DYNAMICS OF INTERMEDIATION IN THE AGRICULTURAL LABOR MARKET: WOMEN WORKERS IN ADAPAZARI, TURKEY

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

BY
ELİF SABAHAT MURA

IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS
FOR
THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY
IN
THE DEPARTMENT OF SOCIOLOGY

MARCH 2016

Approval of the Graduate School of Social Sciences

_____
Prof. Dr. Meliha Altunışık
Director

I certify that this thesis satisfies all the requirements as a thesis for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

_____
Prof. Dr. Sibel Kalaycıoğlu
Head of Department

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

_____
Prof. Dr. Ayşe Gündüz Hoşgör
Supervisor

Examining Committee Members

Prof. Dr. Mesut Yeğen	(Şehir Uni, SOC)	_____
Prof. Dr. Ayşe Gündüz Hoşgör	(METU, SOC)	_____
Prof. Dr. Tansu Açık	(Ankara Uni, HUM)	_____
Assoc. Prof. Dr. Nadide Karkıner	(Anadolu Uni, SOC)	_____
Assoc. Prof. Dr. F. Umut Beşpınar	(METU, SOC)	_____

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

Name, Last name : Elif Sabahat Mura

Signature :

ABSTRACT

DYNAMICS OF INTERMEDIATION
IN THE AGRICULTURAL LABOR MARKET:
WOMEN WORKERS IN ADAPAZARI, TURKEY

Mura, Elif Sabahat
Ph.D., Department of Sociology
Supervisor: Prof. Dr. Ayşe Gündüz Hoşgör

March 2016, 249 pages

This thesis documents wage-labor processes of agricultural workers in Adapazarı and offers to analyze intermediation practices, which is a part of these processes, in a relational perspective. As an alternative to conventional understanding that relates agency of intermediaries to the culture and/or tradition of the workers, it aims to emphasize the agency of workers, specific contexts of work relations, responsibilities of employers and the role of state in structuring the insecurity of wage-labor processes for agricultural workers, in the analysis of wage-labor processes in agriculture. As a dynamic of intermediation, the case study focuses on the strategies of workers to guarantee their payments and increase job opportunities in the labor market. This focus on workers' agency is a search for an alternative perspective in the analysis of wage-labor processes in agriculture as a response to ongoing objectification-victimization and otherisation of workers in the mainstream discourse, particularly within the discussion on intermediaries. The research that questions the widespread analyses and representations of intermediaries is supported by discourse analysis based on historical press research and contemporary literature. The over-emphasis on cultural difference/uniqueness/peculiarity of workers in the contemporary analysis of wage-labor processes in Turkey's agriculture is criticized, since relating the unjustness in the labor processes with workers' own characteristics give sings of a victim blaming discourse, especially in the analyses on of Eastern and/or Kurdsih workers.

Keywords: Agricultural Worker, Women Labor, Intermediary, Victim Blaming, Ethnicity

ÖZ

TARIM İŞGÜCÜ PAZARINDA
ARACILIK PRATİĞİNİN DİNAMİKLERİ:
TÜRKİYE, ADAPAZARI'NDA KADIN İŞÇİLER

Mura, Elif Sabahat
Doktora, Sosyoloji Bölümü
Tez Yöneticisi: Prof. Dr. Ayşe Gündüz Hoşgör

Mart 2016, 249 sayfa

Bu tez, Adapazarı'nda yerleşik tarım işçilerinin ücretli emek süreçlerini belgeler ve bu süreçlerin bir parçası olan aracılığı ilişkisel bir perspektifle incelemeyi önerir. Aracılık pratiğini işçilerin kültürü ve/veya gelenekle ilişkilendiren genel-geçer anlayışa alternatif olarak, tarımda ücretli emek süreçlerinin analizinde işçi failliğine, iş ilişkisinin gerçekleştiği özgül bağlama, işverenin sorumluluğuna ve işçiler için yasal güvencesizliği sürdüren devletin rolüne dikkat çekmeyi amaçlar. Saha çalışması, aracılık pratiğinin dinamiklerinden biri olarak, Adapazarı'nda işçilerin ücretlerini garantiye almak ve iş olanaklarını genişletmek için sosyal ağları kullanma ve genişletme stratejilerine odaklanmıştır. İşçi failliğine odaklanan saha çalışmasının hedefi işçileri kurbanlaştıran-nesneleştiren genel-geçer söyleme ve ötekileştiren aracı steryotipine alternatif bir bakış açısı geliştirmektir. Yaygın aracı temsil ve analizlerini sorgulayan araştırma tarihsel basın taraması ve güncel akademik literatürün incelemesine dayanan söylem analizi ile desteklenmiştir. Literatürde özellikle Doğulu ve/veya Kürt işçiler bağlamında işçilerin kültürel farklılığı/özgünlüğü/ayrıcalığı üzerine yapılan vurgu ücretli emek süreçlerindeki adaletsizliğinin kaynağını işçilerin kendi özelliklerinde arayan—kurbanı suçlayan—bir söylem üretmesi bakımından eleştirilmiştir.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Tarım İşçisi, Kadın Emeği, Aracı, Kurbanı Suçlama, Etnisite

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I wish to express my deepest gratitude to my supervisor Ayşe Gündüz Hoşgör and former supervisor Mesut Yeğen for their guidance, criticisms and encouragement. I am very grateful to the examining committee members, Nadide Karkiner, Tansu Açık and F. Umut Beşpınar, for their comments and suggestions.

I should thank to TÜBİTAK for funding my project in 2014-2015 to spend a year as a visiting fellow in University of Washington in St. Louis. I wish to express my thanks to the Department of Anthropology at Washington University and especially to Peter Benson who encouraged me to write, provided his insightful comments on my drafts and helped the project to progress.

I wish to thank all the participants of MİGA and İstanbul Bilgi University Center for Migration Research—as the co-ordinatior of meetings—for inspiring discussions on agricultural workers in Turkey.

I am grateful for the intellectual and collaborative company of my colleagues in the Department of Sociology at METU. I have been very lucky considering the support offered by my lovely office-mate Mehtap Tosun and my dear friend Meral Akbaş. I should also gratefully acknowledge my friends and colleagues, Burcu Saka and Atakan Büke for their kind willingness to discuss my premature ideas as they both helped me to articulate the arguments of the thesis. My special thanks go to Sündüs Aydın for her kindness and help in all kinds of paperwork.

The person to whom I am most indebted in the writing process of this dissertation is Cem Kamözüt. He not only conscientiously reviewed all the drafts and offered comments but also has always been there for me offering encouragement. I should thank Smita Tewari Jassal for her invaluable support and suggestions on the draft. I am also indebted to my friends, Yelda Kaya, İrem Yılmaz, Özlem Kaya and Ayşegül Turan who reviewed and commented on some parts, which incredibly improved and clarified the manuscript. I wish also to thank Cem Vehbi Özbayrak for being a full-time supporter despite being continents and time zones apart.

I would like to express my warmest gratitude to Beycan Mura who shared my enthusiasm about the subject, tirelessly listened my ideas, commented on the drafts and also took on

some of my responsibilities at home to care our beloved son Güneş. I cannot thank him enough.

Finally, I wish to acknowledge the people who helped me throughout the fieldwork: special thanks to Neslin Gümüş and Yücel Tutal for their tremendous help in providing social contacts and to my family, particularly my uncle Demir Alpcan for his nice companionship in our trips to the villages in 2011. I would like to thank the participants of the study, especially the workers who opened me their doors, accepted me in their crews and generously shared their knowledge and wisdom.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PLAGIARISM iii

ABSTRACT iv

ÖZ v

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS vi

TABLE OF CONTENTS viii

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS xi

CHAPTER

I. INTRODUCTION 1

1.1 Research Question 1

1.2 Case Study 14

1.3 Methodology 16

1.4 Plan of the Dissertation 18

II. THEORETICAL AND CONCEPTUAL TOOLS 21

2.1 Contexts and Agency 21

2.2 Ethnicity and Ethnic Groups 23

2.3 Agricultural Exceptionalism 28

2.4 Agricultural Labor Market 33

2.5 Agricultural Worker 34

III. THE HISTORICAL TRANSFORMATION OF THE DISCOURSES ON AGRICULTURAL WORKERS IN TURKEY 38

3.1 The History of Agricultural Work in Turkey 39

3.1.1 Turkish Republic: Shortage of Labor and Peasantry 40

3.1.2 Post 1980s: Urban Poverty and Labor Migration 46

3.1.3 Summary 49

3.2 Historical Transformation of Press Coverage of Agricultural Workers: 50

3.3 Highlights of Contemporary Accounts: Poverty, Hopelessness, Humanitarian Care 56

3.4 Conclusion 61

IV. CITIZENSHIP, LABOR LEGISLATION AND AGRICULTURAL WORKERS IN TURKEY 63

4.1 Citizenship: Women and Minorities 64
4.2 Atypical Workers in Turkey's Labor Legislation 73
4.3 Politics of Counting: Agricultural Workers in Public Surveys 76
4.4 Agricultural Exceptionalism 78
4.4.1 History 79
4.4.2 Post-2010 Process: Memorandum, METİP, Parliamentary Commission 82
4.5 Conclusion 89

V. THE FIELDWORK, PLACES OF OBSERVATION, PARTICIPANTS 91

5.1 The Fieldwork 91
5.1.1 Data 91
5.1.2 Entrance to the Field: Questioning Pre-conceived Categories 93
5.1.3 Fieldwork 2011-2 96
5.1.4 Fieldwork 2015 98
5.2 Description of the Field 100
5.2.1 Adapazarı 101
5.2.2 Places of Observation 108
5.3 Introducing the Participants 113
5.3.1 Profiles of the Participants 113
5.3.2 Household Characteristics of the Participants 120
5.3.3 Migration Histories and Landownership 125
5.4 Limitations of the Study 127
5.5 Conclusion 129

VI. WAGE-LABOR PROCESSES IN THE CITY: A CLOSER LOOK AT THE AGRICULTURAL JOBS IN ADAPAZARI 131

6.1 Different Patterns of Work 133
6.1.1 Wages 133
6.1.2 Employers 139
6.1.3 Working Age 142
6.1.4 Tasks 143
6.1.5 Working Status and Periods 145
6.1.6 Migration for Work 146
6.2 The Dynamics of Solidarity and Exclusion within the Labor Processes 147
6.3 Signs of an Handover of Agricultural Jobs in the City 155
6.3.1 Age Gap 157
6.3.2 Individual *vs* Community Work Patterns 159

6.3.3 Future Expectations 161
6.4 Conclusion 165

VII. A DISCUSSION ON INTERMEDIATION IN AGRICULTURE 167

7.1 A Note on Agency and Othering: Mainstream Discourse on Intermediaries 167
7.1.1 "Resourceful Intermediaries vs Pitiful Employers" 172
7.1.2 "An Outdated Practice" 178
7.1.3 "Cultural Bonds between Workers and Intermediaries" 185
7.2 Intermediation Practices in Adapazarı 197
7.2.1 Local Women Intermediaries 201
7.2.2 Intermediary/Crew Leader/Driver/Boss Men 202
7.2.3 Women Worker Intermediaries 203
7.3 Concluding Remarks 205

VIII. CONCLUSION 208

BIBLIOGRAPHY 217

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A: INTERVIEW QUESTIONS 231

APPENDIX B: CURRICULUM VITAE 233

APPENDIX C: TURKISH SUMMARY 234

APPENDIX D: TEZ FOTOKOPİSİ İZİN FORMU 249

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

AKP	Justice and Development Party *[Adalet ve Kalkınma Partisi]*
CHP	Republican People's Party *[Cumhuriyet Halk Partisi]*
ÇGSB	Ministry of Labour and Social Security *[T.C. Çalışma ve Sosyal Güvenlik Bakanlığı]*
DTP	Democratic Society Party *[Demokratik Toplum Partisi]*
FLC	Farm Labor Contractor
ILO	International Labour Organization
IMF	International Monetary Fund
IRCA	The Immigration Reform Control Act
İŞKUR	Turkish Employment Agency *[Türkiye İş Kurumu]*
METİP	Project for Rehabilitation of Working and Social Lives of Seasonal Migratory Agricultural Workers *[Mevsimlik Gezici Tarım İşçilerinin Çalışma ve Sosyal Hayatlarının İyileştirilmesi Projesi]*
MİGA	Communication Network of Seasonal Worker Migration *[Mevsimlik İşçi Göçü Ağı]*
OECD	The Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development
SGK	Social Security Institution *[T.C. Sosyal Güvenlik Kurumu]*
SSGSS	Social Securities and Universal Health Insurance Law *[Sosyal Sigortalar ve Genel Sağlık Sigortası Kanunu]*
TARIM-İŞ	Union of Forestry and Agricultural Workers *[Türkiye Orman Topraksu Tarım ve Tarım Sanayii İşçileri Sendikası]*
TBMM	The Grand National Assembly of Turkey *[Türkiye Büyük Millet Meclisi]*
TİSK	Turkish Confederation of Employer Associations *[Türkiye İşveren Sendikaları Konfederasyonu]*
TOKİ	Housing Development Administration *[Toplu Konut İdaresi Başkanlığı]*
TÜBİTAK	The Scientific and Technological Research Council of Turkey *[Türkiye Bilimsel ve Teknolojik Araştırma Kurumu]*
TUİK	Turkish Statistical Institute *[Türkiye İstatistik Kurumu]*

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Research Question

This exploratory case study documents the patterns of wage-labor processes of agricultural workers among the inhabitants of Adapazarı, an industrialized city in northwestern Turkey. I will illustrate the specific contexts of work relations and different strategies of workers to utilize and extend their social networks in order to secure their transactions and increase job opportunities in an insecurely structured labor market. Within the analysis of wage-labor processes, I will offer a framework, which puts emphasis on the responsibilities of employers and the role of the state in structuring such an insecure labor market for agricultural workers as an alternative to conventional reports, which exclusively highlight the actions of intermediaries as the principal actor in the agricultural wage-labor processes.

Agriculture in the hinterland of Adapazarı is based on small-sized commercialized farms, which have long been regarded as the typical Turkish case. Agricultural jobs around the city have historically been one of the important employment options for urban women in Adapazarı although the number of available agricultural jobs has shrunk lately due to industrialization process, enlargement of residential areas in 1990s and mechanization of some agricultural tasks. Yet, the agricultural jobs continue to be one of the major sources of income for some women in the city, especially for those living in the settlements identified with Kurdish and Romani identities.

The analysis of the hitherto undocumented peoples' struggle for income, on the one hand, signals the structural inequalities of the wider society confining women, particularly minority women to precarious agricultural jobs. The fieldwork in Adapazarı provides hints indicating a handover of agricultural jobs from women living in central neighborhoods to peripheral settlements where mainly new migrants and minorities are settled. Apparently, recently increased employment opportunities within the city (in service sector and industries) have not been utilized evenly among the inhabitants of the city, regarding the ongoing vitality of precarious agricultural jobs for women living in peripheral neighborhoods—particularly settlements which are associated with minority identities.

A closer look at the wage-labor processes of agricultural workers, on the other hand, is an attempt to call attention to the urgent necessity of working rights for all agricultural workers who are working without secure contracts, fringe benefits, retirement rights, safety precautions for work places and transportation. In Turkey, the majority of the agricultural workers in private enterprises are working without legally defined responsibility of the employers[1]. They are working without compensation rights, excluded from unemployment benefits and minimum wage laws. Consequently, no farm worker needs to be paid overtime wages. Since they excluded from the Work Law, they are not even protected from the retaliation that may occur as a result of their efforts to organize and collectively bargain. Agricultural employers, furthermore, generally do not take responsibility for providing safe transportation and adequate shelter for workers who are coming out of town to work in agricultural jobs[2].

The agricultural worker participants of this study in Adapazarı work in diverse patterns including part-time, full-time tasks; seasonal and regular jobs; migrating daily or seasonally to other regions for agricultural jobs. The wage-labor processes of these women reflect the structural insecurities of the agricultural labor market in various ways. Intermediation practices appear in a wide variety in that sense as a mechanism of workers to secure the wage-labor process and increase job opportunities in the sector. This study focuses on the multiple dynamics of intermediation and different types of intermediaries acting within the local labor market.

