasonal Agricultural Workers (METİP) that was published in 2010 may be taken as an indicator of progress and increased attention.

In legal terms, migrant seasonal agricultural workers fall outside of the scope of the Labour Law. This is because only those agricultural operations which employ 51 or more workers are deemed to fall under the scope of the Law. Those employing less than 51 agricultural workers are regulated by the Law of Obligations. Since there is no specific law for agricultural labour, and no statistics or records are kept for this form of labour, it is not
possible to access realistic and clear data regarding employment and the workforce in this sector or the working conditions of agricultural workers (KEİG 2015).

The dynamics of labour relations depend on the agricultural intermediaries who bring field/orchard owners and labourers together. The function of agricultural intermediaries is to provide a mechanism which ensures trust, provides security and functions regularly for both parties. However, a form of patronage ensues between the intermediary and the labourers, so that for most workers access to work and to their earning becomes dependent on the intermediary. Accordingly, intermediaries make decisions on behalf of the labourers on almost every subject and negotiate with employers to this end. In exchange they receive a commission. The fact that seasonal agricultural work is not covered by the Labour Law not only makes workers powerless against the employer; it also increases the significance of the intermediaries and the labourers’ dependence on them. The relationship with the intermediary does not cover the working period only. For example, before leaving for work, migrant seasonal agricultural workers buy goods in their places of residence on condition of payment when they return. The list of their purchases is given to the intermediary, who is responsible for paying the store owner after the migrant workers have returned. In other words, all processes to do with wages and money are controlled by the intermediary. In 2011, the Regulation on Labour Intermediaries in Agriculture was updated. However, very few intermediaries have been officially registered as a result, and inspections of even the few that have been registered are inadequate.

The 2014 study of the Support to Life Association regarding the working conditions of migrant seasonal agricultural workers contains interesting findings. When asked about their daily working hours, only 12 per cent of respondents indicated
eight hours or less. 45 per cent said they worked between 9 and 11 hours per day, and 43 per cent reported working more than 11 hours. It would not be wrong to suggest that as a rule the duration of work is from dawn till sunset. According to the same study, around 70 per cent of workers work for seven days a week, and 24 per cent work for 5-6 days. It is clear that migrant seasonal agricultural labour involves long working hours. The reason why the labourers work so intensively may be that they earn an income based on the area covered or the amount of produce. Also, if work is to take place in a number of fields or orchards belonging to different owners in the same location, there is pressure to finish work in one area quickly in order to move on to the next, causing workers to work for long hours and throughout the week.

Studies on migrant seasonal agricultural workers in Turkey (MIGA 2012, Support to Life 2014, Development Workshop 2014a, Development Workshop 2014, KEİG 2015, GNAT 2015) show that there are different systems for remuneration. These may be summarised as follows:

**Daily pay:** Workers receive payment for their labour over a certain period of each day. This type of payment is usually made during the preparatory stages of hoeing, weeding, irrigation and pesticide application. The system is also used in the harvest of some produce. For example, it applies widely in the harvest of hazelnuts, tea, cherries, tomatoes and other vegetables, olives, apricots and apples. It also applies in fodder cutting.

**Payment according to the unit price of harvested produce:** The wage is established by multiplying the amount collected by a worker at the harvest
with the previously set unit price for the job. For example, in the cotton harvest, the amount of cotton picked by a single worker in a day or over the season is multiplied by the unit pay established for a kilogram of cotton to find the total payment by each worker. This system is widely used in the cotton harvest.

**Payment according to the field area of the harvested produce:** Payment is determined by multiplying the area unit price with the area worked or harvested by the labourer. It is generally used in the harvesting of onions, legumes (lentils, chickpeas, beans), cumin, sesame and similar products. The wage rate for 1,000 square metres of land is fixed in advance and then multiplied by the total area harvested. As family labour is common in this form of employment, it is more important how much the family as a whole, rather than individual workers, can harvest. As a result, child labour is the most widespread where this form of payment applies. It is also sometimes used in fodder cutting.

**Monthly, annual or seasonal wage:** This form of payment is widely found in livestock care, horse rearing and high tunnel greenhouse production. It is paid for a month’s work. Although its use in plant raising is limited, annual or seasonal wages may be established through negotiations. In high tunnel greenhouse work, families are employed on a monthly wage, while seasonal wages may be set in the fig harvest.

**Payment as percentage of the product harvested:** This form of payment is traditionally used in cotton production in the province of Şanlıurfa, and those who work under this system are known as “oarsmen” or “thirty per-
centers”. The workers generally engage in all stages of cotton production (soil preparation, sowing, irrigation, pesticide application, weeding and harvesting) together with their households, and in return receive 30 per cent of the cotton harvested in kind. The price for cotton that year determines the monetary income of the workers. With the mechanisation of the cotton harvest, this form of payment is on the verge of disappearing.

**Payment by total amount of produce gathered:** This form of payment applies in the citrus harvest. Workers form teams of a certain number for the harvest of each kind of citrus fruit (grapefruit, lemons, oranges and mandarins). The teams receive a fixed rate for each truck load of fruit they harvest, regardless of the number of hours worked during the day.

**Work on the workers’ own account:** With the mechanisation of the cotton harvest, poor families gather the cotton that is left unpicked by the machines for sale on their own accounts with the permission of the field owner. Child labour is very common in this form of labour. The household earns an income equal to the sales value of the amount of cotton they have picked.

The systems of payment can be said to vary with the characteristics of the produce and the way it is harvested. As will be explained in greater detail in the chapter on field findings below, the labourers encountered during the field study were generally working for daily pay, for pay determined according to the amount of produce gathered, and on their own accounts. It was established that workers earn between TRY24 and TRY100 per day.
Shelter and Health Conditions

There are obvious problems with the shelter and health conditions of migrant seasonal agricultural workers. The workers and their families live in unhealthy conditions, in tents unsuitable for the very high or low temperatures they encounter, and both children and adults are open to injuries and disease arising from the nature of the work carried out. In addition, migrant seasonal agricultural workers are often in the news due to the many fatal and grievous accidents that occur while they are travelling.

In this context, although the Prime Ministerial Circular 2010/6 on the Improvement of Working and Social Lives of Migrant Seasonal Agricultural Workers has set a goal of eliminating the problems of migrant seasonal agricultural workers, it is clear that the potential for improvements under the arrangements made so far are very limited. The circular makes arrangements for the transportation of migrant seasonal agricultural workers to their places of migration, their shelter in their places of work and the education of their children, and assigns special duties to central and local government. At the same time, instead of bringing about structural solutions for the problems of transportation, shelter, healthcare, education, child labour, poor working conditions, low pay and lack of social security, the issue has been perceived as more of a security problem. Discussion has turned to practices which aim to reduce the interaction between the local population and migrant seasonal agricultural workers to a minimum, thereby preventing conflict (KEİG 2015). The situation established by the KEİG report supports our previous claim that migrant seasonal agricultural labour has resulted in social transformation in the countryside through the interaction of different ethnic groups.

The study of the Support to Life Association regarding the shelter conditions of migrant seasonal agricultural workers contains striking findings. While as high a proportion as 81 per cent of workers are sheltered in tents, only 9 per cent live in permanent structures. A tent is a very poorly protected form of shelter that is open on all sides. The report states that the average size of tents, as the most common form of accommodation, is 16
square metres and each tent accommodates on average 7 people. While labourers are expected to provide their own shelter arrangements, in some regions workers and their families reside in temporary accommodation camps established by the authorities. These camps were introduced by the Project for the Improvement of the Working and Living Conditions of Migrant Seasonal Agricultural Workers. They have a maximum capacity of 1,000 persons. (Support to Life 2014)

Migrant seasonal agricultural workers experience many health problems and are at risk of fatal accidents. For example, in 2014 at least 309 agricultural workers died on the job (KEİG 2015). Workers are directly exposed to agricultural chemicals. Among health problems, the most common are complaints of dizziness, fatigue and back pain, diarrhoea, respiratory infections, dermatological ailments such as wounds, boils, eczema, scabies and lice; sunstroke, headaches, poisoning, anxiety, depression and suicide attempts (KEİG 2015). Despite the high incidence of health problems, the distance between places of shelter and centres with healthcare services limits access to healthcare. Furthermore, as migrant seasonal agricultural workers are on the move for around eight months of the year, their access to preventive healthcare is precarious. Another factor preventing the workers from accessing healthcare services is that most of them do not have social security coverage because they are informally employed.
3.2 THE FOREIGN MIGRANT LABOUR IN SEASONAL AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTION IN TURKEY

There is very little information on foreign migrant workers engaged in seasonal agricultural labour in Turkey and most of this information is about Syrians who have fled the civil war in their country. As part of the present study, a media screening study was conducted by analysing news related to foreign migrant workers in migrant seasonal agricultural work between 2010 and 2015.

The newspaper reports show that foreign migrant workers are encountered almost everywhere in Turkey where agricultural production takes place. The mapping study prepared in this context shows that Georgian and Syrian migrants participate actively in agricultural production in the Black Sea provinces producing hazelnuts- and tea. In hazelnut-producing western Black Sea provinces of Sakarya, Düzce and Zonguldak, there are Georgian workers mainly engaged in the hazelnut harvest and in Karabük there are Syrians working as shepherds. In central Anatolian provinces, Syrian agricultural workers have been observed to arrive together with domestic migrant seasonal agricultural workers from eastern and south eastern provinces of Turkey and to work under the same poor conditions in the sugar beet harvest.

In Kars and Ardahan where livestock rearing is widespread, Azerbaijani workers (from Nakhchivan) have been found to work commonly in fodder cutting and other related work. In Antalya, Mersin and Adana, which may be called the “citrus provinces” Syrian workers have been observed to take part intensively in seasonal agricultural work, as they are already present in high numbers in these provinces.

In the cotton-producing provinces of Adana, Şanlıurfa and Hatay, seasonal agricultural work has become the primary occupation of Syrian migrants, which has led to an important transformation of the composition of the labour. Syrian migrants are also employed in citrus production and other arable activities in the Aegean region, and there has been newspaper coverage of the plight of workers travelling to pick cherries in Afyonkarahisar. Syrian workers have recently become engaged in agricultural work, such as cherry picking, in the Emirdağ and Sultandağı districts of Afyonkarahisar. In the district of Sultandağı, workers from Turkey and
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This map was prepared by Development Workshop experts by using an internet search of news reported for the period 2010-2015, research/analysis on migrant seasonal agricultural work, information obtained through face-to-face meetings conducted with agricultural intermediaries and data obtained by the Development Workshop from fieldwork carried out in 13 provinces of Turkey in December, 2015. A list of reference sources for the map may be obtained via e-mail info@kalkinmaatolyesi.org.
Syria coming in for the cherry harvest were given a disused prison as a place of shelter by the office of the district governor. It was noted that this structure, which has deficiencies in terms of providing shelter and meeting other needs, had not been renovated for its new purpose (Support to Life, 2014).

The engagement of foreign migrants in seasonal agricultural work most commonly involves Syrian migrants, which is seen as adding a new dimension to intra-class conflict. The opinion that Syrians cost domestic workers their jobs because they are willing to accept lower pay is voiced very frequently. The media has run coverage to the same effect. According to the 2014 study of the Support to Life Association, Syrian migrants have increased the supply of labour for seasonal agricultural work, and as a result intra-class conflict has arisen between domestic and Syrian workers. The involvement of Syrian migrants in seasonal agricultural work has caused daily wages to stagnate and the amount of work available for each household to fall in comparison with previous years. Household income from seasonal agricultural work has consequently fallen. This not only deepens labour exploitation, but also increases tensions among different groups of workers (Support to Life 2014).

Similar issues are emphasised in the Report of the Parliamentary Research Commission Established for the Study of the Problems of Seasonal Agricultural Workers. It is stated that wages have been pushed down by the involvement of Syrian migrant workers in particular. The report also states that:
Employers see foreign workers as a store of cheap labour and employ them despite their lack of work permits. It has been observed that foreign nationals accept lower pay and heavier working conditions out of desperation. This situation leads to risks both in terms of labour markets and from the point of view of health and social problems, and constitutes a significant source of difficulties in service provision. (GNAT, 2015:176)

With the inclusion of foreign migrant workers in migrant seasonal agricultural labour existing problems have become exacerbated and it is not implausible to predict that they will worsen in the future.

Both reports underline the conflict and potential social tensions between foreign migrant workers and domestic workers. The rural antagonism already experienced between local populations and migrant workers from eastern Turkey has received another layer and become more complex with the arrival of foreign migrant workers. The tension between domestic migrant seasonal agricultural workers and Syrian workers and the reactions of local populations towards both workers from south eastern Turkey and Syrian workers is the most obvious reflection of the social change in Turkey on the labour market. In the following chapters of this report, the encounters of these different groups in the labour market, their tensions and their commonalities will be used to analyse the present situation of foreign migrant labour in seasonal agricultural production in Turkey.
CHAPTER 4

FINDINGS OF THE PRESENT SITUATION OF FOREIGN MIGRANT WORKERS IN SEASONAL AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTION IN TURKEY STUDY
Findings of the Present Situation of Foreign Migrant Workers in Seasonal Agricultural Production in Turkey Study

This chapter of the Report on the Present Situation of Foreign Migrant Workers in Seasonal Agricultural Production in Turkey contains an overview of the findings of the field study. The aim of this chapter is to identify the present situation of foreign migrant workers in seasonal agricultural production in Turkey, based on the field study data, and to discuss the implications for agricultural production and social change of foreign migrant workers engaging in seasonal agricultural activities in Turkey. The chapter is divided into a number of sections.

The first section focuses on the three groups of migrants supplying labour for seasonal agricultural production in Turkey which the field study focused on. This supply of labour was examined in the particular cases of Azerbaijani, Georgian and Syrian migrants. Even if present in Turkey with different legal statuses, these are among the main actors of agricultural production. These three groups alone make up very high numbers in Turkey. Although not all of them are involved in agricultural production, their numbers show that Turkey has a high capacity for employing foreign migrants. The agricultural sector constitutes the most dynamic field of this employment potential.

The second section examines the conditions which create demand for foreign migrant labour. Demand conditions have been analysed from a produce-based perspective. For each commodity, an analysis is made of how the social and economic conditions and changes in production have led to a demand for foreign migrant labour. The produce and activities featured in this analysis are tea, hazelnut, apricot, citrus fruit, cotton and vegetable production and livestock rearing. For all of these activities, it may be said that the basic tenets of rural transformation - emigration to urban areas, the ageing population and smaller land holdings - make the use of paid labour a necessity.

The working conditions and practices of foreign migrant workers are examined in the third section. This section encompasses working conditions, agricultural intermediaries, pay, shelter, periods of work and the experiences of women and children as workers in seasonal agricultural production. The working conditions characteristic of seasonal agricultural work apply equally well to domestic as well as foreign workers and are the basic
cause of the social exclusion of various groups who work in agricultural production.

The fourth section treats the significance of foreign migrant workers in seasonal agricultural production in terms of the nature of agricultural production and the changing social structure of Turkey, the social and kinship networks foreign migrants use to access agricultural jobs, the competition among different migrant groups and finally the rural encounters among different ethnic, religious and cultural groups.

In conclusion, this report seeks to draw attention to the foreign migrant labour engaging in seasonal agricultural work in Turkey and the impact of this labour on social dynamism and change in Turkey while at the same time shedding light on the work and living experiences of the foreign migrant workers. Seasonal agricultural production in Turkey is a dynamic sector open to change, in which domestic and foreign workers, women and children play active parts. Therefore the overall objective of the report is to contribute to the betterment of the living and working conditions of workers in this sector.
The field study covered foreign migrant workers engaged in the production of various goods in various provinces as part of the phenomenon of seasonal agricultural production. One of the basic findings is that the migrants come mostly from three source countries. These are Georgia, Azerbaijan and Syria. While Georgian workers are employed intensively in both hazelnut and tea production in the Black Sea provinces of Ordu, Giresun, Rize Trabzon and Artvin, Azerbaijani workers furnish the seasonal agricultural labour for activities such as fodder cutting in the provinces of Kars and Ardahan, where livestock keeping is predominant. The third group consists of Syrian citizens under temporary protection in Turkey, whose numbers have increased rapidly since 2011 and now approach three million. While it is well known that Syrian migrants occupy an important place in the labour market in Turkey, the foreign migrant labour map prepared for this study using previous studies, field observations, previous field work and a review of media coverage shows that Syrians are employed in almost every form of arable farming and livestock rearing activity. During the field study, Syrians were observed to be widely employed in the harvest of apricots, citrus fruits, cotton, vegetables and pistachios in the provinces of Malatya, Mersin, Adana, Urfa and Gaziantep. In the provinces of Malatya and Ankara, Syrians as well as other foreign migrant workers from Central Asian countries were observed to be employed in the care of livestock.

Workers from Georgia, Azerbaijan and Syria form an important part of the labour supply for seasonal agricultural activities in Turkey. This section of the report examines migration movements from Georgia, Azerbaijan and Syria to Turkey and will debate the nature of the connection between these migration movements to Turkey and seasonal agricultural production.

Migration from Georgia to Turkey

Having joined the USSR in 1921, Georgia became an independent state in 1991 following the collapse of the former. The country’s main economic activities are agriculture and mining, and it is energy dependent. In 2014, per capita national income was USD6,000. Political instability, economic tumult and civil wars have caused population movements. A quarter of a million Georgians were forced to migrate as a result of the conflicts in Abkhazia and South Ossetia in the 1990s (Badurashvili 2012:2). These factors
have also led to significant numbers of Georgians leaving their country.

According to the International Organisation for Migration, Georgia generally sends migrants to Russia, the USA, Austria, Greece, Germany and Turkey (IOM 2008: 11). Although historical ties are important in determining these movements, the economic crisis which overlapped with the independence process of the 1990s has caused negative population growth for Georgia. According to IOM data, the country’s population had fallen by 20 per cent in 2002 compared to 1989. The 2014 census has shown that the trend continued from 2002 to 2014, when the population declined by a further 14.7 per cent to 3.7 million (Agenda, 2015). These data reflect the high numbers of emigrants who have been leaving Georgia over a long period of time.

Due to the resettlement of Muslim Georgians in some provinces of the Black Sea region under the Ottomans following the Crimean War in the 19th century, some citizens of the Republic of Turkey are of Georgian descent. Both the geographical proximity of Georgia and Turkey and the presence of a Georgian population in Turkey have strengthened the population movements between the two countries since Georgia’s independence. The visa exemption regime implemented to develop ties between the two countries allows for citizens of each country to visit the other without a visa for a maximum period of 90 days out of every 180 days. As part of a protocol signed on May 31st 2011, the citizens of the two countries can enter the other country without a passport, using their national ID cards.

One consequence of the liberal visa regime between the two countries may be observed in the number of Georgians arriving in Turkey. Given the population of Georgia, the figures in Table 4 are indicative of a great movement of population between Georgia and Turkey.

Table 4. Entries and exits of Georgians from Turkey (2000-2014)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years</th>
<th>Entry</th>
<th>Exit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>180,480</td>
<td>166,748</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>367,148</td>
<td>356,995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>1,109,615</td>
<td>1,094,619</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>1,149,362</td>
<td>1,138,870</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>1,404,882</td>
<td>1,393,971</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>1,769,447</td>
<td>1,755,484</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>1,755,289</td>
<td>1,736,134</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Even if one were to assume that nearly two million Georgians enter and exit Turkey under the tourist visa-free regime, it is entirely possible that some enter the labour market in Turkey, then return to their countries when the period they are allowed to stay for is over and return once they become eligible for visa-free travel again as part of what is termed cyclical or shuttle migration. Badurashvili (2012) states that migration has become a “national strategy” used to deal with political and economic instability and that short-term shuttle migration has grown as permanent migration to traditional receiving countries has declined.

A 2003 study carried out by IOM with 600 households showed that at least one individual from every household was working in a foreign country. It can be claimed that short-term cyclical migration is the basic characteristic of Georgian migration to Turkey and that seasonal agricultural production offers various income earning opportunities for these migrants.

According to the Enhancing the Role of Georgian Emigrants at Home - ERGEM (2014) report, a significant Georgian population has been resident in Turkey historically. They have been joined by Georgians arriving in recent waves of migration. It is emphasised that these recent waves should be described as cases of short-term, cyclical and seasonal labour migration. Due to the limitations of the Georgian labour market, which fails especially to generate jobs for women, and rising demand for domestic labour from households in Turkey, female labour migration has increased. It is noted that Georgians take advantage of the liberal visa regime.

The results of the study presented in the ERGEM report indicate a high level of education among the Georgians in Turkey. However, it has been pointed out that the study was carried out in large cities such as Istanbul and did not cover Georgians engaged in agricultural production, and that educated Georgians may therefore be over-represented.

A majority of the Georgians who participated in the ERGEM study stated that they entered Turkey through the Sarp Border Crossing, and 51 per cent said that they stayed in Turkey for the visa-free duration, without getting a work permit. As a result, Georgians are employed mainly in low-paid, physically difficult jobs or in domestic services.

Female migrants were found to arrive in Turkey specifically for domestic service work, while those looking for seasonal work are in demand in the hazelnut and tea harvest and construction work. 66 per cent of Georgian migrants think they are overqualified for their jobs. The fact that a third of
Georgian citizens want to obtain Turkish citizenship indicates a belief that this would reduce their adjustment problems (ERGEM 2014:28).

The figures for movement of people from Georgia to Turkey, as well as previous studies, make clear that high numbers of Georgian migrants are engaged in various areas of the labour market in Turkey. Regarding migrants engaged in seasonal agricultural labour, both the report of the Association of Tea Manufacturer Businessmen (ÇAYSİAD) and the study by Çigerçi, Ulukan and Ulukan (2011) show that Georgian workers are engaged in the tea and hazelnut harvest. While Georgian workers are employed exclusively in the tea harvest, in hazelnut picking the dominance of domestic workers from south eastern Turkey continues, despite the sustained increase in the number of Georgian workers over recent years. Although it is difficult to estimate the number of Georgian workers engaged in these activities, the monthly breakdown of entries via the Sarp Border Crossing increase with the onset of the period of the hazelnut and tea harvests.

**Graph 3.** Number of entries by land at the Artvin-Sarp Border Crossing (2014-2015)

As shown in Graph 3, entries through the Sarp Border Crossing increase with the onset of the summer, especially in May, peak in August and then fall off gradually. The tea harvest, which begins in May-June, can be seen as a factor that boosts the entries of Georgians through the border crossing. The exact coincidence of the three monthly rounds of the tea harvest and the three-month visa-free period for which Georgian citizens are allowed to stay may lead one to think that the visa waiver granted to Georgians is in a sense for purposes of seasonal agricultural production. The Tea Region Employment Report of ÇAYSİAD states that Georgians are employed in tea production, centred around Rize and Artvin and adds, “[Georgians] are employed in all tea-related activities, including hauling. The annual cost of this group, which is estimated to have numbered 16,000 in 2013 and 12,000 in 2014, is 125 million dollars” (ÇAYSİAD, 2015). There is no indication of how these figures were arrived at; they can be considered a reflection of ÇAYSİAD’s experiences in the field. Given that Georgians also arrive in the Black Sea region for the hazelnut harvest, the number of Georgians coming to Turkey to participate in seasonal agricultural production can be assumed to be much higher.
Sarp Border Crossing

As one approaches the Sarp Border Crossing, traffic picks up and one comes across small stores in tents and sheds on the outskirts of the small town of Kemalpaşa. These shops sell many goods from textiles to detergent and shopkeepers are seen waiting for customers. The first indicator of the border are the skyscrapers of Batumi, seen in the distance behind the fog. The heavy traffic contains many passenger coaches and vehicles with Georgian number plates, which are hard to miss. The Sarp Border Crossing is where the heaviest traffic of people between Turkey and Georgia takes place. It is the crossing through which Turks enter Georgia and Georgians enter Turkey.