The case is offered as a contribution to the literature on agricultural workers in Turkey in two ways. First, through taking into account urban women's agricultural wage-labor processes, the case portrays the heterogeneity of "local" agricultural workers which is usually overlooked in the literature as an advantageous-monolithic category compared to seasonally migrant workers. Within the case study, the wage labor processes among three main worker groups are analyzed: two groups settled in the neighborhoods are identified with either Kurdish or Romani identities, and one living closer to the city center, that mostly migrated from nearby villages and the Black Sea region (Turkish group). Second,

---

[1] Turkey's Work Law *[İş Kanunu/4857]* excludes agricultural enterprises, which recruit less than 50 workers (TBMM 2015: 31).

[2] "By-Law of Agricultural Intermediation" *[Tarımda İş Aracılığı Yönetmeliği]* assigns the duty of appealing to local administrative authorities (and the continuation of the procedures) for providing shelter for workers to intermediaries. Intermediaries are also (together with employers) responsible for the control and surveillance of transportation of workers. By this way, the areas of responsibility in agricultural work are split between employers and intermediaries in the by-law, yet there is no clear responsibility defined for employers other than control (TBMM 2015: 24).

the multi-ethnic labor processes in the city is offered as a framework to discuss the multiple dynamics of intermediation in Turkey's agricultural labor market, which is largely confined to cultural-traditional terms in the current literature.

Two basic ideas are at the core of this study. First, an analysis on the intermediation practices in Turkey's agriculture requires the consideration of the legal exceptionalism which puts workers into a vulnerable position *vis-a-vis* employers in the absence of protective labor legislation. Secondly, this structure of agricultural labor market enhances inequalities in the work processes that are observed in urban Adapazarı, often resulting in a layered work organization, especially for those workers who have lower chance of access to the resource-rich networks to ensure better contracts. Therefore, workers in the city have been experiencing this vulnerability in distinctive ways through their contextual situations (such as their access to certain social networks, other family members' position in the general labor market and the effects of stigma). This is very much related to the multiplicity of intermediary positions within this local agricultural labor market.

The case of Adapazarı reveals a gap between the gains, responsibilities and authorities of different intermediary positions in the wage-labor processes of agricultural workers. Some Romani groups that have been excluded from job networks work within more hierarchical structures, which involve multiple intermediaries between them and employers. It is not the wages per se but the layers between the employers and the workers that distinguish the wage-labor processes of these workers.

A significant part of agricultural tasks, such as hoeing, picking, and packaging, have been associated with women's labor and established as women's work in the region. Except for some special higher paid tasks such as hauling and porting, the bulk of agricultural workers in the region are women. Women usually work in crews, which occasionally include familiar young men. Among the inhabitants of the city, I have come across adult men working in the harvest together with women only in some Romani groups. Therefore, this case study has been mainly carried out with women workers.

Agricultural jobs attract women partly because they are able to combine income earning with other tasks assigned to them, such as childcare, elderly care and housework. Agricultural jobs are vital for many women as a major source of income, especially for those with small children due to the availability of part time jobs in the sector. Women go to different fields to work, often at night or too early in the morning, with their employer, intermediary or a driver. At first sight, these work processes seem contradictory to the local norms limiting women's work outside, which has been pointed out as a major

constraint in various studies on women's employment in the metropolises of Turkey (White 2004; Kardam & Toksöz 2004; Hoşgör & Smits 2008; Koçak 1999; Özyeğin 2010; Bora 2008). These jobs, nonetheless, have been established as regular practices for women without triggering significant domestic struggles despite the restraints of women's movement in the city[3]. Most of the women I have encountered did not struggle with household men to get permission to work in agricultural jobs, or did not express any concerns about security of the workplaces or even concerns about getting regularly paid.

The practice partly rests itself on Turkey's alleged rural tradition: i.e. the historical significance of women's labor in Turkey's agricultural production (Dixon 1983)[4]. Women's strikingly relaxed and naturalized perception of what they are doing is partly related to the tradition of feminized agricultural tasks like picking and hoeing. Yet, one can easily doubt the competence of explanations resting on tradition since the work is now organized under different circumstances. Therefore, I questioned the obvious for the workers: How they manage it? How women utilize their social networks and organize their labor so as to get paid in such an exceptional (no employer accountability) and masculine (almost all of the employers and the drivers are men) labor market? This focus on workers' agency is a search for an alternative perspective in the analysis of wage-labor processes in agriculture as a response to ongoing objectification-victimization and otherisation of workers in the mainstream discourse, particularly within the discourse on intermediaries.

With these purposes, this research focuses on the ways in which workers utilize their social networks in organizing their labor. In particular, I elaborate on the particular ways female laborers make use of their social ties to deal with the challenges agricultural work entail for women. The challenges in question relate to security, since women work in such distant and ever-changing work environments and remuneration since there are no legal guarantees or legally defined responsibility for the employers in agricultural sector. I study how they used kinship networks and networks of friends, co-workers and neighbors.

---

[3] The researchers on women labor have reported a decrease in women's mobility outside the home following their migration to the cities (White 2004; Hoşgör & Smits 2008; Bora 2008).

[4] According to ILO estimates, the lowest proportions of females in agricultural labour force are found in North Africa and Middle East. However, Turkey and Cyprus has been counterbalancing this low share by extremely high shares of female labour in agriculture (Dixon 1983: 349). This high share of women labour in Turkey, in fact, stems from the high numbers of unpaid women family workers since they have been coded as agricultural workers in the official records (For a comparative analysis on the relationship between the sex composition of the agricultural labor force and the other dynamics of the countries such as the size of land holdings, market orientation of agricultural production, the relative attractiveness of urban employment opportunities see Dixon, (1983).

Within the context of the agricultural workers in Adapazarı, while Romani women tend to invest more in kin and neighborhood relationships, Kurdish women are able to extend their networks beyond neighborhoods through wider ethnic ties and relations with co-workers. Turkish workers, on the other hand, mostly invest in relationships with co-workers. I will try to illustrate the contexts and conditions that make these different strategies significant parts of women's working lives in the case of Adapazarı.

Job search through personal networks may also serve to create power hierarchies within the laborers (Ortiz 2002, 401). The practice of *intermediation* that may create such hierarchies is indeed central to wage labor processes of the agricultural labor market. Consequently, the practices of intermediation between agricultural employers and workers will be a major focus point of this study in the context of agricultural labor processes in Adapazarı.

I try to reformulate the category of "agricultural intermediary" in more transactional terms by locating the practice in actual situational contexts. I will illustrate the processes of intermediation through the fieldwork data, which reveal the multiple positions that a worker can hold at a given period of time. The multiple positions include working and intermediating between workers and the employer, working and intermediating between workers and another intermediary, just intermediating and, finally, just working. "Intermediation" here is a key term offered as an alternative to the category of "agricultural intermediary", which permanently equates the position/practice with concrete individuals and is conventionally explicated in cultural-traditional terms, as a traditional authoritarian figure.

Recent studies on agricultural labor have pointed out the significant role of intermediaries in organizing agricultural labor in Turkey. They portray the ways in which intermediaries manage the encounters with the state and the employers, work as crew leaders, help transportation, health care and subsistence of workers, take on the responsibility of job training and even support worker activism (Çetinkaya 2008; Çınar & Lordoğlu 2010, 2011; Çınar 2014; Karaman & Yılmaz 2011; Akbıyık 2008). Some of the researches on agricultural labor (Çetinkaya 2008; Önen 2012; Ulukan & Ulukan 2011; Karaman & Yılmaz 2011) do present the variability of intermediation practices in Turkey's agricultural labor market. Yet, a significant part of the literature still rests on a monolithic portrayal of intermediary as a traditional-authoritarian figure who extorts workers by holding a part of their wages.

By following the repetitions and patterns in the media and in recent research, it is possible to discover some hegemonic themes within which wage-labor processes of agricultural workers are discussed today. A glimpse at the newspapers reveals that the mainstream perception of the workers are Kurdish families, migrating seasonally to other regions for work, staying in their tents far away from village centers and yet creating a feeling of discomfort among locals. Ethnicization of the agricultural labour is a much-emphasized theme in recent research with respect to the disproportionate representation of such ethnic minorities as Kurds and Arabs among seasonally migrant agricultural workers (Geçgin 2009; Yıldırak et al 2003; Küçükkırca 2010). Yıldırak et al. (2003) reported that 64.1 % of seasonally migrant workers come from Southeastern Anatolia, especially from the provinces of Adıyaman, Diyarbakır, Mardin, Batman, Siirt, Şırnak, Şanlıurfa and Hatay with high ratios of Kurdish and Arabic populations. The report of parliamentary Commission for agricultural workers notes that for only 10% of the—seasonally migrant—agricultural workers, the language spoken at home is Turkish (60% Kurdish and 30% Arabic) (TBMM 2015: 56-7). Consequently, some scholars have identified the land ownership structure in Southeastern Turkey as the source of poverty and the reason of the consequent outmigration (Hayata Destek Association 2014). Çınar & Lordoğlu (2011) and Yıldırım (2015) examined, for example, the reasons behind the disproportionate presentation of Kurds among seasonally migrant agricultural workers through analyzing historical dynamics of land ownership in the region as well as the political processes disempowering the people in the region. Within this context of ethnicization of agricultural labor highlighting the actions of abusive intermediaries has been a popular theme while portraying the unfairness of wage-labor processes for agricultural workers. Alongside with media, the researchers on Turkey's agricultural workers often point to the intermediary as an exploiter while depicting workers as victims of both socio-economic processes and their culture, implying that the hierarchy and authority patterns enforced by their culture are materialized in their relationships with the intermediary (Çınar 2014; Çınar & Lordoğlu 2011; Gürsoy 2010; Şeker 1987; Küçükkırca 2012; Kaleci 2007; Okçuoğlu 1999):

> …the hierarchical social structure shaped by the production relation between agha and sharecropper, and also tribal order in some regions caused multi layered social relations with a rigid hierarchy to be transferred to work relations[5] (Çınar 2014: 176).

[5] …. ağa/ortakçı arasındaki üretim ilişkisinin şekillendirdiği hiyerarşik sosyal yapı, ayrıca bazı yerlerde buna eklenen aşiret düzeni, çok katmanlı ve katı bir hiyerarşiye sahip toplumsal ilişkilerin … çalışma ilişkilerine aktarılmasına neden olmuştur (Çınar 2014: 176).

> The kinship relation that still exists under serious exploitation conditions is also a good instance to see the strength of the feudal ties. The fact that workers and intermediaries are kin enables worker control to be more effective. Because the relation between intermediaries and the workers often continue after they return to their homes from Karadeniz and whether they will take part in the group next year depends on their performance, how well they get along with the intermediary, and whether they caused any problems within the group that year[6] (Küçükkırca 2012: 7).

In the news and also researches, a frequent term defining the relation between workers and intermediaries is "feudal", referring to tribal social organizations which are largely perceived as social forms having a reactionary existence at the expense of social and structural change (Küçükkırca 2010; Yıldırak et al. 2003; Çınar & Lordoğlu 2011). The historical persistence of the intermediary system in the agricultural labor market is, in this way, largely portrayed as if it stems from the "tradition/culture" of the workers as a baggage they carry to labor market. In addition, some recent studies point to intermediary system as the major obstacle for the development of free labor/free workers in the agricultural labor market (Çınar 2014; Gürsoy 2010):

> Due to all these debt mechanisms with intermediaries, workers lose their capacity to reproduce the entirety of the contract relation between the intermediaries and themselves because workers lose their option to "exit" from this relation... It can be argued that the labour relation that the seasonal agricultural workers in Turkey are situated in resembles non-free forms of labour more than the "typical" free-labour relation7 (Gürsoy 2010: 58, 60).

> This work relation is a relation where the worker is rented to the employer instead of being based on a contract made freely between the worker and employer. Unlike slavery the ownership of the seasonal agricultural workers do not belong to the intermediary but unlike free paid labour it is under control of the intermediary. An important reason for this control is loss of the workers' freedom to make a contract for the benefit of the intermediary8 (Çınar 2014: 156).

Žižek emphasizes the key role played by the notion of the "typical" in the ideological processes and notes that "each universal ideological notion is always hegemonized by some particular content, which colors its very universality and accounts for its efficiency"

---

[6] Ciddi sömürü koşullarında hâlâ süren akrabalık ilişkileri feodal bağların gücünü görmek için de iyi bir örnektir. İşçilerin ve çavuşların akraba olması, işçi denetiminin daha etkin bir şekilde işlemesini sağlamakta. Çünkü işçilerle çavuşların ilişkileri genelde Karadeniz'den evlerine döndüklerinde de devam etmekte ve gelecek yıl gruba girip girmemeleri o yıl gösterdikleri performansa, çavuşla ne kadar iyi geçindiklerine ve grupta sorun çıkarıp çıkarmamış olmalarına da bağlı (Küçükkırca 2012: 7).

[7] Aracılarla girilen bütün bu borç mekanizmaları nedeniyle, işçiler aracılar ile aralarındaki sözleşme ilişkisinin bütününü yeniden üretme kapasitelerini yitiriyor çünkü işçiler bu ilişkiden "çıkış" seçeneklerini kaybediyorlar… Türkiye'deki mevsimlik tarım işçilerinin içinde bulundukları emek ilişkisinin "tipik" özgür emek ilişkilerinden ziyade özgür olmayan emek biçimlerine benzediği iddia edilebilir (Gürsoy 2010: 58,60).

[8] Bu çalışma ilişkisi işçi ve işveren arasında özgür bir şekilde sözleşme yapmaya dayanmak yerine işçinin işverene kiralandığı bir ilişkidir… Kölelikten farklı olarak mevsimlik tarım işçilerinin mülkiyeti elçiye ait değildir ancak özgür ücretli işçiden farklı olarak elçinin hakimiyeti altındadır… Bu hakimiyetin önemli bir sebebi işçilerin sözleşme yapma özgürlüklerini elçi lehine kaybetmeleridir (Çınar 2014: 156).

(Zizek 1997: 28). He exemplifies, in this regard, the effective "typical" of anti-abortion campaign as the sexually promiscuous professional woman, who values her career over motherhood—instead of the lower class families with a lot of children with higher rates of abortion (Zizek 1997: 29). This twist, he argues, is the element of fantasy transferring a particular content to a universal notion. The fantasy makes more sense when it is considered with what is missing in the popular narrative. In this respect, it is possible and necessary to question the hegemonic representations of agricultural intermediary in Turkey regarding the mesaage it gives and regarding what it conceals. Three major motives can be specified for emphasizing the necessity of a skeptical look to the portrayals of the blameworthy intermediary in the mainstream literature.

In the first place, the stereotypical traditional intermediary representing the tradition gives a wrong impression about the state's role in structuring agricultural labor market and support of intermediary system. The implications of cultural backwardness rests on hegemonic dualities (West/East, modern/traditional), which posits a contrast between traditional (eastern, backward) culture of the workers and modern(izing) state by ignoring the political processes including dual labor legislation, state support of the intermediary system, and also the repercussions of the structural violence of the state towards minorities. Turkish state has legally recognized the intermediary status and defined a procedure for intermediaries to apply for licenses. In this sense, some researchers/reporters (Şimşek, 2011; MİGA 2012; Görücü & Akbıyık 2010; Gülçubuk 2012) claim the necessity of the legal assignment of agricultural intermediaries to İŞKUR or posit the low numbers of licensed intermediaries as a major problem for workers. Yet, the state, in fact, has been tracking and recording the intermediaries of seasonally migrant agricultural workers in another way—through the security apparatus:

> There is no general mechanism or system for recording and evaluating seasonal workers. Thus, there is no reliable data available for the numbers, ages, genders, accommodations, working conditions, education, and health and transportation problems of seasonal migrant agricultural workers. The acquired number of seasonal workers usually depends on the ID controls by Provincial Gendarmerie Command, carried out in compliance with Law no. 1774 (TBMM 2015: 195)[9].