As one nears the border, the heavy vehicular traffic is joined by pedestrians, who have either just crossed into Turkey and are waiting for busses to their destinations or are walking towards the checkpoints on the Georgian side with their luggage. There are long lines of people before every police officer checking IDs; migrants, mainly women, who wave their white ID cards impatiently as they wait to hand it over to an officer. The practised movements of those walking towards the border with bags in hand indicate that they have carried out the journey many times and that crossing the border is routine.
Migration from Azerbaijan to Turkey

Azerbaijan became independent of the USSR in October 1991. Political turmoil, economic difficulties caused by leaving the union and the war with Armenia characterised the transition period of Azerbaijan between 1988 and 1994. Due to the presidential system, political authority is concentrated in the hands of the president. Current President Ilham Aliyev is the son of former president Haydar Aliyev. Haydar Aliyev was in power in Azerbaijan from 1969 until his death in 2003 and his son Ilham Aliyev became president in October 2003 in an election the legitimacy of which has been contested.

The Azerbaijani economy relies on oil and agriculture. In 2015, the population numbered around 9.6 million. During the years of transformation, the country saw its population growth rate slow down and even dip into negative territory. For example, while the rate of population growth was 3 per cent between 1959 and 1970, it was only 0.8 per cent between 1999 and 2004. With emigration falling and the birth rate easing in 2004–2006, the rate of population growth slowly rose to 1 per cent. Birth rates have risen from 13.8 per thousand to 17.8 per thousand. In the 1990s the rate of urbanisation fell with the splitting up of some ethnic groups, but urbanisation has picked up from 2003 onwards. Overall, the rate of urbanisation fell from 53.9 per cent in 1989 to 51.5 per cent in 2006 (Dedeoğlu and Gökmen, 2011). As these points show, Azerbaijan has a highly mobile population.

Turkey has been a popular destination for Azerbaijanis since the 1990s. In many provinces, the presence of Azerbaijanis is a common fact of daily life. Azerbaijanis can be encountered on popular TV shows. The high level of social acceptance is a result of Azerbaijanis being of Turkic origin and speaking Turkish. In its 2001 report, the International Organisation for Migration cited the ease of travelling to Turkey and staying there as factors of attraction for Azerbaijani migration. The ethnic, historical, cultural and social ties between the two countries were revived following the independence of Azerbaijan. After independence, Turkey came to be visited by thousands of Azerbaijanis, either for leisure or for work. Another factor making Azerbaijani migration to Turkey easier is the visa agreement, according to which Azerbaijani citizens can obtain a Turkish visa at border crossings. Besides the ease of travel by air, there are direct coach services between Turkey and Azerbaijan. Direct coaches can be boarded for Turkey from the Autonomous Zone of Nakhchivan, Baku and Ganja. For migrants coming to Turkey mainly for economic reasons, these are attractive conditions. For Azer-
Azerbaijanis looking to travel further west, Turkey is the country that is closest to the west among Azerbaijan’s neighbours.

The same report also points out that the similarities in culture, language and tradition between Turks and Azerbaijanis make it easier for the latter to adjust after they have migrated. The tolerant and positive approach of the domestic population and of the authorities in Turkey towards Azerbaijanis ensures that many of the problems faced by migrants in a foreign country are not experienced by Azerbaijanis in Turkey. According to the report, Azerbaijanis make better use of such privileges compared to other foreigners. The report mentions several forms of migration from Azerbaijan to Turkey, including general migration, labour migration, transit migration and migration for marriage. The report states that while men may engage in small-scale trade and tourism activities, women care for children and the sick in the services sector (IOM 2001).

It is quite difficult to identify the characteristics and places of residence of the Azerbaijani citizens who live in Turkey temporarily or arrive for a short stay. It is a known fact that these individuals continue to stay after their visa duration has expired and become irregular migrants. Azerbaijanis generally live in Istanbul, Izmir, Trabzon and places close to the Azerbaijani border. Istanbul is a large city where the flow of migration of irregular migrants cannot easily be regulated, and many Azerbaijanis prefer to work there. Those who come to Turkey to work in seasonal or temporary jobs are generally from the Autonomous Zone of Nakhchivan. The second largest group is made up of educated people and consists of students and professionals (IOM 2001).

The thirty-day visa given to Azerbaijanis at border crossings has vitalised relations between the two countries and has led to a rise in the number of Azerbaijanis entering Turkey over the years. The numbers of entries from Azerbaijan to Turkey are given in Table 5 below.

The number of those entering Turkey from Azerbaijan increased rapidly in the early 2000s onwards and surpassed 650,000 in 2014. Not all of these arrivals were for tourism

**Table 5:** Entries and exits of Azerbaijanis from Turkey (2000-2014)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Entry</th>
<th>Exit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>182,124</td>
<td>153,319</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>411,111</td>
<td>400,132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>484,922</td>
<td>475,981</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>576,230</td>
<td>563,022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>593,238</td>
<td>585,513</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>630,754</td>
<td>624,536</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>657,684</td>
<td>651,007</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

purposes and they include persons arriving to work in Turkey’s large informal sector. The study by Dedeoğlu and Gökmen details the struggle of Azerbaijanis in Istanbul, how women and children are turned into workers in the ready-to-wear manufacturing sector, how Azerbaijani migrants are excluded from institutional life in Turkey and how they experience being migrants and foreigners in the periphery of Istanbul (Dedeoğlu and Ekiz Gökmen 2011). The ease with which they learn Turkish, their Islamic faith and the “one nation” discourse make it easier for Azerbaijanis to remain in Turkey and to become accepted. For these reasons, there are many Azerbaijani workers in informal jobs in the Turkish labour market.

Nakhchivan, from which a significant number of Azerbaijanis in Turkey arrive, is not contiguous with the main territory of Azerbaijan but is an autonomous zone under it. The zone neighbours Turkey, Iran and Armenia. Entries to Turkey from Azerbaijan by land take place at the Dilucu Border Crossing in the province of Iğdır and significant numbers of Azerbaijanis enter every year. In 2014, there were 206,000 entries from Nakhchivan, which has a population of 400,000. During the field study, Azerbaijani migrants from Nakhchivan were observed to work in seasonal agricultural production and various other jobs in Kars and Ardahan. Given that there is a settled Azerbaijani population in this region, it may be surmised that Turkish citizens of Azerbaijani origin who live in Kars and Ardahan either employ their relatives or otherwise provide employment opportunities for them.
Most entries into Turkey via the Dilucu Border Crossing ought to be considered to be made for purposes of work. The entries at this border crossing equal around one third of all entries from Azerbaijan. Based on these numbers, it can be asserted that a significant proportion of Azerbaijanis who enter Turkey are engaged in irregular and cyclical migration. Cyclical population movements, according to Erder, are movements of population which appear in regions under liberal visa policies, in which participants do not aim at a long-term stay but travel for business, work or trade purposes (Erder 2007:45). The monthly breakdown of entries via the Dilucu Border Crossing shows that the highest entries coincide with the peak period for seasonal agricultural work: August, which is the month with the most entries, is also the month in which fodder is cut in Kars and Ardahan.
One Nation, Two States: “We are Brothers, Turkey is the Father of the Turks”

In a coffeeshop we enter in the district of Göle in Kars, hoping to encounter Azerbaijani agricultural workers, a middle-aged Azerbaijani man somewhat reluctantly agrees to talk. He says that he has been coming and going to Turkey for years and that he rents a house in Göle. His children too travel between the two countries. He says, “It is easy to travel to and fro, with Nakhchivan being close.” He speaks at length about how much he likes how Turkey, how it is a world-important state and how Turkey is the “father of the Turks”. This manner of speech, which almost all Azerbaijani migrants use, serves to show that having arrived in Turkey, Azerbaijanis are not migrants but “one of us.” The common language and religion, the historical ties between the two countries and the fact of being Turkish is thought to make the two brothers under one nation. No need is therefore felt for the “them and us” distinction one would use for foreigners. The discourse of kinship is something Azerbaijanis use especially when they come up against unwanted controls. They often employ the rhetoric that the father Turkish state would not mistreat its children who are working for their bread.
Children harvesting in the fields
Syrian Refugees in Turkey

The flow of Syrian refugees to Turkey began on April 29th 2011, when 250-300 Syrian citizens fleeing the fighting in their country applied for asylum. As part of the decision which it had taken in 2009 to lift visa requirements for Syrian citizens, Turkey adopted an “open door” policy towards the refugee crisis and established camps for the shelter of refugees in the province of Hatay (Öner, 2014). On this issue, Turkey acted in line with international law and universal human rights by following an open door policy for those escaping the fighting and implementing the principle of non-refoulement. Syrians in Turkey were given temporary protection, in accordance with international law (Erdoğan and Ünver 2015).

As a result of the civil war in Syria, 11 million of the country’s population of 23 million have become reliant on humanitarian aid for their survival, seven million people have been internally displaced and millions of Syrian citizens have had to flee to neighbouring countries. Turkey is the country that houses the greatest number of Syrian refugees. According to data from the UN High Commission for Refugees which Erdoğan and Ünver reference in their report, of the 4,180,631 registered Syrian refugees abroad as of November 2nd 2015, 50 per cent were in Turkey. In terms of numbers of Syrian refugees, Turkey is followed by Lebanon with 25 per cent (1,078,338), Jordan with 12 per cent (629,627), (Northern) Iraq with 5 per cent (245,585) and Egypt with 3 per cent (128,019). The number of Syrian refugees in countries not neighbouring Syria (with the exception of Egypt, which is in the same region), such as the EU, the USA and Canada, is thought to be less than 200,000 and proportionally between 4 and 5 percent of the total number of Syrian refugees (Erdoğan and Ünver 2015:18-19).

According to data from the General Directorate of Migration Management of the Ministry of the Interior, there were 2,733,284 Syrian refugees in Turkey as of March 4th 2016. Among them 272,670 were being housed in temporary accommodation centres, while the rest resided outside these centres (Migration Management, 2016). Today Syrians are to be found in all provinces of Turkey. They try to survive by working in temporary jobs, collecting aid in the street and receiving social assistance. The cities of Şanlıurfa, Hatay, Istanbul and Gaziantep each host more than 300,000 Syrian refugees, which is a very high figure in proportion to the resident population of these provinces.

A total of 272,670 Syrians are living in 25 camps in 10 provinces of Turkey, which are known as temporary accommodation centres. Over the last five
The map illustrates the number of Syrians taken by host countries. The largest number of refugees is in Turkey (4,180,631), followed by Jordan (1,078,338), Egypt (773,284), Lebanon (245,585), and Iraq (629,627). Other countries include Jordan (14,237), Turkey (128,019), and Lebanon (224,655).

The data shows a steady increase in the number of refugees from 2011 to 2016, with the highest number in Turkey in 2013 (2,773,284).
years, more than 500,000 people have temporarily resided in these camps before leaving of their own volition to return to Syria or to live outside of the camps in Turkey. Although the camps in Turkey have high standards, they have in time turned into isolated settlements with limited opportunities for work. For this reason, only the poorest and groups in need of special protection, such as Yazidis, continue to live in camps (Erdoğan and Ünver 2015).

One of the most conspicuous characteristics of the Syrian refugees in Turkey is that 54.2 per cent of the population consists of children under the age of 18. Very roughly put, this means that more than one million Syrians in Turkey are children. Due to structural problems and their high numbers, the rate of schooling of Syrian children between the ages of 6 and 18 is very low at 15-20 per cent. Erdoğan and Ünver (2015) point out that conservative Syrian families from rural backgrounds strongly resist sending their daughters to school past the age of 12-13, whereas the low schooling of boys is due to many of them working informally. The presence of such a young population is significant for social adjustment, education and employment policies and needs to be kept at the focus of policies towards the integration of Syrians.

**Legal Status of Syrians: Refugees or Not?**

The legislation on refugees in Turkey is shaped by the 1951 Geneva Convention on the Legal Status of Refugees. Turkey became a party to the additional protocol of 1967 with a geographical reservation under which it only grants the status of refugee to those people from Europe who apply for refugee status on account of fear of persecution in their home countries due to their race, nationality, religion, membership of a particular social group or political opinions (UNHCR, 2015). Those arriving from places other than Europe may be sheltered temporarily and given the status of temporary asylum seekers. The applications of those arriving from outside of Europe are assessed by the UNHCR and those granted refugee status are settled in third countries by the UNHCR. In this framework, Turkey has not granted the status of refugee to arrivals from Syria and has defined them as “guests” since they first started arriving. However, in terms of rights, the concept “guest” has no place in international law, which leads to the risk of arbitrary practices (Öner, 2014). For this reason, special arrangements have been made for the benefit of Syrians in Turkey through the issue of regulations and circulars.
Map 3. Syrians under Temporary Protection living in Temporary Accommodation Centers in Turkey (2016, March)

Source: General Directorate of Migration Management

54.2% < age 18 > 45.8%
Under Regulation No. 6883 on Temporary Protection (dated 22.10.2014), Syrians were given temporary protection and were issued ID cards. According to Erdoğan and Ünver, two methods are used to register Syrians and to establish their status. The first group consists of those who have entered Turkey regularly with a valid passport through a customs gate. Under the Law on Foreigners, these people are considered “foreigners” who may be able to obtain residence permits and work permits. However, those falling into this group make up only 80,000 of the almost 3 million Syrians who have arrived in Turkey. The main group are those “Syrians who have entered irregularly and who have been given temporary protection status under the legislation in Turkey” (Erdoğan and Ünver 2015: 30). The registration of those living in Turkey outside of camps is intended to create a system which ensures their access to certain public services. An attempt has been made to develop a system in which access to public services headed by For free healthcare, medicine and emergency aid requires recipients to be registered.

It is unclear for how long the increasing number of Syrian under temporary protection in Turkey will continue to live under this status. According to UNHCR principles, temporary status should not be excessively extended. Yet as it is not currently safe for them to return to their country, with the fighting in Syria continuing, it is likely that many Syrians will remain in Turkey for a long period under temporary protection status. A significant proportion of Syrians admitted to Turkey as guests have settled down. While high-income Syrians intend to settle in Western countries and some of the economically disadvantaged are trying to reach European countries, a significant number are expected to stay in Turkey for the long term (Lordoğlu and Aslan 2015).

**Syrians in the Labour Market in Turkey**

The greatest problems in Turkey’s labour market are structural unemployment and informal work. 40 per cent of employment is informal. The increasing complaints of employers to the effect that “[they] cannot find workers to employ” is an indicator that the jobs currently available in the labour
market are not in high demand among workers. With the inclusion of more than two million Syrian migrants in a labour market with such structural problems, the large informal sector has come to offer work opportunities for Syrian migrants. The frankest statement about the employment of Syrian migrants in Turkey was made by former Minister for Family and Social Policies Fatma Şahin, who, while serving as the mayor of Gaziantep, said “The 140,000 Syrians in Gaziantep have been a blessing for the factories” (Hürriyet, 2014). The media review carried out for this study also shows that Syrian migrants are employed in almost every province and in the production of almost all kinds of produce in agriculture. It is well known that Syrians under temporary protection work in the informal sector, even they do not hold working permits.

According to the study by Erdoğan and Ünver (2015), the 80,000 Syrians who reside in Turkey with a residence permit are entitled to apply for work permits, but the rights to work of the remaining Syrians, who are under temporary protection status, is governed by the Regulation on Work Permits for Foreigners Under Temporary Protection. The articles of this circular relevant to seasonal agricultural labour are as follows:

**Article 5** - (4) Foreigners wishing to work in seasonal agriculture and livestock jobs are covered by the exemption from work permits. Applications for exemption from work permit applications are to be made to the office of the governor of the province where temporary protection is afforded. These applications will be reported by the relevant governor’s office to the Ministry.

(5) The Ministry may impose limitations by province and through quotas for foreigners under temporary protection who are allowed to work in seasonal agriculture and livestock jobs.

**Article 9** - (2) The exemptions from work permits granted for foreigners under temporary protection status who are deemed fit to work in agriculture and livestock jobs will be communicated to the relevant governor’s office.

**Article 10** - (1) Foreigners under temporary protection cannot be paid wages below the minimum wage.

The economic activities of those migrating from Syria to Turkey differ in keeping with the significant differences among their levels of income. According to the study by Lordoğlu and Aslan (2015), Syrians engage in the labour market in three ways. One group consists of those who set up their own firms or establish firms in partnership with investors from Turkey, while a second group work as independent traders or artisans. The third and the largest group is formed by wage labourers.
Of the Syrians who applied for a work permit in Turkey between 2011 and 2012, the applications of 3,175 individuals were accepted.

Another interesting economic activity carried out by Syrians has been the establishment of their own firms. According to a report by the newspaper Dünya dated September 3, 2015, there are estimated to be more than 10,000 Syrian owned firms in Turkey, including those which have cleared legal obstacles through the inclusion of a Turkish partner and those which operate informally:

More than 60 per cent of Syrian firms operate in Istanbul. According to official figures, 1,709 of the total number of 2,827 Syrian firms in Turkey are in Istanbul. There are 471 Syrian-owned firms registered in Gaziantep, 250 in Hatay, 70 in Kilis, 56 in Şanlıurfa and 22 in Kahramanmaraş. These firms operate as members of chambers of trade and industry. In terms of sector, 978 Syrian firms in Turkey engage in wholesale trade. Repair and maintenance firms number 606. In construction, 288 such firms are active (Dünya, 2015).

Some Syrians start firms registered under the names of Turkish citizens and the numbers of these are unknown. During the field study, small
shops serving Syrian customers were identified in the provinces of Mersin, Gaziantep, Adana and Şanlıurfa. Many businesses including bakeries, fast-food stalls, grocers, barbers, jewellers and others are run informally and invisibly by Syrians for mainly Syrian customers. Syrians are also widely employed in organised industrial zone-type manufacturing jobs in Turkey (Dedeoğlu 2015). Syrians who have settled in Bursa have adapted to the city’s widespread textiles, clothing and weaving sectors and are managing nearly 100 subcontractor businesses informally (Erdoğan and Ünver 2015).

**Graph 6.** Sectors in which registered Syrian owned firms in Turkey concentrate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sector</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wholesale trade excluding motorised vehicles</td>
<td>978</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail repair of household goods</td>
<td>606</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>288</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation, travel agencies</td>
<td>177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real estate</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other business</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotels and catering</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land transportation</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Textile goods manufacturing</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Furniture and other manufacturing</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The circumstances under which Syrians have entered Turkey, whether legally or irregularly, have forced them to work in jobs which fall far outside the definition of decent jobs (Dedeoğlu ve Şahankaya 2014). Informal employment under tough working conditions does not provide workers with the necessary income to lead healthy lives, and this is even more of a problem for Syrians in Turkey. Akdeniz (2014) has stated that as they do not have residence and work permits, Syrian refugees work without social security coverage and are paid less than Turkish workers. This makes Syrian workers in Turkey doubly insecure and defenceless.

The assessment made by Lordoğlu and Aslan (2015) of the participation of Syrian refugees in the labour market in the province of Hatay shows that Syrians are the new occupants of the lowest-paid work positions in Turkey:
In agriculture, jobs carried out by Syrian migrants include different categories of work such as hoeing, seeding, seasonal work and the gathering of produce. The migrants working in these jobs are generally understood to have been farmers in their own country. In agriculture, in which they participate as daily labourers, their wages are lower than those of local workers and the employer deducts the intermediary’s share before payment. In non-agricultural sectors, Syrian workers are employed in manufacturing industry, construction and services. The jobs they work in are generally low-qualified and unwanted by domestic workers, as in other provinces in the region. Employers often speak of the low level of wages, saying, “It is better to employ two Syrians rather than one local worker.” Employment is concentrated in construction and seasonal agricultural labour (Lordoğlu and Aslan 2015:255).

Syrian migrants are generally employed in agriculture in eastern provinces, while in Istanbul they work in textiles workshops. One of the most important issues Syrian workers face in working life is the language barrier. For Syrian migrants, not to speak Turkish is to be unemployed. Even those who practised a profession in Syria can go unemployed in Turkey because they do not speak Turkish (Akdeniz 2014). In terms of working conditions, it is observed that Syrian workers work for lower pay compared to domestic workers. Akdeniz recounts what he was told by one interviewee he spoke to in Istanbul: “Half of the thirty workers in our workplace were Syrians. They pay Syrians 100 or 70 liras less than domestic workers” (Akdeniz 2014:35). The situation in Istanbul applies to Syrian migrants throughout Turkey. In the context of the present study, interviews at an apricot processing plant in the Organised Industrial Zone in Malatya established that the number of informal Syrian em-
ployees was three times the number of local workers, and that the reason why they were preferred by the employers was that they cost a quarter of what formally employed domestic workers cost.

The most common complaint among Syrian workers regarding the labour market concerns employers who do not pay their wages or who pay them late. They state that after three or four months of regular pay, they are paid very little and often not at all (Akdeniz 2014:23). Another problem is very long working hours. For example, Fatima, a Syrian woman resident in Hatay, recounted that her husband worked between 8 a.m. and 10 p.m. at a restaurant and was fired after demanding two hours of rest.

The lack of decent working conditions for Syrians clearly shows that Turkey is not so much a place of escape for them as a new scene of struggle. The labour market experiences of many Syrian migrants resemble those of workers who are citizens of Turkey. Their foremost problem is that they cannot launch complaints, as they are not registered. Just as they cannot make any demands should they suffer a workplace accident or professional hazard, neither can they ensure that any action is taken should their employer not pay their wages. While this amounts to violent exploitation of labour, it also brings with it the risk of unrest. It may be difficult to prevent Syrian workers who have no legal means of demanding their rights from doing harm to their employers, the workplace and equipment. One such incident is known to have occurred in a subcontractor workshop in Çağlayan, Istanbul, where 30 workers who were not paid for months took over the machines in the workshop. The employer reported them to the police and accused them of theft (Akdeniz, 2014).
Conclusion

A large number of foreign migrant workers enter Turkey in various ways, and there is evidence that a significant proportion of them are employed informally. This report has taken up the experiences of three different groups of workers in seasonal agricultural production. The largest of these groups consists of Syrian refugees, who have come to constitute the most dynamic factor of social transformation in Turkey in recent years. This group of migrants, who are thought likely to be permanent, form an important pool of seasonal agricultural labour given their numbers and activities in the labour market. The recent Regulation on Work Permits for Foreigners Under Temporary Protection has made foreigners under temporary protection who want to work in agriculture and livestock jobs exempt from work permits, so that they can be employed in keeping with quotas to be established by the governor’s office of the province where they reside. It is expected that the number of Syrian migrants engaged in seasonal agricultural production will increase in the period ahead.

Although Syrian migrants are the basic actors of seasonal agricultural production, it has been observed that large numbers of Georgian and Azerbaijani migrants also work in the production of certain agricultural goods. Azerbaijani and Georgian workers are employed in the hazelnut harvest, in which Syrian workers have not yet become involved intensively, and in the tea harvest and fodder cutting, activities in which the Syrians have not become involved at all. The fact that nearly two million persons enter Turkey from Georgia and 600,000 from Azerbaijan every year shows that the number of those arriving to work as part of cyclical migration is nearly as high as the potential labour of Syrian migrants.

The following section of the report analyses for each type of produce the conditions affecting demand for foreign migrant labour in seasonal agricultural production and the characteristics of the foreign migrant seasonal agricultural labourers themselves.
DEMAND FOR FOREIGN MIGRANT LABOUR IN SEASONAL AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTION: A PRODUCT-BASED ANALYSIS

The Report on the Present Situation of Foreign Migrant Workers in Seasonal Agricultural Production in Turkey examines demand for foreign migrant workers in seasonal agricultural production based on the type of produce for which they are employed. This product-based analysis helps to examine the socio-economic transformations which have created demand for foreign migrant workers in seasonal agricultural production, while allowing for greater focus on the characteristics of the foreign migrant workers. The products included in this analysis are tea, hazelnuts, cut fodder for livestock, livestock produce, apricots, citrus fruits, cotton and vegetables. These are some of the most widespread goods in agricultural production. They constitute the livelihood of millions of households and number among Turkey’s most significant exports.

In this section, we examine the conditions affecting demand for foreign migrant labour in seasonal agricultural production and therefore also focus on the place of the agricultural goods in question in the economy of Turkey, the dynamics of social change which have created demand for foreign migrant labour in the production of these items and the forms of labour employed in production. In this context, the production of tea, hazelnuts, livestock, apricots, citrus fruits, cotton and vegetables will be discussed in turn and a general overview will be given of the characteristics of the foreign migrant workers in these fields of production.

TEA: Green Gold from “Two-and-a-Half Leaves”

China is the world leader in tea production. Of all the tea in the world, 30 per cent is produced in China and 5 per cent in Turkey. Tea is grown in Turkey throughout the belt that stretches from the Georgian border to the east of the Black Sea region, to the district of Fatsa in the province of Ordu in the west. The tea growing region includes the provinces of Rize first and foremost, as well as Ordu, Giresun, Trabzon and Artvin. Tea cultivation in the belt between Ordu and Artvin takes place at an altitude of 600-700 metres above sea level, on a total land area of 760 million square metres, and involves 205,000 households. Tea is an important product for the people of this region and for Turkey as a whole. In 2014,
China is the leading producer of tea in the world, followed by India, Kenya, Sri Lanka and Turkey. While China accounts for 30 per cent of world production, Turkey produces 5 per cent of the world’s tea. Tea growing in Turkey takes place in the eastern Black Sea region, on 760 million square metres of land lying on an axis between the provinces of Ordu and Artvin at an altitude of 600-700 metres above sea level. 205,000 households are engaged in tea production. Tea is a source of income for around one million people. In 2014, Turkey’s production of fresh tea was 1.26 million tonnes. 56 per cent of this output was processed at 46 plants belonging to the state tea enterprise ÇAYKUR, while 44 per cent was processed at 151 privately owned plants. Tea production entails the picking of leaves, the transportation of tea leaves to processing plants and the leaves being processed into consumable state. Seasonal agricultural work is widespread during May (first harvest), July (second harvest) and September (third harvest). While Georgian workers are widely employed at the leaf picking stage of the harvest in the region, Syrian workers are encountered in the transportation stage. The processing stage at the plant usually employs formal, temporary workers.
1.26 million tonnes of fresh tea was produced (Table 8). 56 per cent of this yield was processed in 46 plants belonging to ÇAYKUR, while 44 per cent was processed in 151 privately owned plants (Rize Commodity Exchange, 2015).

**Table 6.** Tea production and production area in Turkey by year (1991-2014)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Total production area (1,000 square metres)</th>
<th>Total production (tonnes)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>886,390</td>
<td>682,858</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>893,450</td>
<td>724,383</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>893,300</td>
<td>578,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>767,910</td>
<td>654,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>766,090</td>
<td>523,465</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>767,430</td>
<td>600,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>767,550</td>
<td>752,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>767,520</td>
<td>978,589</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>767,490</td>
<td>1,095,532</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>767,500</td>
<td>758,038</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>766,530</td>
<td>824,946</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>766,450</td>
<td>791,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>766,400</td>
<td>869,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>766,320</td>
<td>1,105,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>766,250</td>
<td>1,192,004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>766,136</td>
<td>1,121,206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>765,808</td>
<td>1,145,321</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>758,257</td>
<td>1,100,257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>758,513</td>
<td>1,103,340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>758,641</td>
<td>1,305,566</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>758,895</td>
<td>1,231,141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>758,566</td>
<td>1,250,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>764,255</td>
<td>1,180,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>760,494</td>
<td>1,266,311</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: TURKSTAT online database

As can be seen from Table 6 above, the amount of tea produced has risen over the years. Tea consumption in Turkey has also grown steadily, as tea drinking is a significant part of everyday life. Tea is an important source of income for the region as it is the foremost agricultural product of the re-
The tea plant is harvested at three harvest times every year by clipping off the topmost shoots growing on the plant. The so-called “two-and-a-half leaves” of the plant, which grow on it last, are cut with scissors. The main periods of production are May (the first harvest), July (the second harvest) and September (the third harvest). The tea that is harvested is collected at tea collection centres, weighed and sent by trucks to processing plants. At the plants it is made ready for consumption. The tea leaves need to be processed into dry leaves as soon as possible once cut. Otherwise they will lose their desired characteristics. Accordingly, the harvest times are a period of intense activity in the tea-producing regions.

The stages prior to the delivery of the tea leaves to the plant – i.e., cutting and transportation, generate the most employment. Paid labour is needed not just for the harvesting of the tea leaves, but also for the transportation of freshly cut leaves to the plant and the related tasks of carrying and loading. For the processing of the tea, temporary workers are employed formally.
Socio-economic Transformation and Tea Production

There are two basic social dynamics which impact on tea production and demand for labour in tea production in the eastern Black Sea region. The first is that, historically, the region has been a source of migration to other parts of Turkey and abroad; the second is the transformation in land ownership. At times in which fluctuations in agricultural output have caused significant losses to the income of the local people their reflex has been to migrate to lower this risk. Every family has members who live outside of the region and as the numbers of those emigrating from the region has increased, the share of agricultural income in total family income has declined, and the number of families reliant solely on tea for their income has fallen. This development has been accompanied by the spread of small scale landownership as land has become divided by inheritance, and cultural codes have prevented its sale, deeming it “dishonourable” and a “betrayal of the family.” Individuals who have emigrated from the region have developed certain means of symbolising their attachment to their roots and places of origin. One of these is to have houses built in their native area, even if they do not live there, to symbolise their attachment. Secondly, the graves of elder members of the family have come to be located on the arable land. This is a strategy developed to prevent the sale of these lands to others and to ensure that the land remains in the family for generations.

Tea Leaves and Social Transformation

Hasan Bey is a retired teacher who lives in Istanbul most of the time. He has two children who live in Istanbul and Ankara. After his retirement, Hasan Bey began to travel frequently to his native village in Artvin to visit his parents and to help them with their agricultural activities. He harvests the tea grown on ten thousand square metres of land left him by his parents using Georgian migrant workers who arrive in the region for the tea harvest, employing them along with other members of his family. He says that he does not need the income from the tea harvest, but because selling off land is dishonourable, he comes to his village at harvest time and stays there until the tea harvest is over. The strong cultural codes of the region dictate for which work paid labour can be employed and which work the owners have to do themselves. For example, Hasan Bey says that he himself does the cutting in the tea field near his house, that he would be ashamed to employ workers for that field that he would be chastised if he were to employ workers for it.
Form of Labour and Seasonal Labour in Tea Production

The declining share of tea production in household income, intensive emigration and smaller land ownership have resulted in a significant part of tea production being undertaken by paid labour. A consequence of the migration away from the region is that the resident population is ageing and needs paid labour to continue tea production.

The use of paid labour in tea production, which traditionally consisted of household labour or of villagers living higher up the slopes working seasonally to cut the tea grown in lower regions, has in time diversified into various forms of paid labour.

A report by the Association of Tea Manufacturer Businessmen (ÇAYSİAD) identifies five forms of harvest labour (ÇAYSİAD 2015):

*Those who collect their own tea*: Those who own tea fields and harvest the tea themselves. An important proportion of the household income of these people is based on income from tea leaves. Most of the labourers are women and young people without social security.

*Local workers*: Workers resident in the area who are familiar with tea production and who are employed at every stage of production from planting to the harvest. They are employed informally and what they do is temporary work for them.
Contractors ("halfers"): These people do not own tea fields. They carry out the harvest on behalf of the field owner. In keeping with the agreement they make with the owner, they receive a percentage of the harvest. These workers usually travel from other provinces to tea-producing areas. Some reside constantly in houses provided by the field owners so that they can carry out field maintenance continuously. The majority, however, return to their own homes in other provinces once the harvest is over.

Migrant seasonal agricultural workers: These are workers who arrive only for the tea harvest, work without social security and have poor shelter conditions. They return to their places of origin once the tea harvest is over. With the involvement of foreign migrant workers in the tea harvest, the number of these migrant seasonal agricultural workers has declined considerably.

Foreign migrant workers: These are workers who come from abroad, mainly from Georgia and Azerbaijan, and are employed informally. Their numbers are rising. They work in the tea harvest, tea transportation jobs, fodder cutting and shepherding.

Although there are diverse forms of labour as outlined above, over recent years foreign migrant workers, especially Georgians, have increasingly become the sole provider of seasonal labour and at harvest time the region receives an influx of Georgian workers. The withdrawal of the local population from labour in tea production has increased demand for the Georgian workers. The intensive employment of Georgians in the tea harvest has caused labour costs to rise compared to other products. In interviews with local producers, mention was often made of the competition among them to find workers in the summer months and the resulting upward pressure on wages. When wages rose to a level that local leaders and producers found unacceptable, an Oversight Committee was formed in Rize before the start of the 2015 harvest and the committee decided that workers should be paid TRY70 per day. However, in practice, the wages paid to workers rose well above TRY70, and some were employed for as much as TRY100-110 per day. According to ÇAYSİAD, the total payments made to Georgian labour annually amount to USD125 million (ÇAYSİAD 2015). This represents a considerable contribution to the economy of Georgia, as well as a significant component of the individual incomes and life strategies of foreign migrant workers.

As the tea harvest is seen as a job without social security for the young people and especially the women of the region, it does not offer the prospect of stable employment, and many locals therefore avoid taking it up.
as a main occupation. With local labour withdrawing from the field, the gap has increasingly been filled by foreign migrant workers and in recent years, most of the harvest has been entrusted to the Georgian workers. The use of foreign migrant workers is not limited to cutting tea leaves: subcontractors awarded loading jobs at ÇAYKUR buying stations sometimes employ foreign migrant workers. The ÇAYSİAD report argues that the involvement of foreign workers in the tea harvest has caused problems that are so serious that they could endanger the future of tea production:

Foreign workers have recently started to be engaged in tea growing as contractors. This has brought with it the prospect of instability in the tea industry, lower efficiency and poorer aroma as these people collect tea only for profit. Since they have come to prefer collecting tea by the kilo, the tea bushes are in danger of being damaged (ÇAYSİAD 2015).

Although some might view the foreign migrant labour as an economic threat, the employment of Georgians in the region nevertheless remains a very common practice.

Characteristics of Foreign Migrants Workers in Tea

Georgian workers generally arrive in groups to engage in the tea harvest. The routine of coming to work for the same field owner(s) every year, that is characteristic of seasonal agricultural labour in general, holds for the tea harvest too. Most Georgian workers reside in village houses or in huts in the tea fields that are provided by a field owner or by the village as a whole, and harvest the tea in all the fields of the village one after the other. Experience of tea cutting and growing tea in their own countries furnishes Georgian workers with a significant advantage. Nevertheless, there are many Georgian workers who learned to cut tea leaves in Turkey.

The tough working conditions and the difficulty of cutting tea on high and steep slopes are important factors contributing to the high wage level. Women as well as men engage in the tea harvest. During the field study, no child labour was observed in the harvest of tea leaves.
HAZELNUTS: Brown Gold by the Black Sea

Turkey is the world leader in the production of hazelnuts and accounts for 75 per cent of world output. Hazelnuts can be consumed on their own as snacks. They also have a wide range of uses in cakes and desserts. However, most of the hazelnuts produced in Turkey are exported around the world to be used in the chocolate industry. Hazelnuts grown in Ordu and Giresun are particularly favoured as primary inputs in the chocolate industry.

Hazelnuts are the most commonly grown hard-shelled fruits in the world after almonds. The largest producers of hazelnuts are Turkey, Italy, the USA, Spain and the Caucasian countries. In hazelnut growing countries other than Turkey, the groves tend to be on flat land and the use of machinery in the hazelnut harvest is commonplace. Because it is a primary input for chocolate manufacturing, the production of hazelnuts has been rising steadily. For example, while world production of unshelled hazelnuts amounted to 250,000 tonnes in 1960, by 2015, it had reached 1 million tonnes (Turkish Grain Board, 2015).

In Turkey, hazelnuts are produced in 39 provinces, mostly in the Black Sea region. Only hazelnuts produced in the Black Sea provinces are traded internationally. 395,000 households registered with the Farmer Registration System produce hazelnuts on a total of 7 billion square metres of land. (Turkish Grain Board, 2015)

In a newsletter prepared by Özer Akbaşlı, a hazelnut producer in the province of Giresun, hazelnut farmers are described as follows:

The farmers are a miserable lot who produce in their own name and to their own gain, derive their yield from the sweat of their brows and aim at surviving for a year with what income they can make. There are thought to be 650,000 such operations throughout the country.6

The fact that Turkey’s Black Sea region enjoys a monopolistic position in hazelnut production may seem like an advantage for hazelnut producers, but according to Özer Akbaşlı, those who really reap the profits of the trade in hazelnut are a very few firms and intermediaries. It is these that derive the most significant earnings from the labour of the small producers.
Graph 9. Unshelled hazelnut production of major hazelnut provinces in Turkey (tonnes) and area of land cultivated (hectares) (2014)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Province</th>
<th>Production (tonnes)</th>
<th>Area (ha)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Giresun</td>
<td>25,327</td>
<td>117,137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ordu</td>
<td>84,874</td>
<td>227,183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samsun</td>
<td>65,011</td>
<td>89,594</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trabzon</td>
<td>31,065</td>
<td>65,432</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Düzce</td>
<td>56,306</td>
<td>62,685</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sakarya</td>
<td>84,865</td>
<td>72,173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zonguldak</td>
<td>30,148</td>
<td>23,591</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NB: The low production in the provinces of Ordu, Giresun, Samsun and Trabzon was due to frost in 2014

Source: Sail Products Office (2015)
European buyers and large chocolate manufacturers make contracts with Turkish hazelnut traders for very high tonnages. They set out the buying procedures, the amounts to be purchased, the conditions for delivery and payment and many other details, and then they sign these agreements. There are seven firms who are the Turkish parties to these agreements. These seven firms then make direct agreements with six smaller firms and indirect agreements with ten others. So the seven firms which make agreements with the Europeans carry out all of their business in the country through 16 smaller firms. The smaller firms take care of all the workings of the market: buying, market conditions, speculation and manipulation. The large firms do not get involved in these matters and you never see them around.

In the region, hazelnuts are seen as a crop that brings prosperity. The rising price in recent years and the confidence that comes with being an international monopoly seems set to lead to a rise in supply. According to one person encountered during the field study, “Gatherers are planting hazelnuts, everyone is planting hazelnuts, supply is rising.” The chairman of the Fatsa Commodity Exchange has this to say: “Every year 600,000-700,000 tonnes of hazelnuts are produced. 500,000-600,000 tonnes are exported and the rest goes to the domestic market... If you had two kilograms of gold, it would take you two days to turn it into cash, but you can turn a million kilos of hazelnuts into cash in an hour.”

Socio-economic Transformation and Hazelnut Production

On the Black Sea coast between Giresun and Ordu, the chief topic of conversation is hazelnuts. During the harvest, the main topic is picking the nuts, but as the harvest approaches an end, talk turns to what the price will be that year. “We even dream about hazelnuts,” local people say. Although the sources of income of the local population have diversified recently, hazelnuts continue to be the most important agricultural product and industrial input of the region, and therefore issues to do with hazelnut production occupy an important place in the minds of the domestic population. One of the most important reasons for this is that hazelnuts produced in Turkey constitute the primary input of the giant chocolate firms which control the global market.

The socio-economic transformation which has taken place in the hazelnut producing provinces of Ordu and Giresun, and especially domestic and external migration, have had significant impacts on the forms of labour in hazelnuts. The phenomena of migration and the division of land into small-
Turkey is the leading producer of hazelnuts in the world and accounts for 75 per cent of world production. Most of the hazelnuts Turkey exports are used by the chocolate industry. Other than being a primary input for the chocolate industry, hazelnuts are used in cake and dessert making, as well as snacks in their own right. Although 39 provinces in Turkey produce hazelnuts, especially those in the Black Sea region, only hazelnuts produced in provinces on the Black Sea coast enter the international market. A total of 395,000 households in Turkey grow hazelnuts on approximately 700,000 hectares of land. While in the 1990s hazelnut picking in the Black Sea provinces was generally carried out by members of the family and local labour, today the hazelnut harvest has been transformed into an area of work mainly for migrant seasonal agricultural workers from eastern and south eastern provinces, due to rural-to-urban migration and urbanisation, the formation of a better qualified workforce with increasing levels of education in the region and the provision of other opportunities for employment. Migrant seasonal agricultural workers are widely employed in the hazelnut harvest in the provinces of Ordu, Giresun, Samsun, Trabzon, Zonguldak, Düzce and Sakarya. It is observed that an increasing number of Georgian and Syrian workers are engaging in the hazelnut harvest as migrant seasonal agricultural workers.
er holdings apply to hazelnut production, just as they do for tea. The fluctuations in hazelnut production have kept households reliant solely on the crop for their income in a poverty trap, and the search for alternative sources of income has accelerated emigration from the region. Although some households still rely only on hazelnuts for income, those households which have not emigrated are increasingly ageing. In interviews held in Giresun, it was stated that the average age of field owners is 57 and that younger people no longer want to work in hazelnut growing.

A significant proportion of the population has emigrated from the hazelnut producing regions. Nevertheless, they have kept in contact with their place of origin, maintained relationships and tried to continue producing hazelnuts in the groves which they see as the “land of [their] fathers”. Efforts are made to manage production in hazelnut groves which have been inherited by running the process from a distance. To this end, the land is either given over to contractors, or what is known as “telephone farming” comes into play to ensure production using paid labour. For those who are far away, production is run through the mediation of neighbours and relatives in their villages, as a means of continuing their attachment to their land. At times when the yield is high and the price is good, hazelnuts can be a form of additional income for those who have migrated away. Local people now living abroad are often observed to come back to their places of origin during the holidays and take part in the hazelnut work. The local population makes fun of the emigrants’ behaviour, as they often spend more on travelling than they earn from the harvest of hazelnuts. One interviewee had the following to say:

*People of the Black Sea love their land. Because they like it so much, those who live in Europe come back for a couple of months, to stay here. They busy themselves a lot about hazelnuts. If they were to turn over their fields to intermediaries and take a holiday, perhaps it would be better.*

The local population has taken to calling the managements of hazelnut fields by their emigrant owners “telephone farming”. People explain that the various stages of hazelnut growing are often carried out through the use of paid labour and by asking family members and neighbours to act as intermediaries.

With the rise in the level of education, people who have taken up more qualified professions and earn their income from other occupations have started to look on income from hazelnuts as secondary and insignificant. An official interviewed during the field study said of his own inherited orchard:
Hazelnuts are not my main source of income. I have inherited three thousand square metres. How much can I do on my own? I could only run it if I were to employ two others to work with me. Last year I took my annual leave to harvest hazelnuts. We picked them as a family. Due to division by inheritance, the hazelnut orchards are growing smaller and smaller. On average my orchard makes about 5,000 liras a year. Half of that is spent to cover costs.

Families also state that they do not involve their children in the hazelnut production process much while they are getting an education. Instead, they keep them away from all activities which might hinder their education and development. Accordingly, the younger generation moves towards other occupations, when they reach university stage.

Emigration to towns and cities, urbanisation, the rise in the level of education and the availability of employment opportunities in other sectors have spearheaded the social transformation in Turkey. As a result, traditional household labour has largely given way to forms of paid labour. This causes high numbers of seasonal agricultural labourers to flock to the area, especially during the hazelnut harvest.

**Forms of Labour and Seasonal Labour in Hazelnut Picking**

The stages of the hazelnut production which require manual labour are pruning, fertilisation, pesticide application, cutting saplings, weeding, harvesting (gathering) and separating individual hazelnuts from their green outer coverings and stems ready for shelling. Gathering is the most labour intensive activity. The hazelnut harvest begins in fields lying on the coast and advances up the slopes, usually in early August depending on temperature. A commission is generally formed to decide when the hazelnut harvest can begin at various altitudes. In high altitudes, it can take up to 15 days for the harvest to start after it has begun at sea level. Under normal circumstances, the harvest is completed in mid-September.

The hazelnut harvest needs to be completed within 45 days at most. If hazelnuts are not gathered in time, the yield will fall and the drier kernel will cause the price to drop. Therefore, many workers are needed for a short period of time. Employers and field owners can engage in tough competition during harvest time to get labourers and to have their hazelnuts collected. This leads them to employ all comers, including foreign workers and child labourers. Each day hazelnuts are not collected leads to a loss in yield and quality.

Hazelnuts are picked in three ways: off the branch and off the ground by hand, and by machine. In the hazelnut producing areas in Turkey, the most
common method is to pick them from the branch by hand. The matured hazelnut clusters on the branches are picked one by one and put into baskets. They are later transferred to sacks and taken off for separating.

The best way of gathering hazelnuts is to shake the tree and to pick the nuts off the ground. However, there are very few groves in the Black Sea region where this form of harvest is practicable. In this method, the mature hazelnuts are shaken off the branches by hand or using recently-introduced shaking machines, and those that cannot be reached in this way are knocked off with long sticks. The hazelnut clusters on the ground are then gathered by hand and taken for separating. In this type of harvesting, not all the hazelnuts can be collected in one go, and hazelnut clusters maturing at different times are collected as they fall off when the branches are shaken softly. This requires the whole grove to be worked at least three times with intervals of 3-5 days.