Article 10 of prime ministry memorandum (2010) on seasonal agricultural workers states that IDs of the workers and their families will be collected and, also, local law enforcers to

[9] Genel olarak mevsimlik işçilerin kayıt altına alınması ve tespitine ilişkin sistem ya da mekanizma oluşturulmamıştır. Bu nedenle mevsimlik gezici tarım işçilerinin sayısı, yaşı ve cinsiyeti, barınma ortamı, çalışma şartları, eğitim, sağlık ve ulaşım sorunlarıyla ilgili sağlıklı verilere ulaşılamamaktadır. Mevsimlik işçi sayısı ile ilgili elde edilen veriler genelde İl Jandarma Komutanlığınca 1774 sayılı Kanun gereğince yapılan kimlik tespitlerine dayalı olmaktadır (TBMM 2015: 195).

ensure security will patrol that the region they stay. Yıldırım (2015) reports that during his field study in Kocaali/Sakarya in 2011-2, local police screeended and kept a copy of ID information of the workers who came to work in hazelnut harvest (335). Similarly, I had the chance to examine the files in the local police office in Karasu where the contact details of the intermediaries of the workers and the locations of the workers, which had recorded under the name of their intermediaries (Field Notes 2011). It is important to note that as Yıldırım (2015) indicated it has been only gendarme and police who record the numbers and locations of workers and they record workers together with their intermdiaries. Within the process of METİP[10], on the other hand, it is decided that the workers will no longer be allowed to wait or stay unregulated within the city, parks or stations as stated by a preparatory committee member Erdoğan (2010) in the Ministry's periodical journal presenting the project (9):

> During their trips to or from their work areas, should the need arise, in order to be able to lodge in the province or district centers, seasonal migrant agricultural workers will be provided with the opportunity of utilizing public facilities; loitering and lodging in the city, in places like terminals, bus stations, parks etc. will not be allowed[11] (Erdoğan 2010:9).

Consequently, METİP process—despite the promises to provide accommodations to workers in Adapazarı—resulted in police's patrolling the train station during harvest season and sending back the workers that have no work contacts by preventing them to enter the city and stay in the terminal (Field Notes, 2011). Therefore, this kind of tracking practice itself might have further enhanced the intermediary system, favoring intermediaries with wider social networks over workers and crew leaders, at least in the case of seasonally migrant workers. Gendarme/police thus record the workers with their intermediaries, through holding the contact details of intermediaries of migrant workers and asking workers' personal information from the intermediary; and occasionally send back workers to their hometowns when they do not have previously arranged jobs. It is apparent that such interventions of the state on the mobility of agricultural laborers have been making it harder for a worker without pre-established work relations, extensive social ties or without a network-rich intermediary to secure beforehand contracts with agricultural employers.

[10] The state funded project initiated by the prime ministry memorandum (2010) to alleviate the conditions of seasonally migrant agricultural workers.

[11] Mevsimlik gezici tarım işçilerinin çalışma mahallerine gidiş ve dönüşlerinde, il/ilçe merkezlerinde geçici konaklamaları için ihtiyaç halinde kamuya ait alan ve tesislerden yararlanma imkânı sağlanacak, şehir içinde, otogar ve istasyonlarda, parklarda, vs. gelişi güzel konaklama ve beklemelerine fırsat verilmeyecektir.

Secondly, the focus on worker-intermediary relationships through stereotypical intermediary must be considered in the light of the relative invisibility of the employers in the literature. The historical press research on the newspaper *Milliyet* reveals a process of replacement of the language of rights and developmentalism with victimization and othering as the main framework in the coverage of the issue of agricultural workers after 1980s. The absence of employers is one of the main characteristics of these news stories, especially with regard to the abundance of news stories foregrounding the intermediaries as responsible agents for workers' poor conditions, insecure transportation and so on. Here are some recent examples from the press following the tragic traffic incident that killed 17 of agricultural workers on their way to work:

> These people are human traffickers. They earn money at their expense. They capture half the money you received[12] (*Dayıbaşı*'s are Human Traffickers, *Milliyet*, 2014, November 1).

> Seasonal agricultural workers complain both about low wages and the intermediary system that is widespread in the region[13] (Like the Slavery System of Ancient Egypt, *Milliyet*, 5.11.2014, November 5).

Here is a sub-headline of a typical news story from the 1990s, highlighting the hard conditions of agricultural laborers working in hazelnut harvest:

> Eastern people arriving to Adapazarı to harvest hazelnuts by the shame train encounter "slave treatment" no later than the station. These people who are searched and whose bread money diminished to a pittance because of human traffickers are also excluded by locals[14] (Contemporary Slaves, *Milliyet*, 1998, August 19).

As in this worker-sympathetic news story, intermediaries—human traffickers in the text—have been described as agents who are responsible for the particular shape of wage-labor relations in the region. The actions of other agents, on the other hand, are often covered in passive voice as in this example. It is not the wage that employers pay; it is bread money of workers. Workers are searched. Some unspecified locals exclude them. Some unspecified authorities must take care of them. Therefore, it is generally just workers and intermediaries who are personally singled out and visualized within news stories. I do not imply that these kinds of news stories have intentionally been written for hiding the responsibilities of employers, officers and/or gendarme. This is rather the established way

[12] …Bu insanlar insan cambazıdır. Onların sırtından para kazanırlar. Aldığınız paranın yarısını onlar alır… (Dayıbaşılar İnsan Cambazı, Milliyet, 01.11.2014)

[13] Mevsimlik tarım işçileri, hem aldıkları ücretin azlığından hem de bölgede yaygın olan dayıbaşılık sisteminden yakınıyor…(Eski Mısır'da Köle Düzeni Gibi, Milliyet, 5.11.2014)

[14] Utanç treni ile Adapazarı'na fındık toplamaya gelen doğu insanı, daha istasyonda "köle muamelesi" ile karşılaşıyor. Üstü aranan, insan simsarları yüzünden ekmek parası kuşa dönen bu insanları, yöreliler de dışlıyor. (Çağdaş Köleler, Milliyet, 19.08.1998)

of narrating the wage-labor process of agricultural workers in the mainstream press since 1980s[15]. In fact, pointing at the intermediary instead of the employer is not unique to the news on agricultural workers in today's context. Deadly work incidents and problems in other sectors have also been presented with a specific focus on intermediaries in the press[16]. It is within this context that I object to the comparisons between intermediary system and slavery (or any other kind of antiquated organization of labor), which imply continuation of a tradition. It is much more fruitful to categorize the intermediary system in Turkey's agriculture with an eye on other kinds of contemporary labor contracting systems which are on the rise.

When we look at academic scholarship, there are two main directions, both of which have so far overlooked the employers in the agricultural sector. On the one hand, within rural sociology, they have mostly been categorized as producers and farmers rather than employers. The research on agricultural workers, on the other hand, categorizes farmers as "employers" (though without naming them as such), yet, mostly call for direct state action to alleviate the conditions of the workers rather than questioning the responsibility of employers (Yıldırak et al 2003; Gülçubuk 2012; Lordoğlu & Etiler 2014; Şimşek 2011). One can easily notice a number of significant researches in the literature on agricultural workers, elaborating on accommodation and working conditions or child labor without mentioning responsibilities of the employers (e.g. Yıldırak et al. 2003; Gülçubuk 2012; Lordoğlu & Etiler 2014).

In Turkey, the political discourse and laws also exclude working rights and empoyer responsibility in the agricultural labor market. Political authorities (partly motivated by the notions/concerns of security and surveillance) claim to undertake the responsibility of accommodation for at least a part of migrant agricultural workers through METİP projects and limited funds (Memorandum 2010; Duruiz 2009; Erdoğan 2010). Nevertheless, the conditions of workers, especially in the labor camps, still very much depend on their relations with the employers. In fact, not all migrant workers stay in the camps that are isolated from village and city centers, from spaces of socialization and sources facilities

[15] The evolution of the press discourse on agricultural workers and current academic literature on agricultural workers with similar tendencies will be overviewed in Chapter III. Legal processes exempting employers from responsibility and recent public policies to aid agricultural workers will be discussed in Chapter IV.

[16] Within the database of daily Milliyet, news articles are available for search following the incident in Soma causing the death of more than 300 miners pointing to the responsibility of intermediaries without mentioning the employer. These are the headlines of two examples: Workers worked and dayıbaşı earned *[İşçiler çalıştı dayıbaşı kazandı]* (Milliyet, 2014, June 5). Shock to dayıbaşı's in Soma! *[Soma'da dayıbaşılara şok!]* (Milliyet, 2014, June 6).

such as electricity or clean water. Employers have also used empty houses and many other places for accommodation of workers. Duruiz (2011) analyzed, for instance, employers' distinctive treatment of "Eastern" and "Western" workers in terms of providing different conditions of accommodation in relation to the their understandings of the community and outside. The accommodation conditions of workers are, in that sense, very much dependent on their relations with the employers, their networks and identities (Duruiz, 2011). The gaps between contracts and conditions of different groups of workers in the case of Adapazarı also reveal the importance of the worker-employer relations. Within this context, putting the blame on intermediaries as *the* exploiters does not challenge the general trend of ignoring employer's responsibility in the agricultural labor market if not legitimizes it.

Finally, the blameworthy agricultural intermediary as shaped by the representations based on cultural differences constitutes a form of victim blaming. I read this stereotype as a way of directing attention to the culture (of workers) at the expense of structural insecurity of the labor market processes in explaining the unfair wage-labor process in the agricultural sector. This stereotype often functions as a way of pointing to cultural difference of workers without calling it as such. Workers' culture I believe has been over-emphasized in the reports on wage-labor processes of minority (particularly Kurdish) workers. When the intermediary is foregrounded as the source of exploitation through relating the intermediary institution to the culture of workers, *culture* itself is implied as responsible for the workers' own situation.

The discursive patterns that single out intermediaries as agents responsible for wage-labor processes—when accompanied by references to workers' traditional social ties with intermediaries—highlight cultural difference of workers. To simplify, if intermediaries are reproducing their authority thanks to workers' *culture* and if intermediaries are the ones creating unfairness in the wage-labor processes, the blame returns to *workers* because it is implied that (feudal/primordial/authoritarian/hierarchical/traditional) relations between the intermediaries and workers are being carried to the labor market *from outside and by workers themselves.* It becomes a way of blaming workers for their culture, based on presuppositions about their hierarchical cultural codes, which are supposed to legitimize their dependent relations with intermediaries. In this sense, the representations of the intermediary as a remnant of the past and representative of traditional authority hint the ways in which workers are being *othered* in contemporary accounts implying that there is a *culture* to blame.

Blaming the victim through his/her own culture is not uncommon in the representations of poor/disadvantaged people in the mainstream media. As Wright (1993) points out, establishing and reinforcing the tendency to blame the victims for social problems or for their conditions is quite widespread among sociologists. In fact, in recent decades, several social science concepts became the center of "academic victim blaming" controversy. Wright (1993) refers to some key concepts such as Oscar Lewis' (1959, 1966) "culture of poverty" and Wilson's (1987) "underclass" in order to explain the reasons of the controversy around such research (as cited in Wright 1993):

> Each of these researchers may be viewed, and has been defended, as having engaged in legitimate efforts to make sense of the social experiences and life opportunities of the poor. Each encouraged placing blame on the poor through seemingly rational, scientific scholarship. Each identified a social problem, studied those affected by the problem, and discovered in what ways they were different from the rest of us as a consequence of deprivation and injustice. Each, to some extent, defined the differences as the cause of the social problem itself… To varying degrees, emphasis on personal characteristics and minimal attention to the effects of the macro political-economic system in creating a structure of lack of opportunity has allowed other sociologists, the popular press, and the political establishment to selectively interpret and apply the concepts set forth by these authors in a manner that emphasizes personal shortcomings as causal variables and as the appropriate focus of efforts to reduce inequality. Thus, each developed, made popular or legitimized a concept or buzzword to which has accrued varied and flexible meanings. And, in all cases, these writings have had an impact on the understandings of poverty transmitted to the public and to undergraduate and graduate students (3-4).

This controversy calls for attention to buzzwords and typologies popularized around a social issue and used to blame people for their own situations regardless of the initial intentions of the scholars who had generated those typologies and concepts. Blameworthy intermediary (regarding pejorative words that are used to define the intermediating person such as *simsar, çavuş*[17]*, aracı, dayıbaşı, elçi*), I argue, has become such a buzzword for the discussions on the unjust practices occurring in the agricultural labor market of Turkey.

In the analysis of wage-labor processes, it is necessary to pay attention to the processes of labor market itself and how they reproduce, condition or create the so-called social/cultural bonds between workers and intermediaries. Such a concern is needed to ensure the analysis of work processes with a dynamic approach taking into account the multiple cross-cutting processes structuring the labor market through highlighting the vulnerable position of the workers *vis-a-vis* the employers and the active role of the state. This questioning does not aim to invalidate the research on cultural bases of various

[17] The word *çavuş* have been used both for intermediaries and crew leaders in the literature. Sometimes the two indeed are the same person. Yet, it does not have to be so in each context since *çavuş* is also the widespread local name of intermediary in Central Anatolia, as *dayıbaşı* in Aegean and *elçi* in Çukurova.

intermediary positions; instead, it prescribes considerable caution in typologies implying causality between cultural codes and the authority of the intermediary as detached from spatio-temporal contexts. In fact, this study assumes that the comparison between wage-labor processes of different resident groups with different ethnic identities will contribute to our understanding of the multiple dynamics of intermediation practices. In the light of Adapazarı case, alongside dual labor legislation and the insecurity of labor process, I will also try to draw attention to the importance of what has been called "the collective dimension of skill" (Thomas 1992: 97), which is central to the process of intermediation. That is, the intermediary system is highly efficient in rapidly providing teams to work on especially small-sized units of production since it gives employers access to established teams working in harmony even for short terms. The teams, thus, work efficiently without training or adoption process. Consequently, workers' use of "collective dimension of skill" through investing in relations of kin, family, neighbors, or co-workers give a comparative advantage to them in the labor market. Taking into account "collective dimension of skill," I think, points toward an alternative perspective, which will help to understand the contemporary relevance of the intermediary system, employer preferences and worker strategies in Turkey's agricultural labor market.

1.2 Case Study

Agriculture in the hinterland of Adapazarı is based on small-sized commercialized farms, which has long been regarded as the typical Turkish case.

When we look at the provincial level, agricultural sector remains a primary income-generating sector for people in Sakarya. Agricultural lands comprise approximately half of the area of the province (T.C. Sakarya Valiliği 2015: 45). Nationally agricultural sector makes up 8 percent of the GNP, whereas in Sakarya it is 24 percent, making agriculture the principal sector in the province (T.C. Sakarya Valiliği 2015: 46).

The fragmented and multi-ethnic agricultural labor market of Adapazarı offers an interesting case for scrutinizing the category of intermediary and analyzing the multiple dynamics of the labor market. It allows us to take the discussion to more contextual terms by including the ethnic groups under relatively durable social ties than those of seasonally migrant workers in the labor market. For example, Kurdish agricultural workers settled in Adapazarı are mostly women who usually work within non-hierarchical crews and are able to extend their social networks through work relations and ethnic ties; whereas, in the literature on agricultural workers, Kurdish seasonally migrant workers have long been depicted as isolated communities, working within hierarchical crews under the authority

of their intermediaries. Therefore, this case enables us to observe the different segments of Kurdish group under distinctive circumstances, which will be helpful to question the cultural stereotypes about Kurdish workers and intermediaries.

Most importantly, this case provides data for comparison between diverse labor processes; i.e., through comparing working experiences, strategies and expectations of women located in different neighborhoods and social networks in the city. The groups of women I encountered have remarkably different work histories, wage-labor processes, and future expectations, hinting at the process of handover of the jobs from the central neighborhoods to the peripheral locations of new migrants and those mostly associated with Romani and Kurdish identities.

An important part of agricultural workers are urban dwellers today (Özbek 2007; Şimşek 2011; Küçükkırca 2010; Çetinkaya 2008; Hayata Destek 2014). Nevertheless, neighborhoods of a Western city have been an unconventional place to do research on agricultural workers since knowledge about labor in agriculture has been developed mainly through research on seasonal migratory agricultural workers, occasionally including research in these workers' hometowns as urban slums and villages from East and South-East of Turkey (Küçükkırca 2010; Şimşek 2011; Hayata Destek 2014). In the absence of general statistical data, recent research provided valuable information on the numbers, different routes and transportation, working and living conditions of the agricultural workers and child labor in the sector (Çınar 2014; Yıldırım 2015; Etiler & Lordoğlu 2014; Çınar & Lordoglu 2011; Geçgin 2009; Şimşek 2011; Çınar 2014; Yıldırım 2015; Duruiz 2011; Kaleci 2007; Ulukan & Ulukan 2011; Küçükkırca 2012; Gülçubuk 2012; Uzun 2015; Karaman & Yılmaz 2011; Önen 2012; Özbek 2007; Koruk 2010; Pelek 2010; Gümüş 2005; Yıldırak et al 2003; IHD 2008; Mazlumder 2008; MİGA 2012; Hayata Destek 2014; Kalkınma Atölyesi 2012; TBMM 2015). Apparently, the labor of agricultural workers has become increasingly vital in spring and summers seasons in Central Anatolian, Aegean, Black Sea and Çukurova regions. Agricultural workers can either be locals or migrants, rural or urban dwellers, they either work as individuals or alongside their families. Among them there are those who work on fields closer to their homes as well as those who consistently migrate from one place to another and finally those participating in this migration circle in shorter terms. There is a visible pattern of seasonal migration from the Southeast to the North and to the West although this is not the only route. Recent researches indicate that the disadvantaged ethnic minorities of the country, particularly Kurds, Arabs and Romas, are overrepresented among agricultural

workers (TBMM 2015; Önen 2011; Hayata Destek 2014; Yıldırak et. al 2003; Çınar & Lordoğlu 2011).