Until recently, hazelnut gathering by local agricultural workers in the Black Sea provinces was very common. These days, however, seasonal agricultural workers travel mainly from eastern, southeastern and Mediterranean provinces to pick the hazelnuts in the major producing provinces of Ordu, Giresun, Samsun, Trabzon, Zonguldak, Düzce and Sakarya (Uras, 2008). In recent years, Georgian and Syrian migrants have joined in.

Four types of workers engage in the hazelnut harvest:

(a) Those working in their own orchards: Family members and close relatives of the field owners working in the hazelnut harvest.

(b) Local agricultural workers: Workers from nearby provinces, districts and villages who take part in the hazelnut harvest in exchange for remuneration.

(c) Migrant seasonal agricultural labourers: Those who arrive from places far from the hazelnut producing regions and who generally take shelter in tents or other accommodation owned by the field owners.

(d) Foreign migrant workers: Those who arrive from abroad specifically for the hazelnut harvest or are under temporary protection in Turkey.
Characteristics of Foreign Migrant Labour in Hazelnut Picking

In interviews with foremost hazelnut producers in the provinces of Ordu and Giresun it was stated that around 60,000 enterprises or units of production require paid labour for hazelnut production. 50,000 of these employ migrant seasonal agricultural workers, between 20 to 30 per cent of whom are Georgian workers. Although Georgian workers have come to be seen as the new main actors of the hazelnut harvest, most migrant seasonal agricultural workers who engage in the hazelnut harvest still come from Mediterranean, eastern and south eastern provinces. These workers have recently been joined by Syrian workers who are normally resident in the same provinces. Thus seasonal agricultural labour for hazelnut production has a multi-layered and multi-cultural structure.

The number of Georgian workers in the hazelnut harvest has been rising for the past five years. This may be a result of the pressure felt by the local population due to the climate of conflict in eastern Turkey. Furthermore, the presence of settled Georgian families and villages, concentrated in Bulancak, Fatsa and Ünye, suggests that the Georgian migration may have begun as a result of family ties and then spread out to the wider region. People of Georgian origin are said to live in 40 out of 61 villages in the Bulancak district of Giresun, for example. Family ties are one of the main factors which have attracted Georgian workers to the hazelnut harvest.

Georgian workers generally arrive in groups of five to ten individuals for the hazelnut harvest and stay for the season, either in accommodation given to them by field owners or in places they rent in district centres in groups of between 5-6 people. Reportedly they arrive in groups including both women and men, women are preferred for the hazelnut harvest and the men therefore
work either in tea or in construction. It is also stated that Georgian workers, who enter the country with a three-month visa waiver, go to work in tea after the completion of the hazelnut harvest - the men may also work in construction if they can find jobs.

The relationships established between field owners and workers ensure that the same workers return every year to work in the same hazelnut orchards. Through their social networks, Georgian workers have developed their own networks of intermediaries, and locally well-known Georgian intermediaries have started brokering workers for field owners. There are known to be either three or four Georgian agricultural labour intermediaries in the Bulancak district. During a face-to-face interview with one of them, field owners in the coffee-house engaged in business with the intermediary and secured five Georgian workers to work in the hazelnut harvest set to begin the week after.

In an interview at a Commodity Exchange in the region, the following remark was made about the use of foreign migrant workers:

*Because there is demand for workers, they come as tourists and work informally. They have gathering places where you can find them in the morning. Employers can get as many workers as they need and take them to the field. Foreign workers are cheap and are not picky. That’s why they are employed.*

Georgian workers are perceived to be more capable and disciplined and to act “like a working class”. This has made them the favourites of the hazelnut harvest. Almost everyone is aware that it is unlawful to employ Georgian workers and almost everyone is equally aware that the authorities turn a blind eye. As mentioned previously, the 90-day visa waiver for Georgian citizens acts like an agricultural work visa.
In Ordu and Giresun, where the hazelnut harvest jobs are concentrated, no Syrian migrant workers have been observed. Syrians are said to arrive alongside workers from eastern, south eastern and Mediterranean provinces. Reportedly, they do not come in high numbers and move on to other areas with the domestic seasonal agricultural workers once the hazelnut harvest is over. Local government officials in Ordu and Giresun say that there are no Syrian migrants in their provinces, and that any arriving have been sent back to the provinces where they are registered. According to the provincial Directorate for Migration Administration in Ordu, there are 127 registered Syrians in the province; other Syrians who arrive are driven away and are not allowed to pitch tents.
APRICOTS: Gold on the Branch

Apricots are the world renowned agricultural produce of the province of Malatya and the symbol of the town. Besides being the chief economic activity of many households, apricots also provide an income for many migrant seasonal agricultural workers arriving from outside the province during the harvest.

World annual apricot production stands at around 3.5 million tonnes. Of this 700,000 tonnes are produced in Turkey. This makes Turkey the largest producer of apricots in the world, with 20 per cent of total production. Turkey is followed in terms of production volume by Pakistan, Iran, Uzbekistan and Italy (Ünal, 2010). There are approximately 15 million apricot trees in Turkey. Of these, 8 million are in the province of Malatya, which accounts for 55 per cent of Turkey’s apricot production (Development Workshop, 2014).

Apricots occupy an important place in the economy of Malatya. While output varies due to climate conditions from one year to the next, a significant proportion of the apricots produced in Turkey are grown in and around Malatya. Around 90 per cent of the apricots produced in Malatya are processed at the many plants in the province and are exported to 150 different countries, mainly to Europe. The province produces 80,000-100,000 tonnes of dried apricots every year and earns USD250-300 million from exports of the fruit. Around 5,000 people are employed in the apricot processing plants in Malatya on a temporary basis while 300 traders and around 50
exporters deal in apricots. About ten firms produce equipment for the processing of apricots. According to data from the farmer registration system, around 30,000 households in Malatya are engaged in apricot farming and derive an income from it. Around 200,000 people depend directly or indirectly on apricot agriculture for their income (Bilsam, 2009).

The harvesting and processing of apricots involves the following stages:

   i. The apricots are shaken off the trees onto a cloth spread below the branches.

   ii. The apricots are classified and placed in plastic crates each with a capacity of 12 kilograms,

   iii. The apricots in crates are:

   a. immediately put on the market if they are to be sold fresh or used to make fruit juice,

   b. carried into the smoke chamber, smoked for six hours by burning solid sulphur and then left to dry on a cloth spread under the sun if they are going to be dried by smoking; or spread on a cloth under the sun if they are to be sun-dried, and

   c. stoned – i.e., the stones are removed from apricots that come out of the smoke chamber or are going to be dried under the sun.

   d. spread out on a cloth again for drying under the sun, following stoning.

Assuming that the on average a single tree produces 60 kilograms of fresh apricots and that a single worker can shake four trees a day, a single worker can harvest 240 kilograms of fresh apricots a day. Furthermore, 70 worker/hours are needed for each 1,000 square metres of apricot orchard for hoeing, fertilisation, pesticide application, formation of ponds, irrigation, pruning, harvesting and hauling. Of this, 33 hours are needed for the harvest, which makes up 46 per cent of the total workforce requirements (Development Workshop, 2014).
### Table 7: Volume of apricot production and production areas for Turkey and the province of Malatya (1996-2014)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Production Area - Turkey (1000 square metres)</th>
<th>Production Area - Malatya (1000 square metres)</th>
<th>Malatya’s share of production area in Turkey (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>703,130</td>
<td>494,360</td>
<td>70.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>826,370</td>
<td>586,190</td>
<td>70.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>898,000</td>
<td>628,630</td>
<td>70.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>895,000</td>
<td>631,020</td>
<td>70.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>900,000</td>
<td>636,980</td>
<td>70.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>960,950</td>
<td>675,920</td>
<td>70.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>1,020,292</td>
<td>688,290</td>
<td>67.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>1,080,534</td>
<td>709,880</td>
<td>65.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>1,140,516</td>
<td>742,800</td>
<td>65.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>1,169,181</td>
<td>768,000</td>
<td>65.65</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*NB: Production dropped sharply in 2014 due to frost in Malatya*
There are approximately 15 million apricot trees in Turkey. Of these, eight million are in the province of Malatya, which accounts for 55 per cent of the country’s fresh apricot output. Around 90 per cent of the apricots picked in Malatya are processed at plants in the province and exported to nearly 150 countries, especially European countries. Malatya exports on average 80,000-100,000 dried apricots per annum, thereby making export earnings between 300-400 million USD. According to the farmer registration system data, around 30,000 households in Malatya make an income from apricot agriculture. Around 200,000 individuals derive a direct or indirect income from this agricultural activity.

Seasonal agricultural workers are mainly employed in picking apricots and removing their inside stones. These workers generally come from eastern and south eastern provinces of Turkey. Since 2012, Syrian migrant labourers have joined domestic workers, who usually come from the provinces of Şanlıurfa and Mardin.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Production - Turkey (tonnes)</th>
<th>Production - Malatya (tonnes)</th>
<th>Malatya’s share of production in Turkey (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>703,130</td>
<td>494,360</td>
<td>70.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>826,370</td>
<td>586,190</td>
<td>70.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>898,000</td>
<td>628,630</td>
<td>70.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>895,000</td>
<td>631,020</td>
<td>70.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>900,000</td>
<td>636,980</td>
<td>70.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>960,950</td>
<td>675,920</td>
<td>70.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>1,020,292</td>
<td>688,290</td>
<td>67.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>1,080,534</td>
<td>709,880</td>
<td>65.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>1,140,516</td>
<td>742,800</td>
<td>65.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>1,169,181</td>
<td>768,000</td>
<td>65.65</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NB: Production dropped sharply in 2014 due to frost in Malatya.

Source: TURKSTAT online database
As the report by the Development Workshop indicates, in 2012, 24.4 million hours of harvest labour were needed for the 742 million square metres of apricot orchards in Malatya. Given an average workday of 10 hours, 2.44 million worker/days were needed for the apricot harvest. If the average worker in the apricot harvest is taken on to work for 20 days, this means that 120,000 workers were required. The Malatya Provincial Directorate for Food, Agriculture and Livestock has estimated that 69,000 tonnes of dried apricots were produced in 2015. For the harvest of so many apricots, 130,000 workers would be needed on the assumption that each worker works for 30 days for the apricot harvest. It is understood that 80 per cent of these workers were migrant seasonal agricultural workers, of whom 15,000 were foreign migrant workers.

Despite the onset of mechanisation in apricot shaking and stoning, it has not yet become widespread and therefore the harvest is carried out using traditional manual labour, which requires workers to arrive in Malatya from outside the province. Apricot production is a labour intensive process and the harvest season is short, so many migrant seasonal agricultural workers arrive in Malatya during the apricot harvest. However, the number of workers arriving for the harvest is not known with any certainty, as no records are kept.

Forms of Labour and Seasonal Labour in Apricot Production

Although the labour required for apricot production is met through various channels, the main source of labour during the harvest season is made up of migrant seasonal agricultural workers. The following four different types of workers are encountered in apricot production, especially during the harvest and stoning:

Those who do their own work: Those who collect apricots from their own orchards, their household members, extended families, and friends and families who help neighbours and relatives.

Local agricultural workers: Workers who travel from villages, districts or provinces where apricot trees are present to collect apricots for others are usually organised by orchard owners or local agricultural intermediaries. Many workers return to their
own homes at nights while very few take shelter in accommodation provided by orchard owners. These workers may provide labour as a family or as individuals.

*Migrant seasonal agricultural workers:* Those who arrive from areas which do not produce apricots, such as the eastern and south eastern provinces of Adıyaman, Şanlıurfa, Mardin, Batman, Şırnak, Diyarbakır and Siirt. They may arrive as families or in groups. These workers may be divided into two:

(i) Those whose employment is organised by agricultural intermediaries;

(ii) Those who arrive without the mediation of agricultural intermediaries, either through direct contact with orchard owners or simply in the hope of finding work after arriving in Malatya. Among these workers there are some who carry out harvest work for firms which have bought the apricots while the fruit is still on the branch.

*Syrian workers:* Since 2012, following the Syrian crisis, there has been an increase in the number of Syrian citizens involved in the apricot harvest in the province of Malatya. Some of them arrive in Malatya by their own means, while others join the harvest through acquaintances and agricultural intermediaries. Some Syrians living in refugee camps are said to go to work in apricot processing plants.

**Characteristics of Foreign Migrant Workers in Apricot Harvesting**

The main group of workers in the apricot harvest in Malatya are migrant seasonal agricultural workers who arrive from eastern and south eastern provinces of Turkey. The high number of Syrian migrants in provinces providing labour for migrant seasonal agricultural work and in Malatya itself is an indicator of radical change in the pattern of seasonal agricultural work. In Malatya there is an accommodation centre (camp) for Syrians. In addition, around 400 households from Kobane arrived in the province during the fighting in Kobane and settled down with the help of their relatives there. An association in central Malatya takes a close interest in the needs of those arriving from Kobane and mediates for them to find accommodation and work. Work in apricots is one of the leading forms of temporary employment for these people. It is often emphasised that Syrian workers work for lower wages than domestic workers; sometimes the foreign migrant workers are said to work for two thirds of the daily wage demanded by domestic workers.

At the busiest times of the apricot season, orchard owners place their confidence in agricultural intermediaries who find seasonal agricultural work-
ers for them. It is the intermediaries who generally run the business of finding jobs and workers. Orchard owners who were interviewed stated that there have been Syrian migrants among the workers arriving from eastern and south eastern provinces in recent years.

During the field study in Malatya, a family which contracts work in orchards owned by others for a share of the revenue said that in 2015 they had asked the agricultural intermediary they usually work with to provide them with a certain number of workers and that they had planned the work accordingly. Their work was delayed when Syrian workers arrived among the workers they were provided with. They stated that they could not have sent the Syrians back because the work needed to be done and that the fruit would otherwise remain unpicked. Of the Syrian workers, they said:

*Actually these people do not know the job. We only have them do the picking. They do not know how to stone and flatten the apricots. Because they don’t speak our language, we can’t tell them how to do it. Once they learn it they work well, but teaching them is very difficult.*

**Hasan the Butcher Becomes a Seasonal Agricultural Worker**

Hasan, who owned a butcher’s shop in Kobane before the fighting, came to Turkey like everyone else in the town when the clashes began. His first stop after crossing the border was Suruç. From there, he and all the members of his family moved to Erzin in the province of Hatay. They arrived in Turkey as a family of nine; Hasan has four children and a son and daughter have remained in Kobane. When they first arrived in Erzin, they slept rough for four nights and then found a job picking peanuts through a friend. They worked for seven months in Erzin but did not get anything close to what they deserved for their labour. The friend only passed on 200 liras to them. They then started migrating after agricultural work. They first went to Kayseri and then to Malatya. They started working in the apricot harvest through an agricultural intermediary from Suruç. When we met, they had been working for 20 days for an orchard owner in Malatya, picking apricots off the branch and laying them out in the sun. Hasan says that they find agricultural work to be difficult. He adds that it is very difficult for him to find other work because he does not speak Turkish and that he wants to go back to his country if Kobane is rebuilt.

The story of Hasan and his family shows how middle class families can be pushed into poverty and deprivation by war. Hasan says that under normal circumstances they would not have worked so much back home. They are unfamiliar with the job and are forced to live and work in poor conditions. He says that unless they go back to Kobane soon, they will settle somewhere with a concentration of Kurdish population and will try to make it there. He says he will feel closer to home this way.
LIVESTOCK RAISING AND THE FODDER HARVEST:
Syrian Shepherds, Azerbaijani Workers

The field study established that livestock raising in the provinces of Ardahan, Ankara, Kars and Malatya is a field of activity which generates widespread and intensive demand for foreign migrant labour. The rearing of cattle, sheep and goats, which is an important source of income in the provinces of Kars and Ardahan, has led to the use of foreign migrant labour in cutting fodder, as well as in the upkeep of the livestock itself.

The provinces of Kars and Ardahan are especially suitable for cattle raising, due to the prevailing geography, with its large grasslands and pastures. The pastures and climate suitable for growing fodder plants have contributed to the rise of livestock keeping in the region, while a factor to its detriment is the long and hard winter period. Agricultural employment in the two provinces accounted for 64.5 per cent of total employment in 2009 and while this had fallen to 55.8 per cent in 2011, it nevertheless remained far higher than the average for Turkey, which was 25.5 per cent in the same year. The share of agriculture in the GDP of Kars and Ardahan fell from 34.5 per cent in 2004 to 24.6 per cent in 2008 (Serhat Development Agency, 2013).
**Table 8.** Heads of cattle in Turkey and in the provinces of Kars, Ardahan, İğdır and Ağrı, and the share of the region in the total (2010-2014)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Turkey</th>
<th>Kars, Ardahan, İğdır, Ağrı</th>
<th>Kars, Ardahan, İğdır, Ağrı/Turkey (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>11,454,526</td>
<td>937,962</td>
<td>8.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>12,483,969</td>
<td>1,068,193</td>
<td>8.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>14,022,347</td>
<td>1,248,554</td>
<td>8.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>14,532,848</td>
<td>1,230,311</td>
<td>8.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>14,345,223</td>
<td>1,271,133</td>
<td>8.86</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: TURKSTAT online database*

**Table 9.** Heads of sheep and goats in Turkey and in the provinces of Kars, Ardahan, İğdır and Ağrı, and the share of the region in the total (2010-2014)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Turkey</th>
<th>Kars, Ardahan, İğdır, Ağrı</th>
<th>Kars, Ardahan, İğdır, Ağrı/Turkey (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>29,382,924</td>
<td>1,900,546</td>
<td>6.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>32,309,518</td>
<td>1,970,375</td>
<td>6.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>35,782,519</td>
<td>2,309,375</td>
<td>6.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>38,509,795</td>
<td>2,309,088</td>
<td>6.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>41,485,180</td>
<td>2,436,084</td>
<td>6.33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: TURKSTAT online database*
Arable farming and livestock keeping are generally carried out by small family enterprises, which for the most part rely on unpaid household labour. However, the region has experienced emigration, young people have chosen not to take up agricultural work, and the population has aged. As a result, the household labour supply is no longer adequate to meet the demand. This is where migrant labour comes into play. One interviewee had the following to say about the attractions of emigration for the people of the region: “You don’t have a car or live in a nice house. People go to Istanbul, they buy the newest cars… Young people think, ‘Why should we stay here?’” Farmers trying to survive in the region emphasise that they expect the population drain to intensify. “Once our generation passes away, this land will be left empty,” they say.

**Characteristics of the Migrant Labour in Agricultural Production in Kars and Ardahan**

The demand for labour created by livestock raising and small scale manufacturing in the provinces of Kars and Ardahan is generally met by Azerbaijanis arriving from neighbouring Nakhchivan. The presence of settled Azerbaijanis in the region and their family ties are among the chief factors influencing Azerbaijani migration. The fact that Azerbaijanis speak Turkish plays a significant role in encouraging Azerbaijani migrants to come to Turkey and ensuring their acceptance by the local population.

The interviews carried out during the field study revealed that some work in agriculture in Ardahan is carried out by the migrants from Nakhchivan. The Azerbaijanis are said to come in April and stay until snowfall. It is possible to encounter Azerbaijanis who enter Turkey through the Dilucu Border Crossing in Iğdır and go on to take up different jobs in Kars and Ardahan. A middle-aged Azerbaijani migrant who was interviewed had the following to say about Azerbaijani migration to Turkey and his experiences in the Göle district of Kars:

---

*Nakhchivan has [a population of] 375,000. I have come and gone for 20 years. Kars, Iğdır, Antalya, Istanbul - I have been to all of these places. My village has 50 souls, here there are hundreds of souls. There are three or four people here from every village. I have worked in every job: agriculture, construction. However, the month-long visa is very short. You come here, work for a few days, then it rains and you cannot get work. The month-long visa is not enough. It is too short. These are kind people, they do not wish ill of anyone. Turkey is the number one [country] in the world. Had it not been for Turkey, we would not have existed!*
Azerbaijanis are generally employed in fodder cutting, loading and emptying. It is stated that they work for a month or more for large landowners and then go back home. One farmer in Kars says the following of his experiences of working with Azerbaijanis:

*Before they came here, Azerbaijanis did not know how to cut fodder. They learned how to use scythes as they came and went. It’s because in their homeland, they each do a different job. The person who plants wheat does not know how to sow it. Some years ago a post office manager came here to work. We have a lot of land. There is all sorts of work. The post office manager worked for us for two months, We looked out for him, He was in debt and we helped him pay it back. Professionals don’t arrive often; they only come when they are in need. They only come once: if they can meet their needs, they will not come back.*

While the labour migration of Azerbaijanis to Istanbul is usually a family affair, in Kars and Ardahan, men of the same household or who are related will arrive as a group for seasonal agricultural work. It is possible for Azerbaijanis to extend their month-long visas three times to spend most of the summer in Turkey.

Close, trusting relations are built up between employers and migrants over the years, as migrant workers work for the same employer every year. So much so that one farmer says: “If a guy’s visa is up, he takes a break from work to go back to his country and to renew his visa. He’ll leave his money here and collect when he returns.”
Ardahan: Fodder Cutting Azerbaijanis

Azerbaijani Tural is 21 and has been coming to Turkey from Nakhchivan to work for three years. He has received 11 years of education and completed high school but could not attend university because of poverty. When he turned of age he served his compulsory military service for 18 months, three of them in Baku. Because he is good at maths, he was employed in the technical job of calculating artillery shell trajectories. After military service he went back to his village and the problem of making ends meet began anew. His mother had died when he was young and he also had to take care of his siblings. He first came to Ardahan with his father, older brother and a relative to find work.

Because they kept livestock back home, he works in fodder cutting in Ardahan. He generally works in fodder cutting but says that other Azerbaijanis go to lay walls and work in other construction jobs if they can find work. He works from 7 a.m. to 7 p.m. in fodder cutting and earns 90-95 liras. If fodder cutting is by the lot, then he gets 70 liras for every 1,000 square metres. He works faster and longer then and his daily income can rise up to 200 liras. Employers usually give workers lunch and a pack of cigarettes a day.

Tural stays in Ardahan in a house which he has rented along with five fellow from his village for 500 liras. Other migrants who arrive in Ardahan also stay at Tural and his friends’ place from time to time. The number of those staying in the house can rise up to 15 when there are many jobs going. They cook their own food and use a launderette for washing. They pay 100 liras for power and 100 liras for water every month.

Tural desires very much to marry a Turkish woman and to live in Turkey. He says he gets very bored when he goes home and “want[s] to come back to Ardahan as soon as possible.” he says that he will go to Istanbul once he has finished his work in Ardahan and that he has worked there before. The money he earns he either saves up, or sends back home through the firm Western Union. From time to time he has been caught by the gendarmerie in the countryside, but he has found a way to overcome the obstacle each time. When he tells them that he is earning his livelihood and needs the job it generally works and they set him free. “Recently the gendarmerie deported eight of my friends,” he says, “But they will find a way to return.” He says he will not and cannot go back home, despite his visa having expired. He says he will pay the fine when the time comes to return. “I will perhaps stay for another year in Turkey,” he goes on, “I will go to Istanbul and work in whatever jobs I can find. I will save up money and then go back home.”

He says he sees Turkey as his own country, that people are good to him and that he likes Turkey. He does mention some difficulties - for example, not being able to see a doctor when he is ill. He sometimes goes to a private practitioner or uses his employer’s social security number to see the local general practitioner. Tural’ life revolves around irregular migration and working in what jobs he can find in various provinces of Turkey, and his current stop is fodder cutting in the various districts of Ardahan.
Syrian Shepherds in the Highlands of Malatya:
Do They Really Exist?

One of the most invisible forms of agricultural labour is that of shepherds, who tend herds of cattle, sheep and goats in the warm summer months. Shepherding remains out of sight because it takes place in the highlands and pastures. Furthermore, the worker is sometimes alone for months with the animals. While shepherding was traditionally done with labour from within the extended family, it has become a form of paid labour in recent years.

The need for shepherds felt by families who keep livestock for a living has increased with migration to urban areas and the lack of interest of the local population and the younger generation in this line of work. With the younger members of families attending university and migrating to urban areas, the need for shepherds is no longer met within the family, and households have turned to paid labour for various production activities. One such activity is that of the hired shepherd who oversees the grazing of herds put out to pasture. In provinces where livestock keeping is widespread, the Ministry for Food, Agriculture and Livestock runs training courses on “herd management” for the development of the shepherding profession and offers various incentives. Those herd owners who employ shepherds who have graduated from these courses and received certificates receive TRY5,000 in support from the state. However, the shepherds have to be employed formally and registered for social security. Due to this condition, only a few herd owners are said to employ shepherds as part of this programme.

Livestock raising is the second most important agricultural source of income in the province of Malatya, after apricot growing. Cattle, sheep and goats are kept by many people in the Arguvan district of Malatya. In recent years, sheep and goat keeping has declined due to pasturing problems, but some households still keep sheep and goats. Traditionally, shepherds from Şanlıurfa and Diyarbakır would have been
A shepherd tending sheep
Riza’s Syrian Shepherd is a Music Teacher

Riza and his family, along with three other households, keep livestock in the highlands of Malatya and rely on it for their income. They previously worked with a shepherd from Adıyaman for 10 years. Later, when that shepherd stopped working for them they started looking for another. From an acquaintance they learned of a Syrian shepherd up for the job. They have been employing the Syrian shepherd, whose older brother also works as shepherd, for two months now. When this person arrived to work for Riza and his family, he was an irregular migrant as he did not have the ID card given to Syrians under temporary protection. Riza was called to the police station in Arguvan and asked where he had found his worker and whether he had ID. A written document in Arabic which the Syrian migrant had on him was taken and sent to the Malatya Directorate of Security for biometrical scanning and registration. After much effort the Syrian migrant was given a temporary ID and he continued to work for Riza and his family.

The migrant gets TRY1,000 for his work every month and the families who employ him provide him with shelter, food, cigarettes, telephone credits and travel expenses. Syrian shepherds work for a third of the amount earned by shepherds who come from other provinces of Turkey. Domestic shepherds get TRY 3,500 per month if they milk the animals (twice a day) and TRY 3,000 if they do not milk them. The reason given why Syrian shepherds are paid much less than domestic shepherds is that they are not familiar with the job. The usual day for the shepherds begins at around 4 or 5 a.m. when they take the herd to the highlands. They have the animals graze until noon and bring them back for milking near the highland house at noon. The herd is then made to rest in the shade for a while to protect the animals from the noon-time heat. Then they are taken back to the higher land. They are brought back to the stables at around 9-10 p.m. The animals are milked twice a day. A shepherd can take care of 200-300 sheep on his own.

When the Syrian shepherd arrived Riza learned that he was a teacher and was unsure how a teacher could take care of animals. “How can a teacher deal with animals? Who would have the heart to make him do it? Also, what does a teacher know about taking care of animals? He was doing it well in Arguvan, but started having difficulties when we came to the highlands.”

Other than the physical hardship of the job, shepherding involves spending almost 15 hours a day alone with animals. When the isolation and solitude experienced by Syrian migrants due to the language barrier is taken into consideration too, seclusion seems to be one of their foremost problems as shepherds. Riza says of the shepherd he employs: “He will sit there and talk with nobody. He can’t speak. We do not speak Arabic; he does not speak Kurdish.”
employed in this region, but the number of Syrian shepherds has increased in recent years. Employing Syrian shepherds has become a common practice in Malatya. Because they are not fully competent in managing the herd and cannot milk the animals, Syrian shepherds are paid less than domestic shepherds. Herd owners have said that in order to overcome the language barrier, they sometimes employ two shepherds, one of them Syrian and the other a local who speaks Arabic. Herd owners access Syrian shepherds through a network run by intermediaries who put shepherds and employers in contact with each other. Speaking of these intermediaries, one herd owner says, “You can say ‘I don’t like this shepherd, send me another one’ and he will do that.”

The main factor that separates shepherding from other work which foreign migrant workers find in the labour market in Turkey is that the job involves considerable seclusion and solitude. The living and working conditions of migrant shepherds are entirely up to the families they are employed by and live with, as their living and working conditions are very asocial. Important difficulties with language and communication intensify the isolation of the migrants. While foreign migrant workers in other jobs can live together and establish solidarity networks to alleviate some of their problems, shepherds spend most of their time with animals and can go for days without speaking a word to anyone. The conditions of shepherds may be considered to be similar to those of the foreign migrant female live-in domestic workers who are often the subject of migration studies.
AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTION AND AGRICULTURAL LABOUR IN ÇUKUROVA: Citrus, Vegetables and Cotton

As Çukurova has very fertile land and suitable climatic conditions, the pattern of agricultural production here differs from the other regions described in this report. Agricultural production takes place all year around rather than seasonally. Although the region is usually thought of in connection with cotton production, the production of citrus and vegetables has risen gradually in recent years, while there has been a significant decline in land used to cultivate cotton.

Between 2000 and 2014, the province of Adana produced, on average, 9.37 per cent of all the unginned cotton produced in Turkey. Adana’s share in total production was the highest in 2008, at 12.31 per cent. The reason for this was that total production
Table 10. Amount of unginned cotton production and area cultivated in Turkey and in the province of Adana by year (2000-2014)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Turkey (tonnes)</th>
<th>Adana (tonnes)</th>
<th>Production in Adana/ production in Turkey (%)</th>
<th>Cultivated area in Adana (1,000 square metres)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>2,260,921</td>
<td>142,718</td>
<td>6.31</td>
<td>449,260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>2,541,832</td>
<td>191,559</td>
<td>7.53</td>
<td>573,120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>2,455,071</td>
<td>159,750</td>
<td>6.50</td>
<td>450,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>2,550,000</td>
<td>291,582</td>
<td>11.43</td>
<td>502,833</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>1,820,000</td>
<td>224,099</td>
<td>12.31</td>
<td>495,027</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>2,150,000</td>
<td>248,950</td>
<td>11.57</td>
<td>479,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>2,320,000</td>
<td>239,091</td>
<td>10.30</td>
<td>455,836</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>2,350,000</td>
<td>204,467</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>363,898</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: TURKSTAT online database
in Turkey that year fell by 20 per cent compared to the previous year. The year 2006 was the most productive year for the province: the volume of production in Adana rose by 43 per cent over the previous year, and the area cultivated rose by 31 per cent. By contrast, the period since 2012 has seen both cotton production and the area of land planted with cotton in Adana fall considerably, bringing down the province’s share of total production.

The trend towards stopping cotton production in favour of other produce in the Çukurova region has been explained as follows:

> When we asked why the land used for the cultivation of cotton, a plant that is closely associated with Çukurova, has fallen by 100 million square metres over the last ten years, farmers told us that cotton is a great risk for farmers because of the higher rents for the fields, the higher pesticide costs, the low sale price for the commodity compared to its high costs and the fall in the quality of the product if it rains. Not wanting to take such a risk, farmers prefer to sow less costly, lower-risk plants such as maize, sunflowers, soybeans and peanuts (İlke News Agency, 2015).

Various plants are cultivated instead of cotton. These are maize, soybeans, citrus fruits, peanuts and vegetables. Especially with the stimulus of exports to Russia, fields which used to be sowed with cotton have been transformed into citrus orchards and the production of vegetables in greenhouses has also increased.

Table 11 shows that the share of Adana and Mersin in total citrus fruit production in Turkey is around 50 percent. Between 1996 and 2000, the pro-
Production of citrus fruits in the provinces of Adana and Mersin accounted for more than half of that of Turkey. The two provinces’ share has fallen in 2012 and 2014. Especially since the year 2000, the area of land used for citrus production in the region has expanded and production has risen by nearly 100 per cent from 1 million to 2 million tonnes.

Table 12: Greenhouse vegetable production in Turkey and the provinces of Adana-Mersin by year (1996-2014)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Turkey (tonnes)</th>
<th>Adana-Mersin (tonnes)</th>
<th>Adana-Mersin / Turkey (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>2,598,993</td>
<td>1,017,517</td>
<td>38.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>3,677,058</td>
<td>1,228,635</td>
<td>33.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>4,181,465</td>
<td>1,078,965</td>
<td>25.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>4,811,689</td>
<td>1,438,934</td>
<td>29.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>5,856,199</td>
<td>1,516,256</td>
<td>25.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>6,224,383</td>
<td>1,600,554</td>
<td>25.71</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: TURKSTAT online database

Production of vegetables in greenhouses is one of the most common agricultural activities in Adana and Mersin. As can be seen from Table 14, the region’s share of Turkey’s total production is quite high and production by tonne has risen every year. Demand for labour is shaped by the diversity of agricultural production in Çukurova and the spread of production throughout the year. This form of production, in which Syrian labour is also widely employed, offers Syrian refugees in the region a source of income.
Seasonal Agricultural Labour on the Fertile Soil of Çukurova

It is said that the soil does not sleep in Çukurova. The high fertility of the region allows for agricultural production to take place 12 months a year. The mainstay of agricultural production, cotton, has recently been dethroned by citrus fruits and vegetables. The fertility of the soil in Çukurova also creates a major contradiction. At the root of the contradiction lies the wealth and prosperity of the farmers who produce on the fertile soil as opposed to the misery of the workers who work the land.

Life in the tent encampments of migrant seasonal agricultural workers along the drainage canal between Tuzla and Karagöçer in Adana is not much different from that experienced by the workers described in Orhan Kemal’s novel Bereketli Topraklar Üzerinde (On Fertile Lands). The stories of those who, as Kemal put it, “live a bitter life for a bite of bread” have not changed much over the years. The tents in Tuzla first hosted the poor local population, then Kurdish workers from the east, and now they are home to Syrian workers. While the fertile lands of Çukurova are the cradle of diverse produce, the workers’ lot has remained the same - the only change being their place of origin and the type of produce they work for. The century old story of the “bitter life” of migrant seasonal agricultural workers continues.

Seasonal agricultural labour is also an indicator of social transformation in the region. Initially practiced by the poor local population, migrant seasonal agricultural work eventually became the field of workers from the east, especially from the provinces of Şanlıurfa and Adıyaman, while in recent years Syrian migrants have started participating widely. Syrian migrants are present in Mersin and Adana in large numbers and have been observed to work in the harvesting both of citrus fruits and of greenhouse produce. It is commonly held that their presence in the region has had a positive effect
on agricultural production, leading to lower labour costs and higher output. A greenhouse owner who was interviewed emphasised the low cost of Syrian labour and said that easier access to cheaper labour has allowed him to carry out production in five plastic greenhouses, as opposed to just two previously, because he could not employ more labour.

In the province of Mersin, in particular, views on the presence of Syrians are more positive compared to the rest of the country. It is often emphasised that the Syrians are becoming adjusted to Turkey. One interviewee said:

“Syrians are getting used to Turkey. Turks are getting used to Syrians. Things seem to be going well.”

Underlying this positive attitude is the cheap labour which Syrians have provided for the agricultural sector as well as the stimulus they have provided for the local economy and traders as customers. Syrians have also put upward pressure on rents, which is a pleasing development for property owners. Despite the positive attitude towards them, Syrians experience many difficulties. It has often been stated that 10-15 individuals may stay in a single room that is more of a stable, in conditions unfit for decent human habitation.

The jobs available in agricultural production are distributed among the various foreign migrant groups according to a certain division of labour. For now, Syrians occupy the lowest rung of this hierarchy and are employed as unqualified labour. Jobs which require more know-how, such as spraying, pruning and tying up cucumber plants with strings in greenhouses are carried out by experienced, mainly local labourers. These jobs pay more compared to unqualified positions. While experienced migrant seasonal agricultural workers from Şanlıurfa and Adıyaman work in jobs which require many experienced workers for a short period, such as the picking

Syrian migrants are present in Mersin and Adana in large numbers and have been observed to work in the harvesting both of citrus fruits and of greenhouse produce.
of peppers and cucumbers, Syrians are concentrated in unqualified positions. These include cutting citrus fruits, soil preparation, vegetable picking (melons, watermelons and tomatoes), cotton picking, hauling and sowing. While Syrian workers are not in demand for jobs such as pepper and cucumber picking for now, it is expected that they will find work in these jobs as years pass and generally move towards more qualified jobs as their experience in agricultural production increases.

An agricultural intermediary who was interviewed stated that he provides workers for citrus orchards, that he had 200 workers at the time of the interview and that 70 per cent of them were Syrians. He said that the arrival of Syrians has stopped the trend of rising wages and forced them downwards over the last few years. For export goods produced in the region, he speaks of Syrians as “those bearing the weight of the Turkish economy.” The intermediary noted that there is agricultural activity all around the year in Çukurova. He said that there are enough jobs for everyone, and that he could find jobs for 200 more workers but that he could not deal with them all. As the onset of irrigated agriculture in Şanlıurfa and its environs has increased the number of jobs available there, reduced the number of migrant seasonal agricultural workers travelling from this region and increased their wages, the arrival of Syrian workers is said to have come at a vital moment and served as a lifeline for agriculture in the region.

**Characteristics of Syrian Agricultural Workers**

Some of the tents next to the drainage canal near the Tuzla neighbourhood in the Karataş district of Adana are home to Syrian migrants. In one of the tents we encountered a Syrian agricultural intermediary chatting with a middle-aged migrant from Kobane. The middle-aged migrant told us they had to leave their country when the war began and took refuge in Turkey as a family with seven children within a group of 14 relatives. They stayed in Diyarbakır for two months but could not find work and moved to Adana when a relative told them there were jobs. He says that it is not a problem finding work in Adana during certain times of the year. The Syrian agricultural intermediary said that he provides Syrian workers for field owners and Turkish agricultural intermediaries. One of the children of the migrant from Kobane had been studying engineering and the other law back home but their education was interrupted when the war broke out. They both work in the fields now, as it is not possible for them to continue their education in Turkey. The only option open to these young people is
to become agricultural workers to ensure the survival of their families. The age of the interviewee and his wife make them unable to work in agricultural production with its fast pace and requirements for young workers, and therefore the income of the family rests on the shoulders of its younger members.

The tent area where the interview took place was barely the size of a carpet and it is difficult to see how a family of five can live there. It is a major problem how an entire winter can be spent in a small tent. The family interviewed had brought their own tent with them when they arrived in Adana. Their income is sufficient only for food and basic necessities like electricity. They say that they have no chance of saving up for the future. They say that they can get jobs but explain that their savings are soon depleted if it rains and they cannot work for a day.

**Will Music make him Forget it all?**

Watching the pace of work of citrus picking workers in the orchard is dizzying. The sound of scissors cutting off oranges and mandarins, with five people by each tree, intermingles with the voices of foremen shouting “quickly, quickly”. Such a pace might only be thought necessary for work-
ers racing to keep up with machines. But the pace of work of agricultural workers is nothing short of that. While it is difficult for someone outside of the orchard to make out the workers toiling under the green trees, as one enters the orchards the rapid pace of work becomes apparent.

About 20 workers around the age of 20 are working in the orchard. There are both men and women among them. Most of them are from Syria. Some of the young Syrians have learned to speak Turkish. While each of them runs to and fro covered in sweat, one of them listens to Arabic songs from a small radio he carries on him. At the same time he rapidly carries buckets full of mandarins to empty them into crates for transportation. This boy, who is barely 15, reconnects with his homeland through the music, which also makes his present condition a bit more bearable. Music allows him to forget somewhat and brings his distant land closer to him.
Working Conditions of Foreign Migrant Workers in Seasonal Agriculture

This chapter of the Present Situation Report on Foreign Migrant Workers in Seasonal Agricultural Labour in Turkey takes up the forms of the labour offered by foreign migrant workers. Up until now, the report has drawn attention to the presence of different ethnic and migrant groups in seasonal agricultural work in Turkey and considered the access of different groups of foreign migrant workers to agricultural jobs on the basis of their experiences. It has been established that foreign migrant workers from different source counties work in the production of different types of agricultural produce, that they fall under different legal statuses while they are in Turkey and that they make use of different networks to access agricultural jobs.

This chapter of the report looks at the working conditions which all foreign migrant workers experience, regardless of the differences among them, and the practices which affect them commonly in this regard. Thus, as well as the differences between groups of foreign migrant workers, the structural factors which affect all migrant and other seasonal agricultural workers will have been examined.

The chapter will examine, more specifically, the intermediary organisations and individuals which migrants use to access agricultural jobs, their earnings from agricultural jobs, the durations of their work and leisure time, and finally the conditions of female and child labour participating in agricultural production. The social exclusion of seasonal agricultural workers arises not as a result of the different ethnic, religious or national identities of foreign migrant workers but from the poor working conditions in agricultural production and the lack of more decent jobs. In other words, the inadequate shelter and working conditions of the poor people who work as seasonal agricultural workers are the main factors that contribute to their social exclusion, whatever their group identity may be.
Getting Access to Agricultural Jobs: Intermediaries, Relatives

The foreign migrant worker groups examined as part of this study use various strategies to access agricultural jobs. They also make use of agricultural intermediaries. The studies carried out on seasonal agricultural workers and related practices contain important information about the role of intermediaries (Support to Life, 2014; Development Workshop, 2014; KEİG 2015). This study also concludes that the intermediary individuals and organisations are very significant for foreign migrant workers and for their employers. Furthermore, it points out that foreign migrant workers are developing similar functions within their own groups and that intermediaries who previously organised domestic labour are building new forms of relationships to aid the mobility of foreign migrant workers and their access to agricultural jobs.

Agricultural Labour Intermediaries

An agricultural intermediary is someone who finds workers for employers and jobs for agricultural labourers, in exchange for pay or without pay, at the onset of the agricultural season or during harvest time. The intermediaries act as a sort of employment agency. While they are known by different names around Turkey (işçi simsarı, elçi, araççı, dayıbaşı), their function is the same: to bring together workers and employers.

Due to the large numbers of workers needed during the harvest and the rising demand for paid labour in agriculture as a result of social transformation, it has become impossible to organise work without agricultural intermediaries. These people play a part in the employment of hundreds of thousands of people throughout Turkey in the production of a diverse range of products. Intermediaries sometimes take over the role from their fathers; sometimes they are former agricultural labourers themselves. Legally, one needs only to have a primary school education and no criminal record to become an intermediary. The intermediaries act like a one-person human resources department. The permit they receive to carry out their profession needs to be renewed every three years. They are also bound to report to their province’s Directorate for Work and Employment twice a year. In practice, these requirements are often ignored and agricultural intermediaries work informally, neither renewing their permits on time nor providing any reports about the workers for whom they find employment. Many agricultural intermediaries have never registered at all.

Agricultural intermediaries sometimes direct locally-resident labour to agricultural jobs and sometimes find jobs for domestic or foreign migrant workers. In order to mobilize such a large potential workforce, agricultural intermediaries maintain close ties with both landowners and workers. Many producers, for example in hazelnuts, apricots, sugar beet, cumin, citrus fruits and cherries, apply to agricultural intermediaries when they require workers. Having determined how many workers they will need and when, the landowners make a spoken contract with the
intermediaries, who then provide the required number of workers at the established time from the pool of labour that is informally attached to them. In some cases, the agricultural intermediary gets a cash advance from the landowner and some of the advance is then paid to workers. Workers are thereby indebted against future work to the intermediary. The entire system runs on unwritten agreements and informal relations.

When many workers are to be employed, agricultural intermediaries split them up into groups led by foremen. The foremen are tasked with the organisation of workers in the field. Foremen receive up to double the pay of workers. Intermediaries who send workers to distant locations for seasonal agricultural work usually provide transport themselves in their own old-fashioned vehicles. Deadly accidents involving such vehicles are frequently in the news in Turkey.

By law, intermediaries may only receive up to ten per cent of the total daily wage paid to workers, ten per cent of the cost of collecting the amount of produce collected or ten per cent of the amount established for the area to be covered, from the employer. Although they are not allowed to take payments from workers or to make cuts in their pay, they generally do make deductions from the workers’ pay. Intermediaries also profit by bringing supplies to workers in remote locations and selling the supplies at above the prices they paid for them. Agricultural intermediaries might be expected to find a balance between workers and employers and to seek to improve the working and living conditions of the workers and to ensure their safety at work; in fact, they generally ignore such matters, side with the employers and are motivated by short term gains. The relationship between intermediaries and workers is a form of patronage that is highly open to exploitation. Agricultural intermediaries are mostly former agricultural workers and are generally not covered by social security themselves. There is no training programme for agricultural intermediaries and no mechanism to regulate their work. The best solution would be for their occupation to be defined as a separate profession and for them to become organised through a professional chamber.

The relatives of foreign migrant workers living in Turkey may be seen as an intermediary institution. Almost all foreign migrant worker groups have begun their migration to Turkey through such relationships. This factor has been particularly significant in the migration of Azerbaijani and Georgian migrants to Turkey. Syrian migrants too have been observed to find seasonal agricultural work and to take part in migrations to this end through their relatives in Turkey. Family relationships are used as part of efforts to find work for individuals. A family which works in livestock keeping and cheese making in a village of Kars said that they arrange for one of their relatives in Georgia to come to their village for two or three months every year to work in exchange for monthly pay and board. A large landowner farmer in Kars who has relatives in Azerbaijan stated that he goes to Azerbaijan to bring workers, who are his relatives, to work in Turkey for a few months. After they arrived in Turkey, Syrian
Workers began to engage in migrant seasonal agricultural work alongside their relatives living in and around Şanlıurfa. Migrants often speak of finding work through intermediaries who had previously found work for relatives.

Workers’ markets, parks and workers’ coffeehouses can also be regarded as institutions which bring together employers and workers including migrant workers seeking work by the day. In Ardahan, a teahouse and a park where Azerbaijani workers gather is used as a workers’ market. Workers looking for daily work in construction, such as brick laying, or in fodder hauling or cutting gather in these locations in the morning and await potential employers. A similar practice is widespread in the Black Sea region, especially for Georgian migrants looking for daily work. In Malatya, a taxi driver, who owns the only vehicle capable of negotiating the very poor roads to some villages and the highland pasture, is the person who brings together shepherds and livestock owners. Furthermore, due to the personal relations which field owners develop with workers over time, working with the same family every year is a common form of finding labour, especially in the hazelnut, tea or apricot harvest.