Given the absence of validated statistics on the labor in agriculture, it is hard to assess the significance of those women's work in Adapazarı with respect to the agricultural production of the region and the relative share of their labor compared to all other laborers (the seasonally migrant workers coming to the region for shorter terms; and those settled in the villages working either as unpaid family laborers ans landowners, those who are engaged in labor exchanges, and paid agricultural workers who are living in the villages). The focus group here, as urban dwellers of a Western city, is a margin of the agricultural labor market. The importance I attach to this particular labor market mostly stems from the vitality of agricultural jobs for these people, especially for those who have settled in peripheral neighborhoods of the city. In this regard, this research strives to highlight a relatively invisible part of agricultural labor market rather than demonstrating a representative sample of the agricultural workers in Turkey. Moreover, focusing on a margin may bring further benefits since atypical members of a group can be used to question the meanings and attributes attached to the "typical" ones.

Finally, I hope this closer look at the intermediation practices in the agricultural labor market will also contribute to the literature on women's labor in Turkey, particularly to the growing literature on the precarious jobs that women have been employed in the cities such as cleaning, home-based production and labor intensive industries. Income earning through agricultural jobs in Adapazarı has been a major alternative to these jobs for women with little formal education. Moreover, the networks and practices of intermediation in the city, as the focus of this study, are not just exclusively functional for agricultural jobs. The women I have encountered in the city often utilize the same networks to gain employment in other sectors such as plastics-recycling, special event organizations (as waitresses), textile workshops, slaughterhouses, and other parts of food industry, which enables switching between jobs and/or compensate for the low seasons of agriculture with other daily/temporary jobs.

1.3 Methodology

As Becker pointed out in 1967, the analyses of social scientists have always been shaped by their personal and political stances whether they are aware of it or not (Becker, 1967). What he had offered to social scientists' is just to be conscious about the effects of taking sides by using theoretical and technical resources to avoid distortions, limiting conclusions carefully and making clear the limits of study rather than to attempt a

scientifically neutral position which is uncontaminated by personal and political sympathies (Becker 1967). In the case of this research, indeed, both the formulation of the research question emphasizing the agency of women and selection of the subject as the wage-labor processes of undocumented agricultural workers reflects the researcher's ethical/political stance. The research is deliberately planned to highlight the invisible labor in our food: *the labor of young Kurdish women in the new brands of lettuces; the labor of Romani families in freezing mud harvesting spinach; the labor of elderly women in cleaned and packaged onions and potatoes…*

Apart from disregarding the necessity and possibility of objective scientist position while choosing the subject to study, the research has also been inspired by the feminist methodology prioritizing to learn from women and give women a voice in history. In this respect, the complex and layered qualitative data based on women's expressions on their experiences is treated as a significant source of information (Harding 1986). Without any doubt, women revise and reconstitute their experiences while transferring them to the researcher. Nevertheless, these reconstituted experiences themselves are parts of social reality as valuable sources of information about how they construct their subjectivities, give meaning to their daily practices and how they act within this world of meanings. This research combined such qualitative interviews with women workers with the method of participant observation that involves unstructured interviews with the workers as well as conversations with other people in the region including landowners, bureaucrats, mukhtars, and NGO representatives. The qualitative interviews revealed some distinctive patterns of work in the city, which has also been hinted throughout the participant observation processes of the research.

One major problem is about the limits of generalization with such data. Yet, the attempted generalizations of this study are rather theoretical. It is an attempt to portray the ways in which relations and places matter in the agricultural labor market. In fact, I follow the "contextualist" paradigm positing that all social facts are contextual—no social fact makes any sense when abstracted from its context in social space and time—rather than searching for causality between abstracted variables (Abbott 1997).

Another major problem is the difficulty of assessing the effect of situations and the researcher within the process of collecting such data, which is non-standardized and very rich in personal expressions. Qualitative research is an interactive process and readers mostly have to rely on the results submitted by the researcher without an explanation of the context and situations within which that data is collected. As a limited but feasible

solution to this problem, I will transfer the data with a reflexive account of the fieldwork, thus opening up the details of data collecting process through describing the places, the participants and the contexts for a better understanding of the position of the researcher with respect to the participants within these contexts. In this respect, fieldwork data will be analyzed through references to the details of the actual conversations, how the researcher had initially contacted the people, the ways in which the participants perceived her presence and the research.

Finally, assuming that I succeed in opening up the details of fieldwork to readers, the scholarly writing itself is still an authoritative process and closed to the participants of the study which is especially problematic for a study claiming to be supportive of and aims to give voice to the "silenced." Within the anthropological tradition, such concerns and decades of self-criticism of scholarly authority had triggered attempts to write ethnography in new/experimental/critical forms. Nancy Lindisfarne (2000), for example, wrote her ethnography on marriage, gender and family in Syria as fictional stories, which had been checked by the participants in the process of writing. Lila Abu Lughod (2008[1993]), likewise, in her second book on Bedouin Women chose to quote directly the conversations, which mostly consist of women's voices, in a way that is distinguishable from the analytical/systematical language of her initial ethnography (1999[1986]) of Bedouin society. I perceive the solitary writing process excluding participants as a limitation and handicap, which is hard to overcome within this study.

1.4 Plan of the Dissertation

In the second part, I will present important theoretical standpoints and conceptual tools of the study.

Chapter Three will examine the frontiers of the contemporary discourse on agricultural workers with references the major socio-political transformations of recent history. The analysis here has three dimensions: first, an account of the transformations in question, second, an archival research of the daily *Milliyet;* and third, an analysis of the distinct and still growing post-1980 literature on agricultural workers in Turkey. I will briefly present the history and the dynamics of agricultural labor market, which will hopefully be useful in delineating agricultural wage-labor relations on the one hand, and the limits of the political environment on the other. In the first part, in order to better understand the context in which current agricultural wage labor is experienced, I will discuss important moments in recent history. The general structure of Turkey's agriculture and agricultural policies will be briefly presented. Particular emphasis will be attached to the 1980s

turmoil regarding military coup, restructuring of the economy, increasing deregulation of agricultural markets and the major socio-political processes that led to the ethnicization of the agricultural jobs. The second part will build on the historical press research on daily *Milliyet*. This press research reveals a process of replacement of the language of rights and developmentalism with victimization and *othering* as the main framework in the presentation of agricultural workers after 1980s. The continuities and ruptures within the discourse in fact give an idea about the main framework in which the problems of agricultural wage-labour processes are discussed today. The final part will be a discussion on the downsides of victimization and *othering* through presenting similar tendencies in the academic literature on agricultural workers.

Fourth chapter will be a discussion on the role of the political processes in shaping the structure of the agricultural labor market and in providing employers access to an exceptional labor force. First of all, I will discuss the equal citizenship ideal of the Republic through the disadvantaged citizens having trouble in realization of their rights. The participants of this study, female agricultural workers have historically had weaker claims on land, little access to formal jobs, trade unions and institutional networks, all of which are necessary tools for access to social rights in Turkey. Second, I will question the politics of statistics and the invisibility of these women's work within public surveys. Not only have agriculture and household surveys of the state have been blind to urban women's agricultural work: they also attribute a marginal status to agricultural wage workers in categorizing them together with self-employed farmers and unpaid family workers. Third, I will illustrate the disadvantaged status of atypical jobs, the major type of women employment, within labor legislation. Finally, I will study state regulations in agricultural labor market—as one of the atypical forms of work—and the recent processes of state intervention in the agricultural wage-labor processes following Prime Ministry Memorandum (2010), METİP projects and finally the approach of parliamentary commission on agricultural workers.

Chapter Five will introduce the fieldwork and participants of the study. I will present the data and the details of the fieldwork, observation locations and the basic information about the participants of case study in 2015.

Chapter Six will be a detailed elaboration on the findings of the fieldwork. I will discuss wage-labor processes of agricultural workers in Adapazarı in its heterogeneity through illustrating different patterns of work, intermediation practices and different prospects of future between the groups. I will illustrate the contexts and conditions that make different

strategies significant parts of women's working lives. These strategies are in fact important tools to analyze the multiple intermediary positions and various practices of intermediation within the city.

The last chapter will raise some questions on intermediation practices in Turkey's agriculture through scrutinizing some discursive patterns prevalent in analyses of agricultural wage-labor processes in the literature. At the end, through combining the findings of the literature and fieldwork data, an alternative framework will be offered to examine intermediation in agriculture, which takes into account the variations of the practice, the importance of particular contexts of work relationships, the significant role of political processes, preferences of employers and workers.

CHAPTER II

THEORETICAL AND CONCEPTUAL TOOLS

In this chapter, I will present theoretical and conceptual tools that will be used throughout the study. I will start by explaining the major theoretical concerns of the study, which are emphasizing the primacy to contexts and agency of workers within the analysis of wage-labor processes. Secondly, I will define the way this study approaches to the concept of ethnicity and the ways in which the case study is designed to distinguish wage-labor processes of different ethnic groups of workers in the labor market. Finally, I will explain three major concepts that will be used in the analysis: *agricultural exceptionalism*, to question rationales and implications of dual labor legislation exempting agricultural employers from responsibility; *agricultural labor market*, to assert that modern commercial agricultural wage-labor processes can fairly be discussed within the conceptual framework developed within labor processes of industries; and *agricultural work/ers*, to define the jobs and worker groups studied—with a concern for entitling all paid laborers of agriculture as workers without asserting atypicality in the definition.

2.1 Contexts and Agency

This research is formulated with two major theoretical concerns reserving primacy to contexts in the social research: approaching the issue of intermediation in agriculture within contextual terms and emphasizing the agency of the workers. These concerns are partly inspired by the powerful criticisms of scholars (Wacquant 1989; Bourdieu & Wacquant 1992; Tilly 1999; Abbott 1997; Emirbayer 1997; Emirbayer & Mische 1998) on the repercussions of dependence on pre-constituted and generalized categories in social analysis. In "The Puzzle of Race and Class", for example, Wacquant (1989) scrutinizes the mainstream social questioning of the effect of ethnicity *[does ethnicity matter?]* with regard to its essentialist, ahistorical and oversimplifying implications. He highlights the significance of specific contexts in which social relations takes place, which is ignored in the very formulation of such questioning of the abstracted affect of "ethnicity". With similar concerns, Emirbayer (1997), in the "Manifesto for a Relational Sociology", proposes an alternative to substantialist approaches through emphasizing "ontological embeddedness or locatedness of entities within actual situational contexts" (289). The social world, in this manner, primarily consists of dynamic, unfolding relations instead of

substances/things. Abbott (1997), likewise, while exploring the valuable heritage of Chicago School, particularly emphasizes their suspicion about the generalized abstractions like "gender", "bureaucracy" as if they can be regarded independent of other variables (1152). He thus challenges the so-called "variables paradigm" of mainstream sociology pointing out that "nothing ever occurs in the social world occurs net of other variables. All social facts are located in contexts. So why bother to pretend that they are not?" (Abbott 1997: 1152).

It is possible to reformulate the idea of agency within a contextualist paradigm that is embedded in situations as an alternative to the ideal of "will" formulated as a property of individuals (Emirbayer 1997: 294). Such conceptualization of agency is also conditioned by history and past experiences; however, since the agent is not separable from the situations, he/she is able to move beyond the pre-constituted identities and interests within the unfolding dynamics of these situations (Emirbayer 1997: 294; Emirbayer & Mische 1998).

The concern for prioritizing contexts/processes and agency in an analysis of agricultural labor market, on the other hand, is a political response to current popular themes of *blameworthy* intermediary and *victim* worker in Turkey. I perceive agricultural work as a decent work, as something women participants of the study do, accomplish and reach—which would surely be more preferable under different conditions—rather than a condition of misery and hopelessness. Following Staples (2007), rather than "deprivation", I will place much greater emphasis on the concept "vulnerability" which seems to better capture the process of change by shifting the focus from the output to people (13-14). As a reaction to the ongoing victimization/objectification of agricultural workers in the media, I deliberately chose to focus on what these women do, the ways in which they act in given circumstances rather than what is lacking. It is not to deny the wider and obviously effective processes that confined them to relatively disadvantaged and/or excluded positions in the society, but it is a choice to look at the specific ways in which they are struggling within these situational contexts. This emphasis on agency of women is also inspired by detailed research on how women, particularly women in poverty conditions, struggle with their conditions resulting in negotiations and reconfigurations on a daily basis (Ong 2010; Sen 1999; Soytemel 2013; Hattatoğlu 2000, 2001; Beşpınar 2010).

Among the poor, minority women have particularly been victimized within the mainstream discourse, which is related to popular assumptions on the cumulative

disadvantage. That assumes if a person has multiple subordinate-group identities, it simply means a double, triple burden on her: people having more subordinate identities simply suffer more than others who have less. Hence, double jeopardy models claim that disadvantage accrues with each of a person's subordinate group identities; i.e the more devalued identities a person has the more cumulative discrimination he/she faces. As a counter argument, social dominance theory posits that oppression directed at subordinate groups will cause subordinate men to experience more direct prejudice and discrimination than subordinate women. Vaughns & Eihbach (2008) criticize these two polars as both score keeping approaches since they all neglect to take into account the many complex ways that people with intersecting identities are interdependent with those who share one or more of their disadvantaged identities (e.g. husbands, sons, brothers of minority women). Moreover, score keeping approaches assume that it is possible to translate qualitatively distinct forms of oppression into a single measure although the various types of oppression that people experience are in fact incommensurable. Vaughns & Eihbach (2008), therefore, offer to ask how the forms of oppression that people with intersecting disadvantaged identities experience differ from the forms of oppression that people with single disadvantaged identity experience instead of asking who is more disadvantaged. With this aim, they develop a general model of "intersectional invisibility" that attempts to specify the distinctive forms of oppression experienced by those with intersecting subordinate identities. Their approach aims to attempt move beyond the question of whose group is worse off—by simply counting multiple disadvantaged identities—to specify the distinctive forms of opposition experienced by those with intersecting subordinate identities. I will follow the approach of Vaughns & Eihbach (2008) as an alternative framework to cumulative disadvantage approaches to analyze experiences of people with multiple subordinate identities.

2.2 Ethnicity and Ethnic Groups

This study distinguishes and compares groups of workers as Turk, Kurd and Roma in the local labor market following the signs of segregated networks/settlements and interactively constituted identities through encounters in the wage-labor processes. The agricultural labor market is approached as one of the sites to observe the processes whereby ethnic groups and cultural differences are formed and made relevant in the social life. As Duruiz (2009) suggested the interactions in the agricultural labor market have proved to be rewarding for an investigation of the reflections of the broader politics of ethnic differentiation and the ethnic antagonisms in Turkey, and analysis of how they are

lived out and reformulated in daily life (22). Moreover, within the analysis, I will specify some contexts in which ethnicity becomes a key factor for allocation of individuals to the positions in the labor processes and subsequently in the allocation of rewards associated with these positions.

In fact, studying ethnic groups in Turkey remains difficult because of the absence of nation-wide statistical data. As most socio-demographic studies refer to Turkey as a whole, limited knowledge has been produced on the socio-economic patterns of the ethnic minorities. Moreover, data availability is not just a practical but also a political problem. As Sirkeci (2000) states in the context of Turkey which characterized "by a long lasting denial of different ethnicities and an imposed official Turkishness based on territorial unity, defining and measuring ethnicity becomes a more difficult task". Although an ethnicity question has been included in national censuses until 1990, the results have not been publicized since 1965 because of political (or as officially said, "security") concerns (Sirkeci 2000: 152).