Although the use of spaces, persons and relations as intermediary institutions varies depending on the spaces and people in question, both workers and employers use a combination of different personal and institutional relations to find work or labour. In hazelnuts, tea and apricots,
and in the Çukurova region, farmers generally rely on intermediaries who supply seasonal agricultural workers professionally (see Box 10): Regular, institutional intermediaries are used for tasks such as citrus fruit and vegetable harvesting, which require a high number of workers. Furthermore, field owners usually prefer to work with intermediaries to establish confidence, if they are to let the workers stay on their land. In most provinces where the field study took place, agricultural intermediaries were seen to be active. At times it was observed that foreign migrant workers themselves acted as agricultural intermediaries and engaged in this job professionally. A Georgian agricultural intermediary in the Bulancak district of Giresun is one example. Azerbaijani workers who secure jobs for one another within their limited network can be seen as a kind of intermediary too.

Agricultural intermediaries find workers and include them in their teams in different ways. In the Doğankent neighbourhood of Adana, most of those in the labour pools of the agricultural intermediaries are now Syrian workers. These people have been acting as agricultural intermediaries for a long time. They emphasise that workers from the south east of Turkey have gradually been replaced by workers from Syria, as domestic workers demand higher wages and fewer workers come from south eastern Turkey to Adana now. The agricultural intermediaries get access to the migrant labour through Syrian nationals who speak Turkish and who organise small teams. I have a van and go and fetch the workers with it.” The intermediary also stated that he provides housing for workers if they request it and that 5-6 individuals share a house. He said that he brings in groups of men and women from Georgia, and that the women generally pick hazelnuts while the men engage in the tea harvest and construction. “I leave the workers at the field with my own van. The working day begins at 7 a.m. and stops at 6 p.m. The workers do not find it difficult in Turkey, because most of them have been coming for 5-6 years; they know the area and have started learning Turkish.”

The constancy of relations makes things easier for the intermediary too. He said there were a couple of other Georgians who do the same work. He also said that he knows what he is doing is illegal but that no one has intervened and added: “It’s for the good of all; workers get jobs, field owners get workers, and everyone gets their business done.” Without hiding the anxiety he felt during the interview, he left the coffeehouse as soon as it was over.
Mehmet, who is originally from Adıyaman, travelled to Adana at the age of 5 with his family, who were cotton workers. Ever since his childhood he has lived along agricultural workers. He himself first worked as an agricultural labourer, later becoming an intermediary as he got to know more people. He wants his children to get an education, have a profession and not work as agricultural intermediaries. His daughter has graduated from college and is looking for a job. His son runs a bakery and a coffeehouse. He sells tea and bread to agricultural workers.

Mehmet has been working for four years to found an agricultural intermediaries’ association. He wants his job to be respected and to be carried out according to rules. He has spent a lot of effort and money on this and intends to spend more. So far he has not been able to get the status of a legal profession or professional chamber, but he will continue to advocate for this cause.

Mehmet finds jobs for around 200 agricultural workers in Adana. He says most of them are Syrian. “There are agricultural jobs 12 months a year in Adana,” he says, “The Syrians here are lucky. It is easier to find jobs in agriculture. It prevents poverty. It gives them a chance in life.”. According to Mehmet, Syrians in cities have it worse, because they cannot get jobs.

Mehmet says that Syrians engage in agricultural production as a family. “They all work - women, children, young and old. Otherwise they could not survive. Children of 12-13 years old children, women, all of them.” He offers us a glimpse of the lives of Syrian migrant children in Adana when
he says, “Even if there were schools they could not attend them; they are all after their bread.” The entire family has to take every job that comes along.

According to Mehmet, things in agriculture would have been bad had the Syrians not arrived. He too links the improvement in agricultural business and the availability of more jobs to the presence of Syrians. He says that had it not been for the arrival of Syrian migrants, labour costs would have risen very high. Syrians work for lower wages than domestic workers. With the onset of irrigated agriculture in Şanlıurfa, the number of migrant agricultural workers arriving from that province is falling. In Adana, agricultural output is rising and diversifying. More workers are needed, and with the supply of seasonal agricultural workers also falling, wages rise. Syrians have been a lifeline for agricultural production in Adana.

The number of agricultural jobs available makes Çukurova attractive to Syrians. According to Mehmet, the population of a given neighbourhood in Çukurova might be 40,000, but 10,000 of them will be Syrians. Mehmet has a large pool of labour. He says that finding Syrian labour has become a form of commerce and that there are Syrians who do it. “They call up and say ‘We need 200 workers.’ The intermediaries send the workers. Most of them cross the border illegally. Actually no one knows who or what anyone else is.”

Mehmet says that in rural Adana, Syrians live without causing any problems. “The actual problem makers are those who rent a house for 30-40 men; they’re trouble.” He believes that smaller families want to adjust and are trying to work to earn an income.
groups of migrants into worker teams. While perhaps not agricultural intermediaries themselves these people may be seen as a type of foreman working for the agricultural intermediary. Another way in which agricultural intermediaries find workers is by adding in relatives of the Syrians already in their pool. Such relations are also common among migrant seasonal workers from Şanlıurfa who are of Arab background. Those fleeing Syria are now migrant seasonal agricultural workers who travel around Turkey province by province for their survival. Their relations with all other actors of agricultural production are very dynamic and the phenomenon of Syrian workers is very new; it is therefore to be expected that relations between Syrian labour and other agents will take on many different forms in the future.

Agricultural intermediaries may be depicted as people who exploit the labour of seasonal agricultural workers and who reproduce a system of patronage by ensuring that the workers are reliant on them. The high commissions they take and the cuts they make in workers’ wages for supplies and transportation may be held up as proof of the claim that agricultural intermediaries are exploitative. However, the presence of agricultural intermediaries in seasonal agricultural work also provides security and trust both for employers and for workers. While for the employers, the agricultural intermediary guarantees that the work will be done, for the workers the agricultural intermediary guarantees that they will get paid. Studies on foreign migrant work in Turkey frequently refer to cases where workers either do not get their pay or receive it very late. The presence of agricultural intermediaries may allow foreign migrant workers to overcome this problem to an extent.

Working Hours and Periods

In seasonal agricultural production, working periods are limited to the harvest time of the product and the duration of the harvest is different for every crop. The length of the harvest closely effects the working hours of labourers. For example, while some produce has to be harvested over a single 25-30 day period, some products, such as tea, are harvested three times every year. In the harvest of all goods examined in the field study, workers were paid daily wages.

Tea is harvested three times every year, in May, July and September. After the leaves are clipped, two months are spent waiting for fresh shoots to grow. As mentioned in earlier chapters, the three-month visa allowed to
Georgian citizens matches the length of the tea harvest, and entries from Georgia are especially high in May and August. The fact that the tea fields are situated on steep slopes makes tea cutting a physically demanding task. It is difficult to stand up on steep inclinations, let alone use scissors rapidly to cut tea leaves and to put the tea leaves in bags all day long. Tea cutting begins at 7 a.m. and lasts until 7 p.m., including ten full hours of work per day.

Compared to tea, the harvest period for hazelnuts is shorter. The hazelnut harvest begins in the first week of August and is generally over by the first week of September, depending on temperature and rainfall. This makes for an average harvest period of 35-45 days. Collecting hazelnuts from heavily planted groves and from the long and irregular branches of the hazelnut tree is difficult work. Work begins at 7 a.m and runs until 7 p.m., after which the workers have little time left to go either to their camps or to the shelters they have been given and to prepare their meals. For workers staying in places given them by the orchard owner, the trek back might not be very long. However, for many workers, the road is long and travelling takes a lot of time and is risky due to the use of inappropriate vehicles.

In the hazelnut harvest, workers are widely employed on a daily wage basis. In the apricot harvest too they are employed for a daily wage. Due to the nature of the crop, the work lasts for four weeks at most. The apricot harvest begins during the last week of June and ends at the latest during the last week of July. As they reside in places close to the apricot orchards during this time, the workers are in effect dealing with apricots from the moment they wake up in the morning until they go to bed in the evening. For workers in the apricot harvest, the working day begins at 7 a.m. and ends at 7 p.m., and includes a full ten hours of work, although this may be lengthened if necessary.

Fodder cutting, which is common in the provinces of Kars and Ardahan, is also done in return for a daily wage. In some cases, workers may be paid in terms of the area of land on which fodder is cut, but daily wages are more common. Fodder cutting work is common in rural Kars and Ardahan in July and August, and foreign migrant workers engage in it for about ten hours a day.

In agricultural production, daily working hours are generally ten hours or more. In effect workers start at sunrise and finish towards sunset.
Morning For Seasonal Agricultural Workers

Between 3 a.m. and 4 a.m., the quietest time of the day elsewhere, is a time of extraordinary activity in the Doğankent neighbourhood of Adana. Strangers to the city might not know what it is all about. It is possible to see people hurrying around and to hear the engine noises and anxious honking of cars. It is the start of another working day for the residents of Doğankent.

Among those starting every day in such a hurry is Ahmet from Çermik, Diyarbakır, aged just 16. So is his friend with whom they go to work together. They both smoke and neither have completed their compulsory eight years of basic education. They don’t intend to. They have come to Doğankent in Adana with their families for seasonal agricultural work. At five in the morning they are queuing up in front of a bakery for bread and buns. They have woken up at 4 a.m. and waited for the old worker van to pick them up in the dark. They have been forced into the citrus fruit harvest along with their families by poverty.

The combination of buns and tea in a plastic cup is breakfast for Ahmet and his friend. They will rely solely on these buns for energy throughout the warm and difficult working day. In the short conversation we have with Ahmet and his friend, Ahmet tells us that he will not attend high school, and that although his mother wants him to enrol in the distance learning high school programme, he will not do so. We ask him about Syrian workers. He tells us that they work for less than him and his friend, that their number has risen very quickly and that if things go on like this they will soon be out of a job.

Doğankent used to be a village in the Yüreğir district of Adana, of which it is now officially a neighbourhood under the new law on metropolitan municipalities. According to what we are told 6 a.m. and work ends around 2 or 3 p.m. Workers get their daily wages for this period of time. The objective of a day of work is to have each group of workers fill up one truck with fruit. Work starts early and finishes early so that the truck can make it to the processing plant or storage facility in time. In order to start work so early in the morning, workers have to start travelling much earlier. Vegetable harvesting, like citrus fruit picking, starts early in the morning and ends when the targeted number of trucks are filled. Compared to citrus fruits, the vegetable harvest lasts longer, extending from May to November.

The cotton harvest, which traditionally employed seasonal agricultural labour, has recently been transformed by mechanisation. The great majority of the cotton is now collected by mechanised harvesters. However, the cotton which is not picked by the harvesters and abandoned by the field owner is collected by poor households, including children, with the own-
by inhabitants, it is a settlement of 40,000, including the surrounding area. It is said that 25 per cent of the population are Syrian refugees and that their number is increasing every day. The plain offers work 12 months a year. In this neighbourhood, all available space, even stables, have been rented out to Syrians. It is said that Syrians pay 5,000 liras a year to rent the stables.

In the early hours of the morning, domestic and Syrian workers alike await the transport that will take them to the citrus orchards and pepper fields. Around 5 a.m., between 30 and 40 of them squeeze into vans designed for 15-20 people and head out without having had a proper breakfast. There are so many Syrian workers around that only the darkness of the night obscures their number. Hundreds of vans take workers from Syria and Turkey to the citrus orchards and pepper fields.

Between 5 a.m. and 6 a.m., dozens of vanloads of workers emerge from every street and take to the main road. By the time the sun rises, the workers’ vans headed towards the fields are followed by the trucks into which they will pile the fruit which they harvest. The place is extraordinarily active and noisy. Yet, at 6 a.m. there is no sign of the mad rush. Doğankent appears to be an ordinary and quiet neighbourhood. All the workers have either made it to their fields or are about to. They will work until the trucks are full of oranges and mandarins and then they will come back home. The next day the same hurried cycle will continue, as it does almost every day of the year.

At the same time as the agricultural workers make it to their fields, factory workers, civil servants and office employees in other places are deep asleep. Yet the struggle for the survival of the poorest has already begun. We don’t know if they go to bed early, but they definitely rise early.

ers’ permission. The collected cotton is sold either to the field owner or to a third party at a unit price. In October 2015, the price was TRY1 per kilo of cotton. This arrangement not only does not prevent seasonal agricultural labour, but encourages the use of child labour. As the potential amount of cotton that can be picked is low, all members of the family are engaged in the job. In stony or small fields where mechanised harvesters cannot operate, cotton is picked by hand. Workers are paid a unit price. If, for example, workers are paid a unit price of TRY0.50 per kilogram, the daily wage of a worker who picks 100 kilograms a day will be TRY50. The cotton harvest begins in late September and ends towards the end of October. Workers start work at dawn and work until it is dark. This corresponds to 11-12 full hours of work.
Shelter Conditions

Problems have often arisen in connection with the shelter available to migrant seasonal agricultural workers in the places of work. An attempt has been made to solve the issue under the auspices of the state with the introduction of ‘METİP’ temporary camps. The METİP are, very broadly, camps made up of tents, with power and running water, but with only 2-3 toilets for every 1,000 people, and very limited bathing facilities. As places where migrant seasonal agricultural workers are allowed to build tents are generally close to drainage canals and main roads, both children and adults are at risk of drowning and traffic accidents. The METİP temporary camps are generally for the use of domestic migrant workers and there have been no identified cases of foreign migrant workers being admitted into one of these camps officially. Although there might be Syrians who have settled in these camps along with migrant seasonal agricultural worker families from Şanlıurfa, Mardin and Adıyaman, their number is not thought to be high.

The rising number of workers during the hazelnut and apricot harvest causes difficulties in terms of accommodation. Hazelnut grove owners generally house workers in shelters which they have had built for the workers in the groves. In the Black Sea region, where ethnic conflict and social hostility towards different ethnic identities are high, workers of Kurdish origin can stay in the orchards.
to isolate themselves, thereby protecting themselves from conflicts that might arise. It has been argued that the METİP temporary accommodation camps also serve to prevent conflicts over ethnic identity and to keep poor Kurds away from sight and out of town centres (KEİG 2015).

In the apricot harvest too, workers are for preference accommodated in tents set up in orchards, so that they can cover up the apricots laid out for drying quickly should it rain. The provision of shelter within the orchard results in longer working hours and the blurring of the line between work and leisure time. Therefore the temporary accommodation centre and prefabricated residences built for migrant seasonal agricultural workers in Malatya as part of the METİP initiative have not been utilised and remain empty.

Georgian workers who arrive in Turkey to collect hazelnuts and tea are similarly housed in places given to them by field owners. Sometimes they stay for an entire season in one village or field and cut tea for the entire village. Some Georgian workers have been reported to stay in groups in residences they rent in district centres. The owner of one hazelnut grove said that he had had a house built in his orchard for the accommodation of workers arriving for the harvest. Accommodation in the field offers the advantage, for workers without permits, of being inconspicuous. Moreover, as they do not have to pay for accommodation, their net earnings are higher. The fact
that hazelnut and apricot orchards are generally distant to villages and district centres makes it advantageous for orchard owners to have workers camp in the fields. Otherwise, they would incur transportation costs for every working day.

There is a connection between the duration of employment of migrant workers and their shelter conditions. For example, those workers who are employed by a different employer every day for a daily wage have to find their own accommodation. Those employed in construction and Azerbaijanis who cut fodder have been observed to stay in rented accommodation. Large numbers of migrants may share the same rented accommodation in order to lower fixed costs per capita and save money. The greatest difficulty for migrant workers is those days when work cannot be found or done. This results in significant economic losses for the migrants, as their fixed costs have to be paid while income is interrupted. Rainy days are the greatest nightmare of seasonal agricultural workers. An Azerbaijani migrant says,

“15 [liras] for the hostel and 15 for food. It makes 30 [liras]. You come to work for three to five days. If it rains, you cannot get work. What wages you’ve earned will wither away.”

Some Azerbaijani workers are known to shelter in hostels in and around Kars for 10-15 liras per night. During the field study, a visit was paid to one such hostel to observe the place and conditions of accommodation of the migrants. Three or four people stay in a room which meets basic needs and has a small stove for cooking basic meals. The cost of accommodation in hostels is much higher than when a number of migrant workers rent a place together.

A young Azerbaijani agricultural worker interviewed in Ardahan stated that he shares his accommodation with other migrant workers from Azerbaijan, and that they can be up to 10 people at a time. He said that they share rent, power and water costs equally and that sharing is for the good of all. He added that they cook evening meals in turn, that they shop for it jointly and that this is how they pass the summer months. At the end of the summer, when work in Ardahan is over, some foreign migrant workers will return home, while others will look for work in other provinces of Turkey, such as Istanbul.
As a result of consultation with producer representatives from various districts, institutions, village foremen, association presidents, chambers of agriculture and representatives of some institutions, the maximum rates for the tea harvest in the province of Rize have been established at TRY250 per tonne, TRY275 per tonne including hauling to the road, TRY70 for the daily wage and TRY7 for hourly pay. The rate for the tea harvest has been established in keeping with the method of establishing all agricultural labour rates in the current conditions of our country and it will be so set in the future.

1- Those who do not abide by this joint regulation will be held responsible.

2- Their identities will be revealed to the public by all possible means.

3- They will face legal action.

4- The matter will be followed up by unidentified persons in districts and villages and should they carry out violations at the next cutting time, the security forces will be asked to do their duties.

The Committee
The main complaints about the housing conditions of Syrian migrants are that they are accommodated in unsuitable structures and that owners often ask for very high rents for unsuitable accommodation. The arrival of a large number of Syrian refugees in Mersin and Adana within a short space of time has made their accommodation an important problem in the region. During interviews, it was mentioned that places in Adana’s Doğan-kent neighbourhood which used to be stables are rented out to Syrians and that the rents are between 400 and 500 liras a month.

The prevalence of greenhouse agriculture in the town of Kocahasanlı in Mersin has made it a popular spot for Syrian migrants. The Syrians are said to live as an entire family in single rooms, without power or running water and without household goods such as refrigerators and washing machines. Local people collected money among themselves to buy a refrigerator for Syrian migrants. Due to the warm climate, there are Syrians in the region who shelter in tents in the winter. Families in Adana try to survive in tents throughout the year. Although tent accommodation may be bearable in the summer, it carries a very high risk of illness in cold and rainy weather. It is clear that urgent measures are needed to ensure that migrants can find shelter in suitable conditions.

Wages in Seasonal Agricultural Labour: Who Gains from the Competition of the Poor?

The wages of migrant seasonal agricultural workers differ by ethnic origin, sex and and the region they work in. Once the costs of commissions paid to intermediaries, transportation and utilities used in places of shelter are deducted, very little pay remains for the workers. According to the 2014 TURKSTAT Agricultural Enterprise Wage Structure Study, the average daily pay for seasonal agricultural work is TRY48. The average wage is TRY54 for men and TRY41 for women (TURKSTAT, 2015). Assuming that a migrant seasonal agricultural worker works for 25 days a month, the worker will earn TRY1,200 a month. While TURKSTAT data are useful for monitoring the nationwide average for the sector, at the local level provincial governor’s offices establish commissions to set the wage rate, and the rate they set widely applies. For example, in 2015, the wage decision of the commission for the province of Giresun was as follows:
It has been decided that during the 2015 harvest, daily payments made to those meeting the criteria for working in hazelnut picking jobs without discrimination by age and sex are as follows:

- 42 liras for workers if the employer provides a meal and
- 46 liras if the employer does not provide a meal;
- 60 liras for haulers who will carry the hazelnuts collected if the employer provides a meal and 65 liras if the employer does not provide a meal,
- 55 liras for cooks working during the harvest,
- 120 liras per tonne or 0.12 liras per kilo for the machine separators,
- 0.35 liras per kilo of hazelnuts for workers getting paid by the kilo,
- 140 liras for the mule driver (including the mule). (Doğankent Newspaper, 2015).

Similarly, a commission presided over by the provincial governor in Malatya set the daily wage for apricot picking at TRY42 for 2015. Although the set wages apply to some produce, especially hazelnuts and apricots, market conditions can render the commission rate ineffective. In other words, while locally set wages are important in terms of establishing the average wage rate, for some produce, the daily wage set by the commission does not apply in practice. For example, although a commission established by the Rize Oversight Committee set the daily wage for tea cutting at TRY70 in 2015, effective daily wages for the tea harvest in the region were above TRY100.
Table 13. Daily wage rate for seasonal agricultural workers in 2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Worker group</th>
<th>Produce/Activity</th>
<th>Daily wages (TRY)</th>
<th>Additional payments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Georgian workers</td>
<td>Tea-leaf cutting</td>
<td>90-100</td>
<td>Lunch, cigarettes, phone credits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Azerbaijani workers</td>
<td>Fodder cutting</td>
<td>90-100</td>
<td>Lunch, cigarettes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgian workers</td>
<td>Hazelnuts</td>
<td>45-50</td>
<td>Lunch, accommodation, dinner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic migrant seasonal agricultural workers (from Şanlıurfa, Mardin, Adıyaman, etc.)</td>
<td>Hazelnuts</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>Lunch, tent space or accommodation allocation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syrian workers</td>
<td>Apricots</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>Lunch, tent space allocation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic migrant seasonal agricultural workers (from Şanlıurfa, Mardin, Adıyaman, etc.)</td>
<td>Apricots</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>Lunch, tent space allocation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syrian workers</td>
<td>Citrus fruits, vegetables, pistachios</td>
<td>24-40</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Figures derived from the field study.

While market conditions have raised wages in tea cutting, the opposite has been the case for the citrus harvest in Adana and Mersin, and for pistachios in Gaziantep, provinces with heavy concentrations of Syrian refugees. During the 2014-2015 citrus fruit season, the advised daily wage rate for workers including the fee for intermediaries was TRY44 (Milliyet, 2014). However, the rate never rose above TRY40 in 2015, and was reportedly even lower for young Syrians at TRY 30-35. People very often refer to the fact that the arrival of the Syrians has been a factor causing wages to fall.

During the field study, it was observed that the daily wages differed from produce to produce. The main determinant of the wage level is whether there is competition between migrant seasonal agricultural labourers. The main axis of competition is ethnic origin and if the labour market is closed off to different ethnic groups, it will pay higher daily wages. While daily wages approached TRY-100 for tea-leaf cutting and fodder cutting in 2015, they were around TRY40-45 in the apricot and the hazelnut harvest. For tea-leaf cutting, Georgian workers alone supply labour, and similar conditions apply for Azerbaijani workers in fodder cutting. In the hazelnut harvest, domestic workers from the eastern, south eastern and Mediterranean provinces of Turkey and Georgian workers are engaged together, while in the apricot harvest Syrian workers join the domestic migrant workers. Syrian workers are heavily concentrated in the Çukurova region, where the lowest daily wages for agricultural work apply. Wage differences may be seen as a strong indicator of the social acceptance of various foreign migrant groups in Turkey and their place within the hierarchy of workers.
Women’s Labour in Seasonal Agricultural Production

One of the issues most widely discussed regarding migrant seasonal agricultural labour in Turkey is child and women’s labour. The use of women’s labour in migrant seasonal agricultural labour is generally discussed in terms of the length of working days, the responsibility for cooking, cleaning and childcare which women have to take, and women bearing the time and labour costs of reproduction, which takes place under difficult circumstances (Çınar 2014, Kezban et al., 2015). Women on average work for 16-18 hours per day and their main helpers are their daughters. Female children also shoulder a considerable amount of this labour burden. They engage in cooking, water carrying, lighting fires and cleaning tents. They also have to take responsibility for their younger siblings (KEİG 2015). Woman workers in seasonal agricultural work generally lack social security and specifically services for mothers. Inadequate hygiene conditions, low socio-economic status, early marriage and adolescent pregnancies, multiple and frequent pregnancies and births and lack of access to healthcare services before, during and after childbirth increase health risks for the child and the mother and can even cause deaths.