Apart from these obstacles, measuring ethnicity has already been a complex issue regarding the ambiguity of defining ethnicity. Members and outsiders have usually defined ethnic groups through references to common ancestors, common cultural heritage, common history and/or common language. Yet, these are most of the time mere "references" rather than reliable and stable facts. Besides, history itself is a form of synchronic rhetoric shaped by the struggles to appropriate the past rather than being simply an objective source of ethnicity (Barth 1998 [1969]). Indeed, among the multiple contemporary [e.g. situational, structural, conditional] definitions of ethnicity, the common point is the rejection of the centrality of primordial ties[18] as constitutive features of ethnic groups. What is constitutive of ethnic group is rather at the outside, i.e, interactions with the other groups. We can speak of no ethnic group in isolation since they are dynamic social forms defined and redefined through interactions with other groups. As Gupta and Ferguson (1997) summarized, the studies of ethnographic writing have already revealed that the apparent boundedness and coherence of a culture is actually something made rather than found (4). In this sense, difference, rather than being a characteristic, has always been a relationship, which is shaped by histories of force, exploitation, and domination (Pascale 2013: 5; Gupta & Ferguson 1997: 4). Boundaries may change in

[18] The term primordial may be defined as "first developed" or "created", but it can also be used to mean "primeval", suggesting the existence of something from the beginning (Hoşgör & Smits 2014: 420). Classical sociologists had generally regarded the primordial ties as natural, essential roots of ethnic communities.

time, so as the members of ethnic groups. This is precisely the reason why it is hard to situate an ethnic group and operationalize in the research. Researchers adopt multiple criteria to measure ethnicity. Many researchers (Mutlu 1996; Sirkeci 2000; İçduygu et al. 1999; Hoşgör & Smits 2002) took Kurdish mother tongue in family as a criterion to define the boundaries of Kurdish group for statistical purposes. Yet, as Mutlu (1996) had mentioned there are also disagreements over what constitutes Kurdish language and there have been members of the group who do not speak Kurdish as their mother tongue as well as Kurdish-speaking non-members (519). At each moment, political processes/struggles are significant in defining and redefining the current boundaries of the group.

For the purposes of this study, throughout the fieldwork I followed segregation, language and network clues, and self-identifications of workers to classify workers, yet, without an aim to measure the ethnic identity of all workers in the labor market. 2015 case study particularly situated and compared ethnic groups' wage-labor processes when ethnicity is associated with residential segregation. Kurd and Roma agricultural workers in the city are in fact larger than the segregated communities even among agricultural workers. For example, a part of the Roma community who live in Güneşler and Şeker Mahallesi were also working in agricultural sector; yet, I decided to focus on Karaköy (Budaklar) and Erenler/Yeni Mahalle in 2015 case study for Roma sample because of clearer signs of residential segregation within these neighborhoods. Moreover, it is evident that even the most segregated settlements inhabit non-members of these ethnic groups. Nevertheless, the settlements associated with Kurd and Roma ethnic groups were the best places of observation for a network-based analysis on the labor market processes of different groups[19]. Furthermore, it was possible to observe discursive construction of the ethnic difference in daily routine of work processes, which have been organized in neighborhoods, as labor market interactions themselves are sites of construction of such differences and identities. Such contextualization of ethnicity offered a framework for comparison between groups regarding the close links between residential networks and wage-labor processes of agricultural jobs. The results as well as differences in patterns of wage-labor process of ethnic groups are limited by the definition of these contexts and definitely cannot be generalized to all Kurd, Roma, and Turk agricultural workers. Besides, a primary concern of this study is to contextualize ethnicity in actual social

[19] "Fieldwork and Places of Observation" parts in Chapter V will clarify the ways in which residence groups have been selected.

relations as an alternative to generalized ethnic/cultural assumptions about agricultural workers in the mainstream literature[20].

Classical sociology was characterized by assumptions on the contrast/duality between ethnic groups and modern societies as an ethnic group is largely regarded as a premodern form of social organization, which is supposed to be resolved in the process of modernization. Yet, historical experiences—particularly fascism and racism—had challenged the way social scientists perceived modern society. It had become apparent that modern societies have not been free from primordial references undeniably favoring some groups over others. Consequently, by late 1960s, social science witnessed a shift in the perception of ethnic groups challenging the former essentialist frameworks[21]. Today, it is largely recognized that ethnic groups have also been constituted through similar processes as social and political units with primordial references as so-called modern societies. Barth (1998), for example, forcefully challenged the primordialist explanations of ethnicity through emphasizing interaction: "the ethnic boundary defines the group not the cultural stuff that it encloses" (6, as cited in Barth 1969: 15). Therefore, differences between ethnic groups today are usually formulated in terms of power relations as majority and minority groups instead of assuming a duality between modern societies and ethnic groups.

Within this study, Kurdish and Romani groups are recognized as minority groups with respect to Turkishness of the majority. This context of power imbalance causes further difficulty in categorizing people into three separate groups. On the one hand, it is relatively easy to spot Kurdish and Romani residence groups since there are apparent signs like bilingualism and at least some insiders and outsiders define the group with such ethnic references. Yet, in an environment, where these identities are understood as challenge to national security and unity, it becomes a political dilemma to code people with minority identities. The political context of Turkish nationalism makes it difficult, even impossible in some cases, for people to express their criminalized and stigmatized identities (Sirkeci 2000). Therefore, I guess at least some participants of the study might have rejected to be categorized as Roma or Kurd and I admit that they have good reasons for that.

[20] In Chapter VII on intermediation, there will be further discussion on the handicaps of ethnic generalizations in the literature of wage-labor process of agricultural workers.

[21] By the late 1960s, three successive analytical shifts challenged the existing essentialist framework studies of race/ethnicity: social constructionism, racial formation and critical race theory (Pascale 2013: 24).

Turkishness, on the other hand, was hardly mentioned by workers since it appeared as a norm for defining the others. There were no neighborhoods associated with Turkishness as in the case of minority groups in Adapazarı. Turkishness, in this sense, is generally established as something beyond the ethnic categories despite its evident ethnic references. Rosaldo (1988) powerfully questioned this kind of cultural invisibility attached to some groups by criticizing anthropological definitions of the concept of culture by *difference* in a way to assert a post-cultural status to contemporary white North American culture. He, therefore, questioned the ideological fallout from the play of cultural visibility and invisibility resulting from looking for culture's that are different from "civilized" white urban dwellers. In the context of agricultural workers in Turkey, likewise, researchers tend to remark on cultures of workers only if they have minority identities. This invisibility of Turkishness in the agricultural labor market resembles the unmarked status of whiteness, which has long been criticized within the critical race theories. Pascale (2013) notices the status of whiteness through her research on newspaper articles, interviews and television shows in the United States and concludes, "whiteness was never noted as a routine racial category" (31). Consequently, she questions how whiteness is produced as unmarked, "how does whiteness gain meaning, not as a racial category, *per se*, but rather as a kind of normalcy, an invisible center from which difference can be measured" (Pascale 2013: 31-2). She critically states that within her research "whiteness emerges as the space against which racial categories gain meaning and visibility rather than a category in itself" (Pascale 2013: 33). Following her scrutinization of un-marked hegemonic category of whiteness as something further reproducing white privilege, I intentionally used Turk as an ethnic category for agricultural workers just like Roma and Kurd. Therefore, the workers settled in central neighborhoods of the city are intentionally categorized as Turks although there was no apparent association of their neighborhoods with a particular ethnic identity as in the case of Romani and Kurdish workers. By doing so, I tried not to produce further hierarchy between categories of workers through asserting a non-ethnic identity to members of the majority group.

In brief, this study will focus on the wage-labor processes among residentially segregated groups of women from different ethnic groups. One of the emphases will be on household men (income, social security, different positioning of the household men in the broader labor market), which often result in distinguishing patterns within the agricultural wage-labor processes and also future expectations of different ethnic groups of worker women in the city. Nevertheless, I want to clarify that ethnicities are not suggested to establish definite boundaries or hierarchy between workers. Indeed, women from all groups have

very much in common in their lives as manual workers of precarious jobs. It is rather a way to analyze the dynamics of differences in wage labor processes through exploring segregated lives and social networks. Those networks overlap at some instances, so as their working lives.

2.3 Agricultural Exceptionalism

The literature analysis and historical press research (Chapter III) will reveal signs for an hegemonic language in which we are talking about agricultural workers that is, above all, characterized by a lack of emphasis on the rights of workers and responsibilities of employers. In fact, the historical course making this language possible was hardly coincidental, and reflects the necessity of questioning the processes of legislation, the role of lawmakers and employers in structuring agricultural labor market in Turkey.

A part of the blame for the deplorable conditions under which agricultural workers live and work today lies with agricultural exceptionalism (Lyon 2005: 271). Critical emphasis on the notion of "agricultural exceptionalism" has its roots in 1970s labor activism in the United States that led scholars to question state policies in structuring such an insecure wage-labor processes for farm workers. A number of scholars (Lyon 2005; Kosegi 2001; Luna 1997; Thomas 1992; Friedland & Thomas 1974, 1982) stated at the direct connection between agricultural exceptionalism and poverty of agricultural workers in the United States. Friedland and Thomas (1974, 1982) used the phrase "agricultural exceptionalism" to define and question the United States agricultural policy in the context of 1960s and 1970s unionization[22] attempts of farm workers in California. They question the rationale(s) for exempting farm laborers from protective labor legislation (Friedland and Thomas 1982: 7, from Friedland and Thomas 1974). Exceptionalism, as they pointed out, purported that agriculture by its very nature could not be equated with industry: "farming was small business; farming was the cornerstone of free polity; farmers were subject to vagaries of God, weather and natural calamity" (Friedland and Thomas 1982: 7). Such rationale legitimized distinctive legislation suggesting that agricultural employers need different sets of rules since they can hardly withstand the combined stress of upholding democracy, unpredictable weather acts and working rights. They noticed that these exceptionalist rationale(s) has been historically consistent in the United States although considerable change had already taken place in the organization of agricultural enterprises in 1970s (Thomas 1992; Friedland and Thomas 1982: 8). Exceptional

[22] Further information on United Farm Workers Union is available in the articles Friedland and Thomas 1974; Friedland and Thomas 1982.

treatment to agricultural labor market has continued although giant corporations replaced farmers in California. It is precisely this historical persistence that deserves further scrutiny and a deeper look in the notions of belonging, citizenship status and political vulnerability of workers as Thomas (1992) pointed out in the case of Californian agricultural labor market. In "Citizenship, Gender, and Work: Social Organization of Industrial Agriculture", he pictured a moment of strike by Mexican farm workers in a small Californian town, which was at first gaze similar to the frequent strikes of other groups of workers such as machinists, firefighters, local police, but, perceived in completely different terms:

> …Commentators went so far as to suggest that if the strikers didn't like their jobs they could simply go back home to Mexico. The right to strike might be part of the law, but somehow it pertained only to those who had "earned" the right by being members of the community… The specter of Mexican workers striking against American employers was difficult to understand. Thus, I recall my friend and their parents voicing sympathy with farm workers ("you could't pay me enough to do that kind of stoop labor") while, in the next breath, muttering anger (and fear) about Mexicans who should "stay in their place." (Thomas 1992: xii - xiii)

Thomas (1992) then rereads the sociological history of farm labor in Californian agriculture to illustrate how growers and the state politically constructed a distinctive labor market fragmented as braceros[23], green card and undocumented workers. He claims that the construction of agricultural labor markets has been an overtly political process through the ability of employer interests to transform their economic power into governmental policy and administrative apparatus (Thomas 1992: 77-8). This politically mediated labor market apparently served to perpetuate low wages, low levels of unionization and labor-intensive production in the Southwest United States. Luna (1997) likewise emphasized the important role of public law limiting collective action of farm workers to understand the nature of employer-worker relations in El Paso region (508). He points out that it is the current institutional structure prohibiting democratic principles from entering the realm of farm work (Luna 1997: 508). Agricultural exceptionalism, in

[23] The Bracero Program was a contractual arrangement between the United States and Mexico to meet agriculture's labor demand throughout the border region and the United States. The program allowed agricultural employers an exemption from restrictive immigration laws to supply their labor demand (Luna 1997: 505). It is first established as a guest worker program with Mexico in 1917, then followed by a second program from 1940s through the 1960s resulted in millions of Mexicans immigrating to the United States (Kosegi 2001: 270-1; McDaniel & Casanova 2003: 88). The program is criticized by scholars and worker advocates as enduring slavery-type working conditions by providing employers an enormous power to intimidate workers through violence and arrest (Luna 1997: 505-6). The program terminated in 1964-5 (Thomas 1992: 10, 87), due to the struggles of worker advocates and the effect of Civil Rights movement (Luna 1997; McDaniel & Casanova 2003: 88). Yet, other guest worker program (H2A) was established again in mid-1980s (McDaniel & Casanova 2003: 88; Kosegi 2001).

that sense, is essential to understand the distinctiveness of agricultural labor and the organization of work in the United States' agriculture (Thomas 1992: xiv).

The limits of citizenship and political vulnerability of workers are central to the discussion on the perpetuation of agricultural exceptionalism in the United States. However, the bulk of agricultural workers have historically been donated with full citizenship rights in Turkey's agricultural labor market despite their apparent problems in realization of these rights. Immigrant labour is still emerging although it is growing in numbers and importance every year regarding increasing seasonal migration of Georgian workers for tea harvest (North) and increasing numbers of Syrian refugees being hired in agricultural jobs as a consequence of the ongoing Syrian civil war. Nevertheless, the central factors in Thomas' analysis such as the notions of political vulnerability, belonging and gender are relevant to the organization and fragmentation of Turkey's agricultural labor market today, even though majority of the workers are full citizens on paper.

Legal exceptionalism, particularly the dual standard of labor legislation enabling agricultural employers to access a distinctive supply of labor, has been able to stay unchallenged for private farms of Turkey until now. The exceptional and secondary treatment of agricultural work/workers has its roots in the very political route of Turkish Republic and various manifestations of exceptionality of agricultural work have been evident in the public discourse for a long time. Turkish state and public discussion has always been exceptionalist in the case of agricultural workers; this was often legitimized through the characteristic of Turkey's agriculture being historically based on small-farmer families and short-term demands of labor. Moreover, over the last decades, this persistence of legal exceptionalism coexisted with the rapid legislation to cut down agricultural employers' support from public budget. Given the predominance of the small landownership structure of agriculture, the restructuring of the economy and the budget cuts are much more than just a pressure. It has been an issue of survival especially for small-sized farms and led to the proletarianization of some farmer families[24] who constitute a part of agricultural work force today. Many small farms in Turkey survive with the support of extra income and social security earned by family members in agricultural and nonagricultural labor market (Teoman 2001; Özuğurlu 2011). Although legal exceptionalism has partly been justified through the concerns for survival of small-

[24] The repercussions of the implementation of tobacco quota for the town Kahta, is one of the well-known examples of that kind which made Kahta one of the centers sending migrants for seasonal agricultural work (Küçükkırca 2012).

sized farms; working rights and compensation would be rather costly for larger enterprises. Short-term and limited labor demands of small-sized farms dramatically reduce the amount of pensions to be paid if workers are granted with rights. Besides, it is important to notice that legal exceptionalism is also harmful for those farmer families who support small-sized farms with seasonally working in other agricultural enterprises. Finally and most importantly, legal exceptionalism denies rights of agricultural workers in Turkey (TBMM 2015: 192) who work without retirement and compensation rights, work place safety, unemployment benefits, minimum wage and rights to unionize and collectively bargain.

Exceptionalism and Othering

Exceptionalist portrayals of agricultural work are in fact widespread beyond the limits of legal-bureaucratic texts that will be illustrated through the literature and the historical press analyses. By "perception of agricultural jobs as exceptional", I specifically refer to the rationale(s) feeding the idea of incomparability of agricultural jobs with other jobs validating the principle that agricultural labour market necessitates distinct sets of laws. Throughout the study, I will use the phrase "exceptionalism" to indicate all rationales which imply that agricultural work is exceptional so that it requires distinct sets of rules rather than protective legislation based on employer accountability and working rights. Within the literature analysis and press research I particularly focused on the ways in which agricultural work has been portrayed as *exceptional.*

The literature and historical analysis reveal that a significant part of written accounts on agricultural work ranging from trade union booklets, NGO reports to scientific studies contribute to exceptionalist perception of agricultural jobs. Exceptionalism is either suggested through its *temporariness* in the sense that the problems of agricultural workers are seen as temporary that will eventually be changed in the process of development; or through an emphasis on its *distinctiveness* in the sense that agricultural workers are not workers in the full sense of the term because of traditional and pre-modern work relations. On the one hand, the emphasis on its *temporariness* as an explanation for distinct rules has usually been conceptualized within the language of modernity and evolutionary view of progress (Tarım-İş 1992; Kazgan 1963; Gevgilili 1974). On the other hand, the arguments highlighting *distinctiveness* of the work relations often point at the intermediary—implying that it is in fact distinctive culture/traditions/characteristics of workers which is *distinctive* about agricultural jobs. In this way, *otherization* has become a component of

exceptionalist arguments especially since 1980s, as I will illustrate within the historical press analysis in Chapter III.

Indeed, the historical press research exposes that *exceptionalism* gained new meaning(s) after 1980s when it is utilized for a discursive construction of difference through expressions of strangeness to a different culture in the case of seasonally migrant agricultural workers. Although various manifestations of exceptionality of farm works had been evident in the public discourses for a long time, it is noticeable that they gained a new meaning after 1980s when they started to be mostly accompanied with the expressions of strangeness to a different culture. The processes of "ethnicization" of work is remarkable since 1980s given the specific portrayal of workers in the media, ongoing articulation of ethnical meanings about and in relation to workers, and the disproportionate representation of women and ethnic minorities (Kurds, Arabs, and Romas) within seasonally migrant agricultural workers throughout the country (TBMM 2015). That's particularly why it is necessary to question current prevalence of the notion of exceptionalism for agricultural jobs with the disproportionate representation of the disadvantaged groups in the sector, particularly minorities and women. I perceive the prevalence of this seemingly unchallenged notion of exceptionalism with the fact that the disadvantaged minority groups and/or women are disproportionately represented in the sector. The members of these groups, either women or minority members, have traditionally weaker claims on land and are less likely to have formal jobs and access to the social rights associated to these jobs since they have also been mostly excluded from trade union networks. I believe contemporary rationale(s) supporting legal exceptionalism underpin the *ethical variability* (Benson 2008: 604) of seeing different people as deserving different standards of living.

To sum up, this study posits two major motives for highlighting *exceptionalism* as a key term in the analysis of agricultural work in Turkey. First, it signifies the legal processes denying agricultural work from protection (agricultural exceptionalism). Second, it concerns the ways in which contemporary exceptionalist portrayals of agricultural work contribute to otherization of workers, implying that it is in fact *culture* of workers that is exceptional. The issue of intermediaries, as the focus of this study, has been one of the areas that cultural distinctiveness of workers, I think, is over-focused within the literature on agricultural work.

2.4 Agricultural Labor Market

I use the term "agricultural labor market" in Adapazarı to comprehend the wage-labor processes within the neighborhoods and workplaces. Such utilization of the term is grounded on the legacy of scholarship emerged in 1980s and 1990s as an alternative to rural-urban divide in the analysis of the labor processes. After 1980s, researchers increasingly question the exceptional character of agriculture and widely accepted differences between rural-urban wage-labor processes (Thomas 1992; Friedland and Thomas 1982; Friedland 1981; Friedman 1981; Ortiz 2002). Consequently, the issues raised in industrial studies began to be incorporated into the analytic framework of rural research. The comparisons of the ways in which the labor processes is structured and restructured in industry and agriculture have proved to be rewarding. Apparently, commercial agriculture is also adopting forms of control commonly associated with industrial sites to reduce costs such as segmenting markets, deskilling tasks, managerial functions, and imposing new relations of production (Ortiz 2002: 395, 407; Thomas 1992).

Ortiz (2002) points out that the economic anthropologists of 1960s and early 1970s had paid little attention to wage laborers in agriculture except for a few studies focused on plantations and mine workers. Moreover, at that time such rural workers had often been categorized distinctively as part-peasants or rural proletarians. Ortiz (2002), hence, criticized the presumptions of these studies:

> …Concern for the plight of migrants has blinded us to the fact that most laborers, even in agriculture, do not work away from their homes… Furthermore, we overlook that many of the local agricultural laborers reside in towns and cities and commute to daily work (Ortiz 2002: 420).

This study is also initiated with similar concerns. Ortiz (2002) illustrates some earlier reported cases of rural-urban labor mobilization worldwide such as workers in sugar beets fields in the Midwestern United States in 1920s; sugar cane workers in northern Argentina until 1990; coffee harvest workers in Colombia during the 1980s (402). For him, regarding these cases as transitional stages in the development of capitalism or as partial proletarianization is to miss an important point because it is the gendered segmentation of labor in the urban sector which lies underneath the cluster of urban women in agricultural jobs. Following his account, this study approaches urban-rural circulation of labor in the case of Adapazarı as a phenomenon strongly related to contemporary gendered/ethnic segmentation of labor in other sectors and patriarchal division of labour in households

rather than as a transitional stage in the development of capitalism or as partial proletarianization.

2.5 Agricultural Worker

In Turkey, the term "agricultural worker" has been mostly used referring to permanent or temporary agricultural workers in public sector, and permanent workers in large-sized agricultural enterprises who have been granted with particular working rights contrary to the majority of workers in private sector (Ulukan & Ulukan 2001: 4). Besides, the statistical institution of the state, TUİK, has recorded all paid and unpaid family workers together in rural Turkey as "agricultural workers" which make it hard to differentiate between rural women's paid and unpaid work. For agricultural workers in the private sector, multiple names have been suggested in the literature, such as seasonal, local, permanent, migrant, temporary, semi-peasant, peasant and so on. The common point of all these definitions is that they are based on the presupposed characteristics of workers and their working terms rather than sector and jobs. Erkul for example, differentiated between season workers (*mevsim işçileri*) and farmer-agricultural workers (*çiftçi-ziraat işçileri*) (as cited in Ulukan & Ulukan 2001: 7). Ulukan & Ulukan (2001) state that the scholars distinguish between daily (*gündelikçi*), seasonal (*mevsimlik*), local (*yerel*) and migrant (*göçmen*) agricultural workers since 1960s (5-6). Yıldırak et al. (2003), Ulukan & Ulukan (2011), Pelek (2010), Yıldırım (2015) differentiated and hierarchically categorized local and seasonally migrant workers in Turkey's agriculture. Pelek (2010) claimed that the local workers are usually landowners and work nearby towns for extra income. The seasonal workers, by contrast, are landless and tend to migrate longer distances to work (5). Likewise, Yıldırak et al (2003) distinguished between temporary (*geçici*) and migratory (*gezici*) workers and stated that temporary (not seasonally migrant) workers' living standards are higher than that of seasonally migrant workers since they have other means of subsistence (such as landownership). Moreover, temporary workers are claimed to have further advantages stemming from their closeness to employers as co-locals living in the same town or village (Yıldırak et al 2003: 118-9; Özbekmezci & Sahil, 2004: 262). Gürsoy (2010) presupposes a similar distinction between landowner (or petty producer) temporary (*geçici*) workers and landless seasonally migrant (*topraksız mevsimlik göçmen*) workers (44). Despite the benefits of comparison, I have concerns about such initial labeling of agricultural workers through the "characteristics" of workers. My first concern stems from the problems of generalizations since these patterns of work are not simply exclusive and hierarchical in the actual contexts. For example, local workers do not have

to work on a temporary basis as a rule as assumed by Yıldırak et al. (2003). They may, and some are working, 12 months a year as in the case of lettuce crews in Adapazarı. Moreover, the ignored gender dimension may result in categorizing landless women workers as landowner agricultural worker group. Secondly, local workers may not actually hold the advantages attributed to them as being co-locals with employers as in the case of socially excluded Romani workers in Adapazarı.

Şeker (1987), in his pioneering studies on agricultural workers in Çukurova, used the term "seasonal agricultural workers". In fact, today "seasonal agricultural worker" is probably the most widespread label to define agricultural workers in private agricultural enterprises. Sometimes, scholars add the term "migratory" (*gezici*) to the label: "migratory seasonal workers". Akbıyık (2010), for example, define migratory seasonal agricultural workers as paid workers migrating from their hometowns for agricultural jobs (192). Today, the boundaries of the term, seasonal agricultural worker is still vague. The term has either been used exclusively to refer to those seasonally migrant agricultural workers, or both migratory workers and others working nearby places to their homes. The terms seasonal agricultural worker and migratory seasonal agricultural worker seems to have been used interchangeably in the recent Parliamentary Commission's Report (2015).

Within this study I prefer to use "agricultural worker" to indicate the group, specifying the sector and paid work relation. The boundaries of agricultural sector, is also another issue of dispute, yet, hereby I use the term in a broader sense including all "field tasks" (*kır işleri*) as a description widely used by participants of this research. Therefore, as defined by Demir (2015), agricultural jobs refer to all paid tasks related to agricultural production and animal husbandry, such as sowing out, picking out, clearing, hoeing, maintenance, carrying and so on (180). I have two motives in preferring a comprehensive label of "agricultural worker" rather than other established terms such as seasonal agricultural worker or local agricultural workers. First motivation stems from the research case. The categories (local, migrant, temporary, permanent) are not simply exclusive but interfere with each other in the wage-labor processes of the heterogeneous research group in Adapazarı. Within the group, there were laborers solely working in nearby fields, some others daily traveling to other regions for work; others migrating for longer terms occasionally; some had been migrated for work in the past; some working throughout the year; others working just in the summer seasons and so on. Conventional distinction between permanent and temporary agricultural workers, suggest that permanent workers of agriculture are either public employees or workers in middle and large-scale agricultural companies. Yet, the case of Adapazarı exposes permanent work relations

between employers (lettuce traders) and workers regardless of the scales of enterprises, which makes it possible to question the presumptions on the relation between the size of farms and the duration of contracts. In the case of lettuce, typically, traders from wholesale market of İstanbul and Ankara buy the crops in the region throughout the year and hire stable crews of workers for cutting and packaging the product. Therefore, with the comprehensive term "agricultural worker", I attempted to emphasize the paid agricultural work relations as a framework connecting workers' all seasonal, permanent, or migrant or settled work. The second motive for preferring the term "agricultural worker" is a political objection to initial labeling of the jobs with a-typicality such as seasonal work. Although I admit that distinct working patterns are important parts of the analyses on agricultural workers; pointing out them at the level of definition reaffirms the current legal codes exempting agricultural workers in the private sector from protective legislation through emphasizing atypicality/exceptionality of agricultural labour processes. As in the cases of service, construction, tourism, industry workers, it is not actually necessary to diversify agricultural workers in the definition as seasonally migrant or local workers.

The literature analysis in Chapter III reveals that the catastrophic conditions of work and settlement of some migrant workers, the condition of labor camps, and the urgency of finding solutions to health and education problems led researchers to focus on seasonal migration as the major problem of Turkey's agricultural labor market. Consequently, researchers overlook "local" laborers as an advantageous category compared to seasonal migrant workers. Yet, the category of "local" laborers also needs an examination. In fact, the laborers working in nearby fields to their homes at a moment are a heterogeneous and layered group. "Locality" is not simply a status achieved by permanent settlement in an area. It is always an issue of dispute reflected in historical and political struggle over who belongs more to space. The case of Adapazarı reveals that living and working within the same region do not simply grant workers a status of "locality", like in the cases of agricultural workers who are permanent residents of Adana staying in the tents and isolated neighborhoods (Çetinkaya 2008) and former seasonally migrant agricultural workers settled in Polatlı (Geçgin 2009). Ethnic discrimination, exclusion, isolation and dangerous ways of transportation are problems that are usually coded with seasonal migration; yet, these problems have also been evident in the wage-labor processes of many workers when they work in nearby fields in the case of Adapazarı. Therefore, hierarchical categorization of workers in definitions as locals and migrants may lead to misperceptions implying the former do not need protection and rights as much as seasonal

migrants. With these concerns, I chose to use a unifying label for all paid workers of agriculture. Therefore, this study attempts to scrutinize this overlooked local category through elaborating on wage-labor processes of different groups of workers settled within the city. One of the main purposes for such scrutiny is to emphasize the connections between workers (both seasonal migrants and locals) working throughout the country within a structurally insecure agricultural labor market. Despite state-funded projects coding the problems of agricultural labor market as something merely stemming from seasonal migration, I will try to emphasize the insecure wage-labor processes and working rights as problems for all workers whether they seasonally migrate, or work nearby fields to their homes, or work for the whole year or work for 3 months.

CHAPTER III

THE HISTORICAL TRANSFORMATION OF THE DISCOURSES ON AGRICULTURAL WORKERS IN TURKEY

This chapter is an attempt to discuss the frontiers of the contemporary discourse on agricultural workers. The analysis is based on the major socio-political transformations of the recent era, a historical research on daily *Milliyet;* and an analysis of the post-1980s' distinct and still growing literature on agricultural workers in Turkey. I will briefly present history and dynamics of agricultural labor market to grasp the dynamics of paid agricultural work relations and the limits of the political environment in Turkey.

In the first part, in order to better understand the context in which current agricultural paid work relations are practiced, I will discuss important moments in recent history. The general structure of Turkish agricultural system and agricultural policies will be briefly presented. Particular emphasis will be given to the 1980s' turmoil regarding military coup, restructuring of the economy, increasing deregulation of agricultural markets and the major socio-political processes that led to the ethnicization of the agricultural jobs. The period following 1980s on the one hand enhanced inequalities between agricultural producers, leaving small-sized agricultural production units vulnerable to market forces. The same period, on the other hand, led to the intensification of regional inequalities (through armed conflict and forced migration) and the intensification of inequalities within the urban space. This last outcome is reflected by crowded urban slums, which become one of the main sources of agricultural labor. By 1980s, Turkey has become an overwhelmingly urban society. That manifested itself as a decrease in the contribution of agricultural sector to GDP and decrease in the population earning their income from agricultural sector. Within the same period, the share of paid agricultural work relations within agricultural sector—which had always been marginal—relatively increased and gained a certain kind of visibility in the national media through the seasonal migration.

The second part will build on the historical press research on daily *Milliyet*. This press research reveals a process of replacement of the language of rights and developmentalism with victimization and *othering* as the main framework in the presentation of agricultural workers after 1980s. The continuities and ruptures within the discourse in fact give an idea about the main framework in which the problems of agricultural wage-labor processes are being discussed today.

The final part will be a discussion on the downsides of victimization through presenting some tendencies in the academic literature on agricultural workers.

As a final note before going further into discussion I want to clarify that, small land owners and unpaid family workers have always made up the main body of laborers in Turkey's agricultural sector. In this regard, the paid labor, which is usually a seasonal job, proved a hard category to determine; since its boundaries are statistically lost within the complicated agricultural labor processes—labor exchanges, sharecropping, unpaid family labor, landowner farmers, and seasonal migration—of Turkey's agricultural structure. For this reason, the studies and the data about paid labor in Turkey tend to concentrate on the cases that includes mass migration of workers, as this provides the most observable and categorizable version of agricultural paid labor. As a matter of fact, the increasing interest of the press in agricultural worker and its changing coverage of the matter is also about seasonally migrant workers. The growing academic literature on agricultural workers as well, particularly focuses on seasonal labor migration. Therefore, the data I will use in this part to observe the discursive patterns will inevitably be concentrated on the areas where *en masse* seasonal migration is visible.

3.1 The History of Agricultural Work in Turkey

At the end of the 19th century Ottoman peasantry was suffering from a chronically repressed economy, lack of markets and continuous deflation (Clay 1998). The high costs of land transport constrained production by making shipping crops far for sale unprofitable. The average size of landholdings remained small except for three areas of commercial agriculture, İzmir, Bursa and Çukurova, where a demand for extra seasonal labor grew. Clay (1998) argues that people living in the Balkans at that time had much wider immigration opportunities of agricultural and non-agricultural jobs than their Eastern counterparts (26). Throughout the 19th century, Aegean Islands supplied agricultural labor demanded by Western areas. Although there are some evidences of Kurdish seasonal migration to Bursa (Northwest) in the peak seasons, Kurdish workers' main route was Çukurova region (South) at the end of 19th century (Clay 1998: 12). On the significance of Kurdish and Armenian workers for the agriculture of Çukurova region, Clay (1998) notes that:

> Those arriving for the harvest of 1891 were described as being Armenians and Kurds, and the heavy dependence of the Çukurova economy upon them was made manifest a few years later. In the spring of 1896, in the aftermath of the wave of massacres that had

> afflicted much of the region from which they came, none appeared, and the result was a heavy drop in that year's harvest of both grain and cotton (26).