In addition to the intensive use of women’s labour in seasonal agricultural production, the central position of women in international migration movements is referred to in migration literature as “the feminisation of migration”. The female bias of both migration and agricultural production has also been observed among the migrant seasonal agricultural workers examined in this study. With the exception of Azerbaijani migrants working in the provinces of Ardahan and Kars, women are visibly engaged in all kinds of production. There are Syrian migrant women who pick and stone apricots and Georgian women who are the main workers of the tea and hazelnut harvest. Syrian women also engage in the struggle for survival of their families by working in citrus fruit, cotton and vegetable harvesting in Adana and Mersin, pistachios in Gaziantep and red peppers in Şanlıurfa. They make every effort to somewhat alleviate the difficult conditions facing their families.

Georgian women are the main workers in hazelnut groves in Giresun and tea fields in Rize and Artvin. They have taken to the road to improve their families’ declining income due to the poor economic circumstances of their country. They do not only arrive in Turkey for agricultural work, but sometimes marry older men just to work as
caregivers. The widespread presence of a Georgian population in the Black Sea region is a factor which makes it easier for Georgian women to migrate and increase their alternative sources of work and income.

The labour of migrant women is one of the most important components of agricultural production. Tea is traditionally women’s work and the image of the hard-working Black Sea woman is popularly accepted. Collecting and stoning apricots and packaging them are all women’s work, which are done by migrant women as well as traditionally by the female labour of the household. The traditional sexual distribution of labour in agriculture has not been transformed and the jobs have come to be shared out accordingly between the migrant women and men.

Georgian Nüyra

Georgian Nüyra is one of the thousands of women in Turkey who work as caregivers for the children of upper and middle class households. She takes care of the children of a household that lives in one of the wealthy residential communities in Istanbul. We met her at a hazelnut orchard in Giresun, where she was spending her annual leave picking hazelnuts. Her friends and relatives from Batumi come to Giresun to pick hazelnuts. They will work for the same orchard owner for nearly 10 days. If they can get work in another grove, they will go to work there too. Nüyra will be working during her annual leave this year.

Nüyra’s form of employment is no different to that of the other workers. Her greatest advantage is working for an employer who is of Georgian origin. This takes care of the language problem, but in any case, Nüyra speaks Turkish fluently. She acts like an interpreter for the team she has brought in from Batumi. Nüyra is a strong willed woman who keeps the group together. She says she has six children and ten grandchildren. She had many children and grandchildren at an early age, as she married young. When asked where her husband is, she says, rather evasively, “He’s sick; he couldn’t come.”

The working day for Nüyra and friends begins early in the morning and continues until darkness falls. They get TRY50 for the long working day. In addition, the grove owner gives them accommodation in a place that resembles a dormitory. Their employer also provides some ingredients for a meal. They eat dinner together with all the other workers in the garden which they share with the grove owner. Nüyra says that they have toilets and showers in their place of accommodation and that sanitation is not a problem for them. Sometimes one of them will not go picking hazelnuts but work as the cook. Nüyra sometimes gets to cook. The cook gets the same daily wage from the grove owner. The Georgian workers we visited during dinner were laughing and joking among themselves. Nüyra says she spends her earnings on her family. She says that life is difficult in Georgia and that the money she makes from the hazelnut harvest will be used for the livelihood of her family in Georgia during the winter.
Child Labour in Seasonal Agricultural Production

As agricultural production traditionally relies on unpaid household labour in Turkey, child labour is a part of agricultural production. Most of the children involved spend all seven days of the week working 12 hours a day. While a third of them abandon their education between the ages of 12 and 15, 71 per cent of 16-18 year olds are no longer going to school. According to a report by the Seasonal Labour Migration Communication Network (MİGA), once they have interrupted their education, female children wanting to go back to school upon returning to their place of permanent residence meet with resistance from their families. Even when their families are not opposed, by the time they return to their permanent address, the registration period for schools will have passed. Furthermore, even when it is possible for children to go to school from their place of work, they often do not attend, because they may face discrimination at school (MİGA 2012).

In recent years, efforts have increased to prevent child labour for certain products, especially in the hazelnut harvest. Various campaigns have been organised and certification procedures introduced. The rising sensitivity towards the prevention of child labour in the hazelnut harvest is a result
of the insistence of large firms on the implementation of ILO working standards in their supply chains. Despite such developments, migrant seasonal agricultural work continues to affect the lives of children on many dimensions. At the Fatsa (Ordu) METİP temporary accommodation centre, there were more children than adults. This means that children have to live in an unhealthy environment, exposed to many dangers and risks. Although the goodwill of NGOs has made it possible for children to continue to take part in educational activities at the camps, these efforts will not result in important structural changes. In the long run, most of these children will work as migrant seasonal agricultural workers in hazelnut groves once they are past the age of compulsory education, just like their parents.

Among the groups studied, no child workers were observed among the Georgian and Azerbaijani migrant groups. While this does not mean that child labour is not employed at all, it shows that it is not widespread. The migration from Nakhchivan to the provinces of Kars and Ardahan is dominated by men and is not a case of family migration: the children stay at home with their mothers. A study on Azerbaijani migration in Istanbul, however, has shown that some Azerbaijanis do migrate as a family, including women and children, with the result that Azerbaijani children as young as nine are employed in the ready-to-wear workshops in the city (Dedeoğlu and Gökmen, 2011).

Although women feature prominently in the migration of Georgians, no children have been encountered. It is very likely that the women leave their children behind with other women when they engage in migrant work. Because of this form of migration is seasonal, short term and circular, children do not present an obstacle to their mothers or families. However, the Georgian agricultural intermediary interviewed expressed a desire to open a kindergarten in future years. This implies an inclination to further alleviate obstacles in the
way of women with children joining the workforce. On the other hand, the migration of women with children means that their children have to live without parental protection when left behind with others.

Among the groups covered by this study, Syrian migrants are the most prone to using child labour. Observations made during the field study have shown that the most basic condition for the survival of the family under the extraordinary conditions facing it is for most members of the family to engage in income-earning activities. Child workers are widely employed in harvesting apricots, citrus fruits, vegetables, pistachios and cotton. The cotton left behind in the field by machine harvesters is then collected by the poorest households in the area, including Syrian families, with children also engaging in this activity.

Children a little over 10 years of age have been observed working among Syrian families engaged in seasonal agricultural production. Children were seen carrying heavy baskets of citrus fruits to collection areas and from there to trucks, working with groups of young Syrians in orchards in Adana. Among Syrian migrants, it is commonly accepted that agricultural work should be done by younger people, since older people cannot bear such heavy and rapid work.

As the schooling ratio among Syrian migrants is very low, and they lack access to educational services, Syrian children are left with no other option but to work in fields and orchards in rural areas and on the street in urban areas.
While this report argues that the engagement of foreign migrant workers in agricultural production in Turkey has been the result of certain social and economic changes in society in Turkey, there are also signs of social change brought on by the presence of foreign migrant workers. The presence of migrant networks and the role of these networks in determining which jobs migrants are able to access, the multi-cultural structure of migrant seasonal agricultural labour and the competition among agricultural workers all indications of the social changes taking place in Turkey.

### Migrant Networks: Kinship and Virtual Kinship

Certain kinds of relationships and social networks make it easier for foreign migrant workers to take part in agricultural production in Turkey, and direct migrants towards such jobs. These networks have been established differently for each of the different foreign migrant worker groups, and it is the existence of these networks that allow workers to take jobs in the production of certain goods. Family relations are especially important for the three main groups of foreign migrants examined by this study. It is primarily through these relations that migrants access their initial place of migration and the jobs they can do in the area. Underlying the intensive migration of Georgians to the Black Sea region is the presence of a Georgian population and geographical proximity. Azerbaijanis have arrived in and around Kars as a result of ties of kinship and acquaintance with the Azerbaijani population there. Syrian migrants begin to take up seasonal agricultural jobs through their relatives in and around Şanlıurfa.

Just as the use of these networks determines which jobs workers will get to engage in, and in which regions, so migrants who remain isolated from such networks of kinship are unable to access seasonal agricultural jobs in Turkey at all. One of the most important reasons for this is that field and orchard owners do not hire workers without somehow knowing them first. This is when agricultural intermediaries come in. One of the most striking examples of workers who are unable to find jobs in seasonal agriculture because of a lack of family ties is to be found among those Syrian migrants who have arrived in the Black Sea region by their own means but ended up unemployed or collecting aid in the street. While these people cannot
access jobs, one can find many Syrian workers in fields and camps in the same region. These have arrived for seasonal agricultural work together with their relatives from in and around Şanlıurfa.

The formation of social relations does not always necessitate real kinship or blood ties. A sense of kinship may be derived from the same ethnic origins of two nations, as is the case with Azerbaijani migrants, or from having the same religion and speaking the same language. Many Azerbaijani migrants see themselves as brothers of Turks, from the same nation and religion, and insistently employ rhetoric to the effect that “Turkey is the father of the Turks”, all of which helps to build and maintain social networks.

Similarly, the political and social ties which developed between Turkey and Georgia from the early 1990s onwards initiated a process through which Georgian migrants discovered their settled Georgian relatives in Turkey’s Black Sea region. The favourable statements made by some high-ranking state officials regarding Georgians show that the process has resulted in the domestic Georgian population also rediscovering their relatives from Georgia. Therefore, when Georgian labour is to be employed, relatives are preferred. The initial working relations built around kinship ties have gradually expanded, so that most of the tea harvest is now being carried out by Georgian workers.

The relations developed by migrants with the local community are the main factor in determining which seasonal agricultural jobs the migrants will get to work in. The establishment, development and maintenance of these relations is important both for the local population and migrant workers and is one of the chief factors which determines the social organisation of seasonal agricultural production.

The Rivalry of the Poor

Migrant seasonal agricultural labour in Turkey has always been carried out by the poorest segment of society. While paid agricultural production was traditionally carried out by landless peasants and the urban poor, this is a dynamic area that has been affected by urbanisation and social transformation. As those situated at the lowest end of the income scale move upwards in time, the poverty shift they have exited is taken over by other social groups. Migrant seasonal agricultural labour may be regarded as a poverty stop. Different social groups have halted at this stop at different points in time. Most recently it has been visited by those migrating from rural areas in south eastern and eastern parts of the country due to the armed conflict, and settling in the towns without land or other property.
The main source provinces of this population are Şanlıurfa, Adıyaman, Siirt, Van, Diyarbakır, Batman and Mardin. Now their place is slowly being taken by Syrian migrants. The greatest impact of these new actors on the seasonal agricultural labour market in Turkey has been the competition they have entered into with the local workforce.

One of the main points emphasised in this study is that the main underlying dynamic of change in seasonal agricultural production in Turkey in the near future will be the competition among different migrant groups over jobs and wages. This competition will also come to play an important role in the social organisation of seasonal agricultural production. The most visible form of competition is that between domestic migrant seasonal agricultural workers from the south east of Turkey and Syrian workers. There is a general consensus among domestic workers that, in addition to pulling down wages, Syrian migrants have been taking away their jobs. In the report prepared by the Support to Life Association, a domestic worker speaks of the situation as follows:

_Syrians came and our time was up... Does Turkey not have poor of its own? The bosses like it because it’s cheap. Last year [a Syrian worker] was showing [a field owner] a 20 lira bill, implying he would work for that amount. The going daily wage was 40 liras (Support to Life, 2014: 76)._  

_There is a lot of potential for foreign workers in apricots. We expect to see even more Syrian workers in future._

Competition among the workers is clearly visible when workers from different ethnic groups vie for the same jobs and the most obvious outcome of the competition is falling wages. If a single group of workers dominates the labour market for a certain kinds of produce, the daily wages for work in that area are usually higher than for work in other areas in which different groups of workers are active. For example, the daily wages for the tea harvest, which Georgian workers carry out alone, and for Azerbaijani workers in the Kars-Ardahan region, were the highest encountered in the field study.

The falling wages which result from competition among workers or from the entry of certain groups into work in seasonal agriculture constituted one of the basic dynamics of seasonal agricultural production in Turkey during the summer of 2015 in which the field study was carried out. The competition has increased due to the arrival of large numbers of Syrian
migrants. There are significant indications that Syrian migrants will increasingly come to dominate seasonal agricultural labour in the years to come. This has been well documented in the Çukurova region, where, as the capability and experience of Syrian migrant workers with agricultural jobs grow, they tend to replace domestic workers, pushing down wages, which had previously been following an upward trend.

The involvement of Syrian refugees in seasonal agricultural work has led to daily wages remaining stable and the amount of work available per family to fall compared to past years. Therefore household income from agricultural work has fallen. This has led to an intensification of labour exploitation and increased tensions among different migrant groups (Support to Life, 2014:74).

One factor that somewhat mitigates the force of competition among worker groups is the introduction of wage differentials, with different tasks being allotted to different groups. More emphasis is being placed on the experience required for some field jobs which cannot be done by beginners, and workers engaged in these tasks - mainly domestic workers - are paid higher wages. It is often noted that the workers have been employed constantly do some tasks better, and are therefore preferable to Syrian migrants, which is why the latter are paid less. While the division of labour among seasonal agricultural workers does not always cause wages to differ, the more prestigious jobs are sometimes given to domestic workers. Quiet appreciation of the experience held by certain groups is an old phenomenon in seasonal agricultural production. For example, stoning of apricots is not a task given to Syrian workers, who are generally employed in the more menial tasks of shaking the trees and collecting the fruit. This is a way of appreciating the know-how and experience of domestic workers.

While seasonal agricultural work used to be a means of staving off absolute poverty used by the poorest groups and passed on to the next, in recent years it has transformed into a field of competition of the poorest in which different groups of the poorest people vie for the same jobs.
Workers’ Hierarchies, Rural Antagonism and Ethnic Encounters

The employment of migrant workers in seasonal agricultural production in Turkey leads to certain outcomes encountered in analyses of poverty and the labour market. One of these, as explained before, is the changing form of poverty. While in the past the poorest groups in time passed over poverty to other groups, and experienced poverty in shifts, now poverty is not temporary for any poor group, and has come to involve competition among them. The role of foreign migrant workers within the competition of the poor is significant. The competition of the poor also involves encounters and clashes among different ethnic, religious and cultural groups.

‘Antagonism’ is the term used to describe conflict among groups and the attempts made by one group to eliminate or to impose hegemony over the others. In this case, conflict is more of a means of survival and its resolution is only possible if groups accept the existence of others or try to find new means of coexistence. Antagonism in Turkey has generally been experienced in urban areas, where groups from different religious, ethnic and cultural backgrounds from the homogenous rural areas have come to live side by side. That groups with no previous experience of cohabitation should live together and develop common values is only possible if they develop common codes of living over time. In the study Kentsel Gerilim (Urban Tension), focusing on the Pendik district of Istanbul, Erder (1997) has claimed that the different approaches of various mosques and religious schools in the neighbourhood to religion has helped in the development of an understanding of shared living in urban areas.

Antagonistic relations formerly thought to be peculiar to urban areas have now appeared in rural areas, which typically have more homogenous social structures, as a result of migrant seasonal agricultural labour. Rural areas and seasonal agricultural production, which form the stage for the competition of the poor, are also fields of encounter among different ethnic, religious and cultural groups. Migrant seasonal agricultural work is undergoing a dynamic change in form as a field of encounters among domestic and foreign workers and the local population. The ethnic confrontations which were previously experienced between workers from the south east of Turkey and field and orchard owners are now being experienced by diverse groups meeting each other in rural Turkey. What we have termed “rural antagonism” carries the risk of conflict among different groups. Rural areas where only two different ethnic groups and cultural identities used
to confront each other are now places where many different ethnic groups meet and in some cases compete for the same work.

The places where the confrontation is most clearly observed are those where more than one group of workers arrive for work. In regions such as the Black Sea region and Çukurova, where there is demand for many seasonal agricultural workers, domestic workers from south eastern Turkey and Georgian, Azerbaijani and Syrian migrant workers all encounter one another. This meeting of groups from different places and with different ethnic, religious and cultural identities have made the rural areas more multicultural than they have ever been as places of cohabitation of different migrant groups who are unfamiliar with one another. In Giresun, while one hazelnut grove may be worked by domestic workers from south eastern Turkey, the next plot may be worked by Georgian migrant workers. This also paves the way for encounters with other groups for the local population, who live in a homogenous social structure. Although these encounters may have an antagonistic character, they also contain the initial elements of a rural structure that will emerge in the future.

Especially as Syrian migrants start to become permanently resident in Turkey, it would not be out of place to predict that the antagonism will not remain limited to agricultural production but will expand to other domains, while deepening in those where it is already present.

4.5 PERCEPTIONS OF MIGRANT WORKERS: GEORGIANS, AZERBAIJANIS AND SYRIANS

The relationship of the local population with the foreign migrant workers and the locals’ assessments of them both as fellow humans and as workers is an interesting field of study in terms of what it tells us about the social construction of “the Other” and the dimensions of the separation between “them” and “us”. The construal of migrants as “the Other” involves pointing out the differences, which may sometimes take the form of comparisons between domestic and foreign migrant workers, and sometimes comparisons between different groups of foreign migrant workers.

Pointing out differences between themselves and Syrian migrants, locals usually focus on different behavioural patterns. Those families who employ Syrian workers as shepherds have had an especially good chance to observe their behaviour closely. As forms of behaviour which they find strange, they point out that Syrians do not use forks but with their hands. They often emphasise how quiet they are, how they always sit at the same
spot and how they do not talk. One interviewee says of the Syrian shepherd who works for him:

_Every day, he sits at the very same spot. He washes his hands and face thoroughly - he takes care of his cleanliness. He prays and then comes and sits at the same spot. Wouldn’t a person sit somewhere else for a change? He never opens his mouth, never says a word._

The surprise of the herd owner at the behaviour of the Syrian shepherd is in keeping with the curiosity and the desire to understand an unknown “stranger” and contains expressions of wonder. Having had minimum communication with the shepherd and not having got to know him puts the local employer in an unfamiliar situation.

In some cases, foreign migrant workers are compared with domestic workers to point out the differences. This is encountered most often in comparisons of Georgian workers with others. When Georgian migrants workers are compared to domestic migrant workers, they are frequently said to be very clean, to take a shower every evening, to have “working class discipline” and to complete any task they are given fully. The differences in the appearance of Georgians compared to other workers has a significant effect on the perception of locals of Georgians and allows them to be construed as strangers who are at the same time closer to the local population. In comparison with Georgians, workers from south eastern Turkey are seen as more distant, strange “others”. Yet some families say that the latter have worked on their land for decades and that they are “almost like relatives”.

The exclusion of migrants becomes more apparent when their working conditions, and the differences in the way they are treated compared to other workers, are considered. The main reason why Syrian workers feel
ostracised is that they receive almost half the pay for the same work as domestic workers. Regarding the position of Syrians in Turkey, one interviewee said:

“They cannot be in the same position as [Turkish] citizens here, they are in a sense second class citizens. They feel unprotected”.

Another factor making foreign migrant workers feel excluded, especially for Syrian workers, is that they have no option other than taking the work they are offered. Another interviewee put it like this:

Employers prefer Syrians because they are a cheap source of labour. They don’t ask for social security, they don’t ask for overtime, and they work with greater care over longer hours. It’s because they don’t want to lose their jobs. They make a greater effort not to be fired.

Another significant factor influencing the locals’ perceptions of foreign migrant workers is that educated people with professional occupations come to work in Turkey as seasonal agricultural labourers. This is often pointed out in the case of Azerbaijani migrants, who include civil servants and army officers coming to Turkey to work for a few months in the summer to save up or pay off debts. This situation is met with surprise – all the more so because it is in stark contrast to the experiences of the households, which have seen their more educated members withdraw from agricultural production. An Azerbaijani who worked in post office at home and worked hauling fodder in Ardahan for three months was said to have saved up enough to cover his debts: when he went back to Azerbaijan, the money he earned in Turkey was very valuable there and could support a family for six months.
The Report on the Present Situation of Foreign Migrant Workers in Seasonal Agricultural Production in Turkey analyses the conditions of foreign migrant workers in seasonal agricultural production in Turkey. It also seeks to answer the question of how increasing numbers of foreign migrant workers in Turkey have affected agricultural production and agricultural labour. To answer these questions, analyses have been made of the labour supply of foreign migrant workers working in seasonal agricultural production, of the conditions that create demand for paid labour in seasonal agricultural production and of the social change brought on by the foreign migrant labour.

An analysis conducted on a product-by-product basis examined the production of tea, hazelnuts, livestock, apricots, cotton, pistachios, vegetables and citrus fruits in relevant provinces in north eastern Anatolia, the Black Sea region, Çukurova and south eastern Anatolia. The foreign migrants working in the production of these goods were found to come from three source countries: Georgia, Azerbaijan and Syria. While Georgian workers are more concentrated in the production of tea and hazelnuts, Azerbaijanis constitute the foreign migrant labour in the provinces of Kars and Ardahan, and are mainly employed in cutting fodder. Syrian migrants workers are most heavily concentrated in the provinces of Adana, Mersin, Şanlıurfa and Gaziantep.

With the visa exemption agreement signed between Georgia and Turkey, Georgian citizens can enter Turkey without a passport for 90 days every 180 days. Since 2010, the number of entries has increased rapidly and in 2014, there were 1.7 million Georgian entries into Turkey. Most of them arrived by land via the Sarp Border Crossing. Most entries take place in May and August, coinciding with the tea harvest. Azerbaijanis mostly enter Turkey via the Dilucu Border Crossing in Iğdir to go on to Kars and Ardahan. While Azerbaijani citizens make more than 600,000 entries into Turkey every year, the number of entries via the Dilucu Border Crossing in 2014 was more than 200,000. Some of these entries by land are thought to be for purposes of agricultural production.
The migration from Syria is one of the largest population movements Turkey has ever experienced. The number of Syrian migrants arriving in Turkey over the last five years has approached 3 million. Some of them work in seasonal agricultural production in south eastern provinces. Syrians also work in the non-agricultural sectors of manufacturing, construction and services. These migrants are expected to stay in Turkey permanently, considering their numbers and active roles in the labour market. They constitute an important pool of labour for seasonal agricultural production.