Şeker (1987) stated that the migrant laborers of Çukurova at the end of the 19th century were also small farmers/landowners who were strategically cultivating some other crops to be free in the harvest season of cotton (59). Today's mostly urban dweller landless workers of agriculture in Çukurova, in that sense, are different from these "peasant" workers (Çetinkaya 2008; Şimşek 2011; Yıldırm 2014; Pelek 2010). Indeed, currently the slums of Southeastern cities which have been overcrowded by impoverished populations through the armed conflict and forced migration of late 1980s are one of the main origins of seasonal migrant workers throughout the country. Apparently, within the Republican period, Eastern seasonal migrants had replaced their precedents from Aegean Irelands and Balkans as laborers recruited in the Western agricultural tasks. Moreover, the areas demanding seasonal migration of laborer for agricultural works have significantly extended recently. According to the recent report of Parliamentary Investigation Commission—which is formed to find solutions to the problems of agricultural workers—currently 48 provinces (North, West and South) of Turkey seasonally demand migrant agricultural workers (TBMM 2015: 15). The number of agricultural workers is estimated to be approximately a million in the report (TBMM 2015: 160).

A closer look at the Republican period and rural transformation will be helpful to understand this transformation and current dynamics of agricultural work relations.

3.1.1 Turkish Republic: Shortage of Labor and Peasantry

In the first decades of the Republic one of the biggest problems of Turkey was demographics. After years of warfare, the country was considerably depopulated and as a result suffered from a severe labor shortage (Zurcher 2004: 164; Pamuk 2008). The composition of the population was also substantially different from the Empire due to new borders and the deportation of non-Muslim population (Dündar 2001, 2008; Mango 2008; Hanioğlu 2008; Zurcher 2004). Their departure not only caused depopulation but also the loss of the bulk of commercial class of the country, a significant proportion of craftsmen and professionals, and some of the best farmers[25] (Mango 2008: 159).

[25] This loss of population with professional and entrepreneurship skills have been argued to be one of the driving forces behind the Republic's route of state-driven economy and the protectionist development strategy with an aim of empowering the Turkish national capitalist class (Mango 2008: 177).

One of the first actions of the new Republic was lightening the tax burden on peasants. Mustafa Kemal[26], the heroic leader of the Republic declared, "The peasant is the true master of the country". The new leadership was apparently concerned about alleviating the poverty of the majority, i.e., the small and medium-sized producers. Yet, a deeper look on the historical facts and the priorities of the regime will alter this popular portrayal of the regime as ultimately favoring rural poor. Instead, large productivity and income differences between agriculture and the urban economy have been an important feature of the Turkish economy since 1920s (Pamuk 2008: 294). During the interwar period as well, the regime remained "urban" in its agenda of pursuing significant institutional changes that are mostly failed to reach the peasant population (Pamuk 2008: 274-5). Especially before 1950s rural poor has been offered very limited amounts of education and capital, and have a little chance for upward mobility (Pamuk 2008: 294). Nevertheless, the long-term consequence of breaking from Ottoman patterns of taxation is the consolidation of small peasant ownership in the country (with the exceptions of Kurdish Southeast and a number of fertile valleys opened to cultivation only in the 19th century, such as Çukurova and Söke-İzmir) (Pamuk 2008: 276-7; Kaya 2015). And this strength of small and medium sized land ownership was critical in delaying the emergence of a substantial category of urban poor in the country. It has slowed down the movement of labor to the rest of the economy despite the prevalent income differences between urban and rural areas (Pamuk 2008: 294).

Throughout the 1920s prices of agricultural products were unregulated, industrial crops are encouraged by different taxes, *Ziraat Bankası* had provided credits for supporting agricultural production, which all accelerated commodity production in agriculture (Toprak 2008; Pelek 2010: 38). Nevertheless, small farming families were able to sustain their position as producers within the processes of commoditization of agriculture so that the processes have not created a substantial landless population (Keyder 1989). This structure of small sized farms inherited from the Ottoman period which had been characterized by land-labor imbalance and transportation problems and had also been supported by the Ottoman State with a concern for undermining local power holders' gaining extra benefits from the agricultural production (Keyder 1983). Kaya (2015) exemplifies from parliamentary speeches and land reform drafts that "free status" (free

[26] The key civil and military officers, including Mustafa Kemal, who had been trained in Western-style schools can be regarded as a distinct group influential in shaping the policies of the late Ottoman and early Republican state although they also had ties and even personal links with local notables, landowners and tribal leaders (Mango 2008: 160).

from local *aghas*/power holders) of peasants were one of the sensitivities of early Republican politicians, which mostly manifested itself as a reaction against sharecropping system[27]. Throughout 1930s and 1940s, government representatives expressed various kinds of concerns about sharecropping system in the parliament such as economic (as a primitive form of production with an inadequate economic performance), social (since the system is creating a bounded relationship between peasants and landowner/*aghas*) and political (since *aghas* can easily transform their economical power to a political one that is a danger for the central state, regarding the riots in Kurdish provinces) (Kaya 2015: 92). The political sensitivity about sharecropping indeed partially oriented to the Kurdish provinces where the state enforced settlement of the nomadic tribes largely resulted in large landownership of tribal leaders[28] (Kaya 2015: 81; Gözel 2007).

As the system largely depend on unpaid family labor and sharecropping, the share of paid laborers in the agricultural production stayed marginal in the Republican period. In the period of 1923-50, early commercialized Çukurova (South) and Ege (West) regions continued to be destinations for seasonal migration of agricultural workers. Okçuoğlu (1999) claims that an important part of seasonal workers of the period were also coming from East of Turkey (160). The numbers of the period on the paid laborers are inconsistent and based on estimates since the first general census of agriculture is applied in 1950. In 1927, Şefik Hüsnü mentioned 450 thousands, yet, Hikmet Kıvılcımlı mentioned 250 thousand families migrating for agricultural jobs (as cited in Okçuoğlu 1999: 160).

In the 1920s Turkey was still a peasant society as agriculture accounted for more than 80 percent of the employment (Pamuk 2008: 292). Less than 25 percent of population lived in urban centers and this balance of urban-rural remained until 1950s' urbanization process (Pamuk 2008: 268-9). The share of agriculture in the labor force started to decline after 1950s. It was 80 percent in 1913, 83 percent in 1923, 84 percent in 1950, then started to decline after 1950s to 51 percent in 1980 and 34 percent in 2005 (Pamuk 2008: 267).

[27] Anti-sharecropping sentiment is still visible in the literature on agricultural workers, particularly within scholars' approaches to Kurdish and/or Eastern intermediaries. For example, in one of the pioneering studies of field, Şeker (1986) searched for the roots of the intermediary institution in the workers' traditionally shaped habit of needing authoritarian leaders as a result of their sharecropper experiences of living under the rule of aghas. (126-7). "Bounded relationships" that early republican politicians used to criticize sharecropping system, nowadays become one of the terms to criticize the relationships between Kurdish intermediaries and agricultural workers (Çınar 2014; Gürsoy 2010).

[28] Gözel (2007) illustrates the significant impact of Land Code of 1858 on the development of large landownership pattern in the Eastern Anatolia among other factors such as *yurtluk-ocaklık* system, the Kurdish Armenian relations after 1878 and *tehcir* of 1915.

Yet, agricultural sector still contained the largest portion of the population in 1950s and 1960s (Makal 2001: 119).

According to Makal's study (2001), which makes use of the data compiled in 1963 Agricultural Survey, 88 percent of economically active population was working in agriculture, provided that we include those who work as unpaid family workers and those who work on their own farms (Makal 2001: 119). Makal (2001) also observes that both in 1950s and in 1960s, the number of workers is larger than that of landless families. This implies that not only landless families, but an also family with scarce land was participating in seasonal agricultural work at a large scale (Makal 2001: 119-20).

1950s witnessed the start of mechanization of agriculture; iron plow and tractors replaced wooden plow and other agricultural industries were introduced in agricultural production. The mechanization of 1950s, led to an increase in family farms and—contrary to the expectations—spread of small-scale plants[29] (Keyder 1987: 130). Makal (2001) explains the migration dynamics of the period and the processes of replacement of unpaid family labor (and community labor exchange practices) with paid labor in agriculture as such:

> Although the Turkish agricultural sector did not lose its main feature, which has always been characterized with small land ownership, technological developments and other factors changed the land and labor usage. One of the results of this phenomenon is the emergence of a surplus labor in agricultural activities, leading to accompanied migration from rural areas to the cities… Within the migration dynamics, waged workers have increasingly substituted the labor demand in the processes of dissolution of rural population, especially in the absence of family laborers (Makal 2001).

Sharecroppers who break with agriculture in this process were first wave urban migrants who have found temporary jobs in urban areas (Keyder 1987:135; Zurcher, 2000: 329). Roma were one of the first groups affected by this transformation. This process of mechanization triggered the migration of Roma people to urban areas, who were nomads wandering in rural areas and working as menders of agricultural equipment (*demirci/ironsmith*) in the villages. Better roads and easier access resulted in the integration of these villages to the national consumer markets and caused *kalaycı/tinsmith* groups to lose their niches and follow suit. As a result, Roma people largely began migrating to the cities and seek alternative means of subsistence.

[29] The data confirming this observation can be derived comparing General Agricultural Censuses of 1950 and 1963, and Autumn Survey of 1952. A comparison of 1950 and 1963 censuses reveals an increase in the ratio of very small-scale farms (smaller than 50 decare) and the ratio of land cultivated by them. According to the 1950 census 336 860 families out of 2 760 304 (12.20 %) is totally landless (Makal 2001).

The predominance of rural population gradually changed after 1950s through the processes of internal migration until the 2000s when almost 65 percent of the population in Turkey was urbanized (Mango 2008: 178). The agriculture led bloom of the first years was eventually followed by a foreign exchange crisis and the major devaluation of 1958, which led to the beginning of implementations of IMF and OECD, backed stabilization programs (Pamuk 2008: 282). One of the trademarks of the post-war era was the strong emphasis placed on agricultural development and the populist policies supporting agricultural producers who constituted two-thirds of the electoral base. Within the period of 1947-62, agricultural output was more than doubled due to the expansion in the cultivated area and Marshall Plan aids for importation of agricultural machinery (Pamuk 2008: 281).

Increasing political struggle and diversification within ruling classes has also marked the post-war period. After 1950s' transition to a more open political regime and rapid urbanization, urban industrial groups became more and more powerful which enabled them to challenge previous alliances and balances. The second half of the century was marked with series of crises related to this uneasy transition, including three military coups and a number of fragile coalitions between the parties (Pamuk 2008: 275). From 1960s onwards Turkey has witnessed a major transformation from a primarily agricultural economy to an industrial one. It was, in fact, a deliberate policy guided by the development objectives and intervention programs of Turkish Governments given that all Turkish development plans put main emphasis to industrial growth (through ISI), assigning a secondary and supportive role to agriculture (Pamuk 2008). The composition of employment by sector changed gradually, service sector and industries increased their share while agriculture decreased.

Although post-1950s was a period that increased the survival chances of small-scale producers, income differences between urban and rural populations were preserved. Aside from other differences in income, even when only wages were considered, there still was a substantial differentiation between rural and urban wages. In the period between 1950 and 1963, the difference of wages between manufacturing industry and agricultural sector were stable in time, manufacturing industry paying approximately 50 percent more wages. But the real difference was due to the differences in working hours. Considering seasonal characteristics of most of the agricultural jobs, the differences in incomes over a year were much more dramatic (Makal 2001: 132).

As Makal (2001) points out, theoretically, mechanization can both increase and decrease demand for labor in agriculture. On the one hand it has a decreasing effect by decreasing the need for more laborers. When there is no change in property patterns, mechanization implies less need for sharecropping and tenancy, which in turn releases a portion of former sharecroppers and tenants to become workers elsewhere. In 1950s mechanization, especially mechanization in middle and large-scale agricultural enterprises caused unemployment among the villagers who were previously working as sharecroppers or tenants (Makal 2001: 112). On the other hand, mechanization has also positive effects on demand for agricultural labor. Especially in industrial crops and in large plantations, mechanization led to a large-scale need for agricultural workers. A 1952 study by Ankara University shows that 88 percent of mechanized farms were employing paid agricultural workers (as cited in Makal 2001: 112). The same study also shows that there was an increase in the number of temporary workers in mechanized farms while the number of permanent workers in the same farms was decreasing. Yet in evaluating such figures, it should be remembered that total cultivated land area was not constant during this period but was expanded considerably (Makal 2001: 113). As a result, this two-sided process during the 1950s resulted in a worker migration to the cities on the one hand, and was instrumental in keeping the remaining population (who were not able to migrate) in agricultural activity by providing them extra income through seasonal jobs on the other hand (Makal 2001: 113).

The introduction and distribution of new agricultural land in 1950s helped many sharecroppers to transform into land owners/farmers. Economic policies during this period were in favor of agricultural sector, with new subsidies and increasing credit availability (Makal 2001: 114). It was also the period in which agricultural sector was opened to market conditions by means of developing road infrastructure. With the help of agricultural support programs, which were in effect through late 1970s, they were able to continue their commercial agricultural activity on their own lands (Yıldırım 2015: 180). Until 1980s, although rural population was declining, many farmers were able to continue their small-scale agricultural activities after the proliferation of capitalist relations (Keyder 1988, Akşit 1988). Akşit's (1988) study showed that in the case of Antalya, the irrigation canals built by the State helped the consolidation of small-scale farmers in the region. The spreading of seasonal waged work both in rural and urban areas was also helping farmer families to increase their household income, and was regarded as a factor in their resistance against dispossession (Keyder 1983; Yıldırım 2015: 181). As a matter of fact, the number of landowner families in Turkish agriculture increased in the period between

1950 and 1980. An exception is the Southeastern region. According to Keyder (1988) because of the alliance between center and the local powers, government policies to protect peasantry were not implemented in the region.

In short, 1960s and 1970s was a period in which a significant portion of agricultural workforce was transferred to industry and service sectors while there was no significant change in sizes of agricultural enterprises. Within this period, the share of agriculture in national workforce fell to 50 percents. In 1970s there was an apparent increase in the visibility of agricultural workers in the press and serious labor shortages were observed in some regions. This manifested itself as spectacular worker strikes and boycotts, which increased negotiation power of workers against agricultural employers in some areas (e.g. Söke) as evident in the press articles of the period.

3.1.2 Post 1980s: Urban Poverty and Labor Migration

1980 military coup was a breaking point for the country. A period of repressive social and political environment followed, in which the military and the ensuing governments tried to exercise strict control over all kinds of associations, organizations, trade unions, and other elements of especially leftist opposition. The restoration of democracy and normalization afterwards was remarkably associated with financial liberalization and the necessary economic and institutional changes for neoliberal restructuring. This was a period of transformation leading to diminishment of social and civil rights and deepening of inequalities through increasing the gap between urban groups, between rural and urban and between regions, especially between the East and West of the country.

Agricultural producers' influence and ability to shape economic institutions, which was risen after 1950s shift to multi-party political regime, started to decline after 1980s with the decline in the share of agriculture in both the labor force and total output (Pamuk 2008: 299). As a matter of fact, agriculture's share in the total employment decreases to 27 % in 2006 from 47 % in 1988 (Gürsoy 2010: 37). On the other hand, the elimination of small agricultural producers in the process has increased paid workers relative share in the sector (Bakır 2011; Küçükkırca 2012).

After the military coup the most important change for agriculture was the virtual elimination of subsidies and price-support programs (Pamuk 2008: 288). In fact, transformation has not happened in a day, given survival of the institutions supporting and subsiding agriculture throughout 1990s as an important component of populist policies of the time. The economy became increasingly vulnerable to external shocks in the process

of financial liberalization. The result was increasingly unsustainable macroeconomic balances and the major crisis of 1999 (Pamuk 2008: 289). Years of high inflation and high interest rates have made income distribution increasingly unequal. The measures for fiscal discipline and IMF guided new stabilization programs to recover budget deficits remarked the period after that. After 2002, the Justice and Development Party— which still holds the power—have maintained these policies[30].

After 1980s, the more policies strengthen the domination of the market, the more prices and demand patterns fluctuate leaving small producers vulnerable to market forces and raising the level of risk and insecurity (Keyder & Yenal 2011). In the previous era, state was the largest customer for crops such as cotton, tobacco, sugar beet and hazelnut (Akşit 1999: 173). Yet, after 1980s the shares of public institutions such as agricultural sale cooperatives, Turkish Grain Board, Tekel, Çaykur and public sugar companies decrease and that of private merchants increase (Akbıyık 2008: 225).