Regarding how foreign migrant workers come to work in seasonal agricultural production, the answer is that the socioeconomic transformation in agriculture in recent years has increased demand for paid agricultural work. For all the products examined, it has been observed that social change in rural areas has increased demand for paid labour, and that large numbers of workers are needed for a short period at harvest time. In the Black Sea provinces, agricultural production has ceased to be the only or even the primary source of income for many local households. Meanwhile, many people have migrated to urban areas, the population has aged, and land holdings have become smaller due to inheritance and to cultural codes which prevent the consolidation and sale of ancestral land. This situation forces households to use paid labour for the harvest of the produce grown on their land. Demand for Azerbaijani labour in Kars and Ardahan follows a similar pattern, with migration to urban areas a major factor.

In the Çukurova region, demand for paid workers arises from increased output and the year-round agriculture that is practised in the area. While the migration of Syrians has been an important factor in meeting the rising demand for labour in the area, it has also kept wages stable or made them fall; causing output to rise further. The example of Çukurova shows that demand for foreign migrant labour does not always arise from social transformation but that foreign migrant labour itself can be a trigger for social
change. The introduction of Syrian migrant labour in Çukurova has had a positive influence in terms of the expansion of agricultural production.

The Report on the Present Situation of Foreign Migrant Workers in Seasonal Agricultural Production in Turkey also contains findings regarding the working conditions of foreign migrant workers. The report points out that different groups of foreign migrant workers and domestic migrant workers alike experience similar working conditions and that the social exclusion of workers in seasonal agricultural production is created by these structural conditions. The strategies employed by workers for finding work and the means they employ to this end are an important predictor of which regions the group will be concentrated in. While family relations are an important factor in determining where a migrant worker will be employed, foreign migrant workers can also resort to agricultural intermediaries to find work, just like domestic migrant workers. Agricultural intermediaries have a very significant role in accessing migrant labour, and great influence over the workers, but some labourers do not use agricultural intermediaries because they can find work themselves or have worked for the same household repeatedly over the years. However, the role of agricultural intermediaries is critical in meeting demands for high numbers of workers and directing the work. Furthermore, agricultural intermediaries appear to be emerging from within the foreign migrant worker groups, and Georgian and Syrian agricultural intermediaries are slowly becoming influential in directing the movements of the seasonal agricultural labour.

In almost all of the activities in which migrant agricultural workers take part, working hours can be up to 12 hours a day. Working hours and cycles differ depending on the produce. Harvest periods in seasonal agricultural work can range from thirty days to three months and can involve heavy and dangerous work. Seasonal agricultural workers are generally paid daily wages. Commissions formed in each province before the harvest season determine the wage rates. However, the market rate may sometimes differ from the set rates. Wage levels are influenced by competition among foreign migrant worker groups and between them and domestic workers. If more than one group of workers supplies labour for a particular product, daily wages tend to be lower than for other products. This is the case with hazelnuts, apricots and all production in Çukurova, for which daily wages never exceed TRY45. The highest wages are paid for the harvesting of tea and fodder, in which only one ethnic group is employed. Meanwhile, the presence of Syrian migrant workers has pushed wages down for almost every kind of agricultural work in which they are
employed. Çukurova, where Syrian workers get the lowest wages, furnishes the best example of this.

Woman and children are among the most important groups of workers in seasonal agricultural production in Turkey. This also holds true for foreign migrant workers. Women are an integral part of all agricultural production activities. Female labour is used very widely in apricots, tea and hazelnuts as well as in production in Çukurova. Female labour has only been found to be absent in fodder cutting. Besides being more difficult for women in general, migrant seasonal agricultural jobs also heavily increase the burden of work on women. For while women engage in production in the fields for pay, they also work to take care of other members of the household.

Among foreign migrant workers, child labour is most commonly observed among the Syrians. Use of child labour is common in apricots, citrus fruits, vegetables, pistachios and cotton. It is possible to see children of ten years of age working in the fields. There is a widespread opinion among Syrian migrants that children and young people are best suited to agricultural labour, and that only they can shoulder the heavy burden of agricultural work. The low rate of schooling in this group increases the proportion of children available to work. In any case, even if some children might have the opportunity to attend school, they may be obliged to work to support their family’s survival. Children working in seasonal agricultural production face many risks in terms of poor nutrition, hygiene, safety and health, harassment and negligence. The tendency for families to have many children means that many of them, especially girls, not only miss out on an education but are at risk of being neglected in the family, as well as having to do housework and care for siblings and the elderly.

The employment of foreign migrant workers in seasonal agricultural production in Turkey may be seen as an indicator of social change in three fields in Turkey. First, foreign migrant workers can access various geographical areas and jobs through their kinship networks, which at the same time serve to exclude groups of domestic workers from these fields. These networks, which are established in different ways by the various groups of foreign migrant workers, ensure that members of the groups can participate in production as workers. At the heart of these networks lie the relationships of kinship established by the groups of workers with the local population. Initially, it is only through these relations that foreign migrant workers can reach the intended place of migration and have access to jobs. The reasons why Georgian migrants are concentrated in the eastern Black Sea region are the high numbers of Georgians already settled there and

Besides being more difficult for women in general, migrant seasonal agricultural jobs also heavily increase the burden of work on women.
the geographical proximity of the region to Georgia. Azerbaijanis have also arrived in their region of migration through family relations and ties of kinship with Azerbaijanis in Kars. Syrian workers can only access agricultural jobs through their relatives in and around Şanlıurfa.

The second field of social transformation is the change in poverty as experienced by agricultural workers. This is the phenomenon of transformation from “poverty in shifts” to “the competition of the poor”, which points to a new stage in poverty studies in Turkey. Migrant seasonal agricultural labour in Turkey has always been carried out by the poorest segment of society. While paid agricultural production was traditionally carried out by landless peasants and the urban poor, it is a dynamic area which is affected by urbanisation and social transformation. As those situated at the lowest end of the income scale move upwards in time, the poverty shift they have exited is taken up by other social groups. Migrant seasonal agricultural labour may be regarded as a poverty stop where different social groups have halted at different points in time. Most recently it was the turn of migrants from rural areas in south eastern and eastern parts of the country, who had been displaced by the armed conflict and become the new urban poor. Now their position is slowly being taken up by Syrian migrants. The greatest impact of these new actors on the seasonal agricultural labour market in Turkey has been the competition they have entered into with the local workforce.
The involvement of foreign migrant workers in seasonal agricultural production in Turkey has had a number of consequences on poverty and the labour market. One of them is the changing appearance of poverty in Turkey. Different groups are now doing their shifts of poverty at the same time, which leads to competition among the poor. The competition of the poor has intensified with the involvement of foreign migrant workers of different nationalities alongside domestic workers of different ethnic backgrounds.

Another aspect of the social transformation in Turkey caused by the involvement of foreign migrant workers in seasonal agricultural production is that rural areas have become places where people of different ethnic, religious and cultural backgrounds encounter one another. Antagonistic relations, which were previously thought to be peculiar to urban areas, have appeared in rural areas formerly of more homogenous social structure as a result of migrant seasonal agricultural labour. Rural areas and seasonal agricultural production constitute the stage on which the competition of the poor is played out, but they are also the zones of encounter among different ethnic, religious and cultural groups. Migrant seasonal agricultural work, as a field of encounters among domestic and foreign workers and the local population, is undergoing a dynamic transformation. The ethnic confrontations which were previously experienced between workers from the south east of Turkey and field and orchard owners are now being experienced among a diversity of groups that come into contact in rural Turkey. What we have termed “rural antagonism” brings with it the risk of conflict among different groups. The rural areas, where only two different ethnic groups and cultural identities used to live, are now places where many different ethnic groups meet and in some cases compete over the same job.

The Report on the Present Situation of Foreign Migrant Workers in Seasonal Agricultural Production in Turkey has taken up the experiences of foreign migrant workers in agricultural production, demand and supply-side relations and the serious social transformation which foreign migrant workers have created in Turkey. While the social transformative effect of international migration cannot be overstated, this study is only a first step towards the study of the effects of the transformation on different groups and sections of society.
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### Appendix 1: Organisations and Persons Interviewed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Public institutions</th>
<th>Number of interviews</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Provincial Directorates of Labour and Employment</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provincial Directorates of Food, Agriculture and Livestock</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provincial Directorates of Migration Management</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Aid and Solidarity Foundation</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministry for the Family and Social Policies</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Organisations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chambers of agriculture</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chambers of commerce</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NGOs</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IGAM Ankara</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Association of Seasonal Agricultural Workers, Şanlıurfa</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Individuals</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural intermediaries</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign migrant workers</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field or orchard owners</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local experts in provinces</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>International Organisations</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IOM</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UN Population Fund</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ILO</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNHCR</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNICEF</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Academic Organisations</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ordu University</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malatya İnönü University</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Çukurova University</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mersin University</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Migrants’ Organisations</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RIZK Syrian Employment Office, Şanlıurfa</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syrian Social Community, Mersin</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 2: Field Study Questions

Questions for institutions/organisations:

1. There has been an upward trend in migration to Turkey over recent years and Turkey has become a receiving country. How does your organisation assess this development?

2. Studies and media reports show that a significant number of migrants coming to Turkey are concentrated in particular sectors within the labour market. How does your organisation evaluate the situation?

3. What kind of work does your organisation do regarding migrants and migration?

4. Seasonal agricultural labour is a field in which foreign migrant workers are intensively employed. What is your opinion of this? Have you carried out work specific to this issue? How do you experience this phenomenon at the local level?

5. How are foreign migrant workers becoming the main workforce for seasonal agricultural work when Turkey has seasonal agricultural workers of its own? What do you think are the main causes?

6. What sort of work or activities are you carrying out on this issue? Are there any future activities planned?

7. If you see migrant workers as a problem area, what are the possible solutions to the problems (legal, institutional, etc.)?

(For central institutions in Ankara, especially public and security institutions): What is your assessment of the adjustment process of Syrians? What approaches could be taken to alter the negative social attitude towards Syrians?
Questions for foreign migrant workers employed in agricultural activities:

1. Migration routes: Where do they come from? How?

Story of arrival

1. Why did you decide to come to Turkey? What was the most effective factor in this decision? What motivated you?
2. Are there intermediaries who managed your arrival? How and from which sources did you get information about Turkey? Do you have relatives, associates, former neighbours, etc. here?
3. Who have you left behind? Who are they staying with? Why?

Story of crossing the border

1. Which route did you take into Turkey (by coach from the border, by air or illegally?)
2. Did you get a visa? (Information on visas: what kind of visa did you get, for how long, is it difficult to get a visa, can everyone get a visa?)
3. If you have entered illegally: how is this organised, how did you cross the border?
4. When your visa expires, do you overstay, do you just cross over the border to apply for a new visa, or do you stay outside of Turkey for a longer period?
5. How often do you exit and re-enter Turkey? Where (which border point) do you enter and exit?
6. Do you always stay in the same place, other than when you are seasonally employed? Why there? (Because of associates, relatives, work opportunities, recommendations etc.)

Story of settling down in Turkey and potential return

1. What did you do when you first arrived? (Ask about story of settling down, and friend and family connections.)
2. How did you get work? (Applying to organisations/intermediaries/associates? By ability/experience?)
3. How do you communicate with those back home? Do you have ways of taking to/visiting them?
4. Do you want to/plan to go back? What are you doing to this end?
5. Why do you prefer agricultural work in particular?

**Questions for those employed in seasonal agricultural work:**

1. How did you decide to engage in seasonal agricultural work? Were there people or events which influenced you?

2. Have you ever previously engaged in work similar to what you do now? If so when and where? At which stage of production (harvest, sowing etc.)?

3. How did you find your present job? Did you pay a fee to intermediaries? Have your passports been taken away?

4. Who do you work with (alone, with groups of friends, family members, compatriots, domestic workers)?

5. Could you tell us about the work you do?

6. What sort of division of labour do you have among women/men/children in seasonal agricultural work?

7. How do you get paid? By day, week, amount of produce collected, area worked, etc?

8. How do your receive you pay?

9. What are the main difficulties of your job? (payment, housing, living environment, hygiene, health/safety at work, being treated as a foreigner, socialisation).

10. Are you treated any differently from domestic workers (local or from elsewhere in Turkey)? Are there any differences in the treatment of different foreign migrant groups?

11. What will you do/where will you go once the seasonal agricultural work is over? Will you come back next year for the same job?

12. Why do [people from country x] always do this job?

13. What will you do with the income you earn? Living expenses, savings, future investment etc.?

14. How much of the family income comes from this work? (For Syrians, how many people in the household work?)

15. (If they work as a family) If you work as a family, do you share the income, if so how? (Who controls the income, who gets to keep it?)

16. Where do you see yourself in the future? Is there anything you want to add?
Questions for the field or orchard owner

1. Do you employ strangers (who are not from the area, who are foreign migrants in Turkey) as seasonal agricultural workers for the harvest of hazelnuts, tea, apricots, vegetables, citrus fruits or cotton, or for fodder cutting and animal care? How does production take place in other months of the year?
   a. How many people do you employ for how long, on average?
   b. Are there workers who arrive or work as families?
   c. How many people are there in a family, on average?

2. How do you find the workers?
   a. Do you have an agreement with an intermediary for workers?
   b. If so, who are they?
   c. What is their usual employment?
   d. How do they find the workers?

3. Why is the labour of your own household, or that of local workers not enough for the harvest of hazelnuts, tea, apricots, fodder etc. or for animal care?
   a. Why can the workers not be recruited locally?
   b. Do you prefer migrants who come as families, what is the usual practice?
   c. Why have you began employing foreign migrants? (Need to ask about the developments that triggered the employment of foreign migrants) How did the change in this respect take place?

4. Regarding workers:
   a. pay,
   b. working hours,
   c. housing,
   d. health and safety,
   e. child labour,
   f. other issues.

5. What do you think about labour costs?
   a. How much of the total production cost do you pay for labour?
b. What are the difficulties in this field? (Does the presence of intermediary buyers lower prices, what effect do state subsidies have?)

c. What would labour costs be like if it were not for foreign migrant workers?

6. How have you been affected by agricultural policies and subsidies in recent years? (Ask about the relationship between these and the use of foreign migrant labour.)

7. Is there anything you would like to add about agricultural production and seasonal agricultural labour?

Questions for agricultural labour intermediaries

1. Could you tell us about the work you do? (Where do you get workers, how do you establish connections, which products do you get workers for, which months of the year are you engaged in this job, how many workers do you get jobs for every year?)

2. How do you contact migrant workers? (Who do you reach foreign migrant workers through, why is it that migrant group x comes especially, how do these people migrate, do they have work visas, are they here illegally, do the same individuals come every year, do they migrate as individuals or as a family?)

3. Why are foreign migrants so intensively employed in the production of this good? (lower pay, higher ability, carrying out tasks without questioning them, working long hours etc.)

4. How is the employment of foreign migrant workers regulated? (working conditions, living environment, food, wages, work routine)

5. Why do you mediate for foreign migrant workers instead of domestic workers? (Ask whether this has arisen due to some recent change)
International Seasonal Agricultural Migration in Turkey
Situation Analysis, Policy Recommendations and Cooperation with European Union Countries

BACKGROUND

For centuries, Anatolia has witnessed the influx of refugees and immigrants coming in or passing by. Turkey’s place in the international migration system has begun to dramatically change in the early 1990’s, from a migrant sending to a migrants receiving country. Within its geographical region Turkey emerged as a popular destination for labour migration, as its large informal sector offers different opportunities for irregular migrants to stay for a while than travel further to other countries or return to their home countries. Together with the increasing number of Syrian refugees seeking shelter and safety in Turkey, the number of irregular migrants in the labour market reaches to thousands and these migrant workers mainly find work in production industry, general services, and agriculture sector\(^1\). Agriculture is one of the leading sectors employing migrant workers. Migrant workers are primarily involved in mowing grass and livestock breeding in the eastern cities of Turkey such as Kars, Ardahan, and Iğdır, meanwhile in the Black sea, Eastern and South Eastern Anatolia, Aegean and Central Anatolia regions, migrants work in grazing animals, harvesting vegetative products like hazel nut, tea, cotton, apricot, sugar beet, citrus fruits, grapes and vegetables as seasonal agricultural workers.

The pool of irregular immigrants working\(^2\) in seasonal agricultural work in Turkey also increased due to the outgrowing number of Syrian refugees fleeing from the Syrian civil war.

ORSAM\(^3\) and TESEV’s\(^4\) joint January 2015 Report shows that according to the official figures, Turkey hosts 1.6 million (unofficial figure is 2 million) Syrian nationals and this number constitutes 2.1% of the country’s population. Since the outbreak of the Syrian crisis, 85% of Syrian citizens who entered Turkey and were granted temporary residence status\(^5\) have been living with their own resources in 72 of 81 Turkish provinces; outside the camps established and managed by the Turkish Republic\(^6\). In order to sustain their lives, Syrian nationals are currently working in textile industry, service sector and seasonal agricultural work without social security, under poor living conditions and low wages, and in competition with the poorest segments of Turkey.

ORSAM\(^3\) and TESEV’s\(^4\) joint January 2015 Report shows that according to the official figures, Turkey hosts 1.6 million (unofficial figure is 2 million) Syrian nationals and this number constitutes 2.1% of the country’s population. Since the outbreak of the Syrian crisis, 85% of Syrian citizens who entered Turkey and were granted temporary residence status\(^5\) have been living with their own resources in 72 of 81 Turkish provinces; outside the camps established and managed by the Turkish Republic\(^6\). In order to sustain their lives, Syrian nationals are currently working in textile industry, service sector and seasonal agricultural work without social security, under poor living conditions and low wages, and in competition with the poorest segments of Turkey. Majority of the studies forecast that approximately
75 percent of Syrian nationals are likely to remain permanently in the country even though they are defined as “guests” by the Turkish government. Thus, coupled with the presence of undocumented immigrants coming from other neighbouring countries and working in Turkey’s large informal sector, the pressing issue of Syrian nationals/refugees has become a human rights agenda for Turkey along with European Union countries.

The problematic areas;

a. The impact of displaced persons/refugee and/or irregular immigrant labourer on the agricultural production and crop processing works is not visible enough yet. For instance, although there are many observations and field reports on the living conditions of Syrian nationals (prepared by international and national governmental, academic, civil society organisations), these people’s employment and especially their agricultural activities are mainly limited to the reports of short newspaper pieces. In summary, there is paucity of scientific data collection, analysis, reports and in-depth studies of the situation of irregular immigrants working in agriculture sector.

b. There is no comprehensive study on the violation of rights regarding living and working conditions of irregular immigrant labourers involved in seasonal agricultural work.

c. There is no mapping exercise that identifies in which areas immigrant labourers work.

d. There is neither any study that addresses educational, health, employment, living conditions etc. of the displaced/refugee or immigrant children involved in seasonal agricultural work which is one of the worst forms of child labour, nor is there a framework policy on the violation and enforcement of children’s rights.

e. It has been observed that immigrant families’ living and working conditions are worse than Turkish workers involved in the seasonal agricultural production and they also live below the poverty line. This situation can be presented as an example of the “rivalry of the poorest”. However, it is not known how the competition between Turkish and ‘foreign’ workers affect the production processes, social life and relationships within and between communities.

To sum up, immigrant labourers are grappling with severe violations of human rights, children’s rights and women’s rights.
MAIN GOALS AND OUTPUTS

The project aims to render the deprivation and discrimination immigrant seasonal agricultural labourers face every day visible in order to build a sustainable, participatory, democratic and transparent social development that respects and protects human rights of all habitants of Turkey. It also targets to stimulate action with evidence-based advocacy and result-oriented policy tools to prevent violation of immigrants’ basic human rights and improve their living and working conditions.

To accomplish this;

• Prepare a situation analysis and mapping of the living and working conditions of immigrant labourers employed in agricultural production in Turkey with the aim to report the deprivations, identify the needs and requirements, envisage the remedies of their situation in Turkey.

• Meanwhile, examine the lessons learned and existing practices to combine evidence based recommendations with tested interventions and also to create means of collaborations with civil society and professional organisations primarily in Turkey and/or European Union member countries.

• Prepare a policy note containing solution-oriented recommendations for the government, the European Union member countries, international and civil society organisations, and private sector companies, and conduct a widely participated validation meeting with national and international keynote speakers as the complementary advocacy work to make the subject visible and as a leverage for action.

With this project;

a. The recruitment process and employment conditions of immigrant labourers involved in agricultural production will be portrayed.

b. Since the majority of the Syrian nationals in Turkey are likely to remain permanent, a tangible input for a roadmap of employment of these communities/people who came with irregular migration will be provided.

c. Exemplary practices carried out by civil society and professional organisations in Turkey and/or European Union member countries will be assessed and collaboration opportunities will be examined; and solution-oriented partnerships with at least one NGO will be developed in order to provide solutions to the problems of immigrant labourers (primarily Syrian nationals) employed in agricultural sector.

d. First systematic study on violation of rights exposed to the living and working environments of displaced/refugees and/or immigrant labourers involved in agricultural activities, will be conducted.
PROJECT RESULTS, OUTCOMES AND ACTIVITIES

RESULT 1

Publish the Lessons-Learned Paper on interventions and practices already in effect or started to be put into effect by national and international bodies (civil society organisations, academics, think-thanks etc.), the situation analysis and mapping of the living and working conditions of immigrants employed in Turkey’s agricultural production (4 documents)

1. National and international interventions and practices Lessons Learned Paper
2. Desktop Study
3. Situation Analysis Report
4. Situation Analysis Map

Activity 1.1

Examining interventions and practices already in effect or started to be put into effect by national and international structures (civil society organisations, academics, think-thanks etc.)

Activity 1.2

Contacting and sustaining communication with identified institutions for validation and in-detail inquiry.

Activity 1.3

Preparing a Lessons-Learned Paper concerning interventions/project in the area of international seasonal agricultural migration (which includes irregular immigrant labourers)

Activity 1.4

Desktop study of the field study (preliminary literature review, internet search for secondary data).

Activity 1.5

Activity 1.6
Mapping exercise. Field observations, media coverages, reports, interviews

Activity 1.7
Design, printing and dissemination of Lessons Learned Paper, Situation Analysis and the mapping exercise

RESULT 12
Prepare the policy paper with participatory methods and advocate to make the subject visible (2 documents)
1. The validation meeting for policy development and advocacy with national and international experts
2. Policy Paper
3. Press Release

Activity 2.1
Preparation of draft policy paper and press release

Activity 2.2
Conducting meeting in Ankara to present the findings and draft policy paper with the participation of national and international key-note speakers and at least 50 participants that have roles and responsibilities related to the field.

Activity 2.3
Finalisation, designing, printing and dissemination of policy paper in Turkish and English to the participants of validation meeting and public using new media tools to raise awareness and implement the recommendations

Activity 2.4 Finalisation and wide range dissemination of press release with conventional and new media tools and announcement of study
Poverty, Rivalry and Antagonism: The Report on the Present Situation of Foreign Migrant Workers in Seasonal Agricultural Production in Turkey presents the changing faces of agricultural production, poverty, labour markets and ethnic relations in contemporary Turkey by showcasing the working and living conditions of Syrian, Azeri and Georgian seasonal workers in Turkey’s agricultural production. Rural Turkey has become a stage for poverty and the rivalry of the poor from different ethnic, cultural and religious backgrounds.