Lower prices of crops, deregulation of the economy and the abolition of state support have been the central dynamics of the period following 2000s. Within this period, as İslamoğlu et al. (2008) pointed out the nation state has lost its superior role in the regulation of agriculture along with the rise of transnational corporations in the agribusiness industries and global governance agencies. Under these conditions, small-scale farmers, who cannot compete in the global market, have been disempowered dramatically.

On the other hand, in the same period many small-scale farmers were able to survive financially. Sönmez (2001) has noticed the prevalence of small-scale farms producing for the market in the North. He stated that against expectations, hiring paid labor in agriculture had spread in small-scale farms as well large-scale plantations (71-5). While in 1980, 30 % of all enterprises were employing seasonal workers, in 1990 this ratio increased to 45 % (Sönmez 2001: 71-2). There are a few studies examining the survival strategies of small-scale producers during fluctuating market prices. For example Özuğurlu (2011) stressed small scale producers' strategy of working in other sectors as wage workers to supplement farming making use of the concept *köy ayaklı proleter* (village-based proletariat). Similarly, Saka (2010) pointed out strategic use of labor within small producer households in Çanakkale. According to Saka's study (2010), the most impoverished landowners were themselves working in the vineyards of a wine corporation as agricultural workers, while on the same time trying to carry out as much of the work as

[30] However, this was mostly a jobless recovery. Despite the increase in incomes and the rapid expansion of export of manufactures, the unemployment rates remained high (Pamuk 2008: 291).

possible on their own land personally. In this way, they were limiting the need for employing paid workers on their land to labor intense operations, which are inflexible in time, such as harvest (Saka 2010: 63). Labor exchange practices, which are common in the region, were also helping them to decrease labor costs (Saka 2010: 63, 87). Similarly, Teoman (2011) emphasizes the importance of increasing intra-household labor input as a survival strategy for small-scale producers. Boratav and Şen's study, which was based on regional household surveys supports this hypothesis through its implications on women labor (as cited in Teoman 2011). According to the study, the ratio of women working in income generating jobs in Middle Anatolia is 22.5 percent. Some of these jobs (like sewing, carpet and rug weaving) are carried out at home, while others (such as agricultural jobs) need out-of-home work. In addition to these, this study regards the system of agricultural intermediaries as a means to access efficient short-term labor force, which helps the survival chances of small-scale producers. Intermediary system helps many landowners to reach already established agricultural worker crews for short terms, without high costs for training and supervising. This is an important factor in minimizing the economies of scale disadvantages of small producers in Turkey.

These major transformations of post-1980s Turkey such as neoliberal restructuring of the economy, the Kurdish uprising and forced migration causing massive transfer of Kurdish villagers into cities have all contributed to a substantial change in the characteristics of urban poor. By 2000s the further deepening of poverty levels of the urban poor of Turkey had started to be defined within new terms, like "new poverty", "underclass", "ethnicization of poverty" (Buğra & Keyder 2003; Pınarcıoğlu & Işık 2008; Saraçoğlu 2010). Until recently the poor in Turkey had rather been accepted as dynamic since they had been able to retain their hopes for upward mobility. Absolute poverty—a hopeless mass—had been accepted as an exception regarding the absence of a substantial landless category, with the help of the gradual migration processes from rural and successful utilization of urban networks of solidarity by migrants in Turkey (Keyder 1989; Pınarcıoğlu & Işık 2008: 1356).

It was also the state, with developmentalist concerns, laying the basis for the conditions of upward mobility in pre-1980 period through "helping in filling the relatively pre-defined, vacant class and spatial positions via either direct investments or the allocation of subsidies to the private sector" (Pınarcıoğlu & Işık 2008: 1396). Pınarcıoğlu and Işık's fieldwork on Sultanbeyli/İstanbul illustrates that the dynamic character of urban poor—adopting survival strategies by strengthening religious, ethnic and cultural bases and utilizing the opportunities of the informal labor and real estate markets for upward

mobility—was still the case throughout the 1990s (Pınarcıoğlu & Işık 2008: 1354). Hence, poverty in Turkey before the turn of millennium was revealing a different pattern from the mainstream theories of poverty or culture of poverty (e.g. underclass, advanced marginality, culture of poverty) indicating vicious cycles ensuring the future poverty of residents (Pınarcıoğlu & Işık 2008: 1355). After 2000s, on the other hand, the dynamics of the poverty conditions seem to change in that direction with the new generation of urban poor living in the slums reminiscent of the well known western poverty characterized by underclass, social exclusion and rise in poverty-induced violence among youngsters (Pınarcıoğlu & Işık 2008: 1367). A significant portion of agricultural workers in Turkey is living in these urban slums today, as in the case of Adapazarı.

3.1.3 Summary

To sum up, while the main purpose of the laws passed in the first years of the Republic was to prevent or slow down migration from rural to urban areas, to boost production and to make more land cultivable; today rural enterprises are subject to seasonal labor shortage and urban slums become an important source for agricultural workforce. From 1980 onwards, the share of agriculture in total national employment continued its decrease. Meanwhile, the share of paid agricultural workers in agricultural sector increased (Küçükkırca 2012; Bakır 2011).

In contemporary Turkey, agricultural work has lost most of its economic and demographic importance compared to rural past. The stages and tasks of agricultural production were more familiar and relevant to daily lives of people when the majority was living in rural areas since family operated small sized farms has been the predominant structure of agriculture of the country. In post-1980 Turkey, majority of urban dwellers distanced from agricultural production processes. The laborers of farms, paid or unpaid, constituted the bulk of the population of young Republic as large groups of peasants. For a long time, their work had been important to the lives and well being of the majority—not only villagers but also many urban dwellers with rural ties. The dependence on migrant labor is hardly news for many farms of the country. Massive labor migrations in the harvest seasons even precede the Republican years especially for the farms in Aegean and Çukurova regions. Yet, agricultural labor today is organizing in a society where the majority of the people are living in the urban centers, physically and spiritually distant from the farms. While villages are emptying, seasonal agricultural tasks are becoming more and more depended on migrant labor, i.e. more strangers in towns.

The next two sections will focus on the changed discursive patterns in news coverage and recently growing literature on agricultural workers in this context. I will particularly focus on the ways in which the discourse(s) on agricultural workers have been evolved to better grasp the current meanings attached to agricultural jobs. The research is drawn upon a myriad of institutional and individual accounts: the press coverage of agricultural workers since 1950 (based on a database search of mainstream daily *Milliyet*), official documents, Trade Unions' publications, NGO reports and academic studies. Among these various, sometimes-contradictory accounts I will highlight some common themes to illustrate the ways in which agricultural work and agricultural workers' problems have been conceptualized in today's Turkey.

3.2 Historical Transformation of Press Coverage of Agricultural Workers: *From Rights and Developmentalism to Victimization and Othering*

In this part, I will present the findings of the research[31] in the database of the daily *Milliyet* to see the coverage of agricultural workers since 1950.

In daily *Milliyet*, press coverage of the agricultural workers in 1950s and 1960s was rather rare yet distinguishing in some aspects. First, the phrase 'agricultural workers' was being used predominantly and somehow indiscriminately to refer various groups of workers, such as seasonal, migrants, local workers and workers in the state farms and non-paid family workers. There were almost no visual representation and no references to hometown, identity, sex and/or age of workers.

Second, the importance given to agriculture and farming is prevalent in the declarations of politicians, in the columnists' articles and the news. Here is news reporting on the first trade union in the agricultural sector:

> The trade union of agricultural workers as the most important of all trade unions came into operation in Adana for the first time in our country[32] (*Milliyet* 1951, April 6).

The political language of the era drew heavily on such normative statements as the necessity of regulating public budget in favor of rural areas. A special perception of a coherent "rural" that is supposed to be taken care of by the state is noticeable in the news articles. The presupposed harmony of the interests of farmers and workers was apparent in

[31] I searched a few words that I expect to be related to the subject such as tarım, işçi, ırgat, amele, ziraat, kır and take into account only the news articles that are directly about workers.

[32] Mevcut sendikaların en muhimmi oldugu kadar yurdumuzda ilk defa Adana'da teşekkül etmiş bulunan tarım işçileri sendikası faaliyete geçmiş bulunmaktadır.

both politicians' declarations and columnists' interpretations on agricultural sector. The news articles of 1950s and 1960s, mention the problems of agricultural workers alongside with the problems of farmers, almost all the time. The role of intermediaries, on the other hand, usually stated as one of the fundamental problems of workers. Apparently intermediaries do nothing but cut workers' pay as representatives of the old order of *agha*s (landlords), as *simsar*s[33]. Until the 1980s shift, the content of news about agricultural workers were primarily the problems of workers due to conditions of work, while occasionally covering the words of worker and farmer representatives and the reports they published. The framework of the interpretations and news were concentrated on the issues like working rights, assigning minimum wages, social security, and unionism in the sector. The peak period of such coverage was 1970s, when both the frequency of the news and the struggle for rights has been on the front.

> The Minister of Agriculture has cried while the agricultural workers are signing the collective agreement[34] (*Milliyet* 1964, May 28*)*.
>
> The agricultural workers coming to Çukurova are complaining about the wages and accommodation[35] (*Milliyet* 1975, May 20*)*.

Another distinguishing aspect of the news articles in the period preceding 1980s was the problematization of the wage differences between the workers in the industrial and agricultural sectors. The agricultural workers of the period, even if they were employed in the state farms and institutions had been excluded from the Work Law (No: 1457). News articles largely covered the struggle of agricultural employees (in the state enterprises) throughout 1980s and 1990s who tried hard to be included under the Work Law and to gain the full working rights available for industrial workers.

When we look at the transition of discourses in Turkish press after 1980, disappearance of the discourse of rights and struggle has not also happened in a moment. In the case of agricultural workers, the discourses started to diversify within news articles, at least, between two groups of workers, which were represented in completely different ways. First group was composed of the agricultural workers who have been employed in the public institutions/enterprises. The news covering them had continued to be focused on the issue of struggle and the negotiations for rights until those news and the institutions themselves disappeared by 2000s. For example, the news with the headline "5 Thousand

[33] *Simsar* is a pejorative Turkish word, which usually refers to middlemen/go-between.

[34] Tarım işçileri toplu sözleşme imzalarken Tarım Bakanı ağladı.

[35] Çukurova'ya gelen tarım işçisi ücret ve barınmadan şikayetçi.

Protestor Workers" was reporting that the Tekel employees of İzmir are protesting the cut in their gratuity (*Milliyet* 1986, June 7). The news headlined as "Good News for Agricultural Workers," likewise, is announcing that the grants reserved for agricultural workers are doubled (*Milliyet* 1998, November 17).

Most of the news in that category was about the problems of temporary employees in mainly Rural Affairs[36] who were struggling for getting the full benefits of a state employee. The group had been represented through trade union declarations, political promises, and news covering the conditions of workers, working rights and the protests until they got the rights granted to permanent workers in the beginning of 2000s. The issue was taken seriously by governments of the time given that it was a headline in the budget negotiations and was a subject in the declarations of political promises a number of times. That was also an issue of political favoritism subject to criticisms regarding the superfluous recruitment practices in some regions and inappropriate interventions of politicians in the recruitment processes of such agriculture related state institutions. This critical discourse against favoritism has been survived and set the base for the legitimacy of privatization of state enterprises in the following period although the other part of the news, discourse of rights, mostly disappeared, at least, in the press coverage of agricultural workers.

In the news, the agricultural employees of the state were specifically referred as the "seasonal workers" throughout the 1990s. Then, by 2000s, the phrase "seasonal workers" is started to be used exclusively referring to agricultural workers in private agricultural enterprises. This group is actually loosely defined but seemingly composed mainly of agricultural workers migrating from one region to another in the peak seasons. These groups of workers became increasingly visible after 1980s mostly through news covering tragic traffic accidents and inappropriate ways of transportation.

A new line of news stories emerged in the aftermath of military coup portraying the misery and hopelessness of workers in a specific way supported by photographs of the workers, the camps and the inappropriate ways of their transportation. The visualization of workers was new for the press, as the news covering the issue were mostly picture-less before. The news story with the headline "They are putting their life in danger for 500 liras[37]" is one of the predecessors of this new line of news stories (*Milliyet* 1983, July 20).

[36] Four public institutions *[Köy Hizmetleri, Orman Bakanlığı, Karayolları, Devlet Su İşleri]* were hiring approximately 47,000 seasonal workers at that time.

[37] 500 lira için yaşamlarını tehlikeye atıyorlar.

The subtitle of this news was reporting, "Agricultural workers are piling in the trailers as 40-50 people totally disregarding death"[38] (*Milliyet* 1983, July 20). The headline's implication on workers' own responsibility in putting in their lives in danger is also supported within the article through quotations from interviews with workers as they interpret the tragic accidents as destiny. The ignorant/irrational worker profile that is not conscious about his/her rights is emphasized somehow ironically alongside with hopelessness of them in choosing such a dangerous job. The story is supported with a couple of photographs of workers with non-smiling faces explained as such:

> She is 50. She has been an agricultural worker as far as she can remember[39] (*Milliyet* 1983, July 20).
>
> His name is … at age 14. Occupation is agricultural worker. He is working in fields while his friends are playing in backyards[40] (*Milliyet* 1983, July 20).

Apart from victimization, some other aspects of this news story like naturalization of the conditions of work, absence of employers, blaming the intermediaries have been the common themes in the representation of agricultural workers since then. Today the news covering the issue of agricultural workers are still maintaining these themes emerged in 1980s. Here is a headline from the summer of 2014:

> Theirs is a story of poverty: Seasonal workers whose names come to the agenda only with tragedies have been scattered around in poverty. Sometimes the dramatic lives of the families turn into tragedies[41] (*Milliyet* 2014, August 3*)*.

There was a typical uncertainty about the responsible subjects even in the critical news stories of 1980s. The absence of direct criticism especially for state institutions is partly related to the repressive political environment created by the military intervention. Within this context, it was often the news stories themselves addressing the problems of agricultural workers within the terms of destiny/fate:

> Before they could give the money they gained with sweat of their brow and was hiding in their belts to their families, fate had caught them on the road[42] (*Milliyet* 1982, December 8).

They are the "poor agricultural workers", the article presenting "who piles in the first available truck with their children, with their pots and pans because they want to return to

---

[38] Römorklara 40-50 kişi doluşan tarım işçileri ölümü hiçe sayıyor.

[39] Yaşı 50, kendini bildi bileli tarım işçisi.

[40] Adı … yaşı 14, işi tarım işçisi. Arkadaşları bahçelerde oynuyor, o tarlada çalışıyor.

[41] Onlarınki yoksulluk hikâyesi: Adları sadece yaşanan facialarla gündeme gelen mevsimlik işçiler, oradan oraya yoksulluk içinde savruluyorlar. Ailelerin dramatik yaşamları kimi zaman trajedi halini alıyor.

[42] Kuşaklarına sardıkları alınteri paralarını ailelerine ulaştıramadan ecel onları yolda yakaladı.

their homes quickly after the harvest". Then, "death comes and finds them as a result of neglect, more than as a result of God's command" (*Milliyet* 1982, December 8). Yet, it is not stated whose neglect it is. Instead, there are detailed explanations of the workers' despair helping us understand why they are getting on those trucks that are not safe for transportation, why they are going to their death:

> They were agricultural workers. They used to wake up and start working before sunrise. For all of them the biggest threat to their lives was the trucks taking them from their villages to the farms… But for agricultural workers there was no escape from this[43] (*Milliyet* 1982, December 8).

The same article includes another photograph showing a truck full of workers with a subtitle: "There are still ones who do not take lessons from the tragic accidents" (*Milliyet* 1982, December 8). Yet, it is not stated that who are not taking lessons. There are only workers in the photograph. There was no one else. Here, again, although that article was seemingly written as a criticism to responsible people or institutions, the only subjects who are directly mentioned, visualized and pointed, as in many other articles, are just the workers.

In the 1980s, the term *göçer* (meaning nomad) was used in the press for a while to describe workers migrating for agricultural jobs. This was a specific kind of othering since the term is culturally loaded, among other things, with the images of unsettling Kurdish tribes of the near history. Furthermore, the strangeness to the culture of the workers, to their social relationships, to their way of life was evident in many accounts to the issue. Yet, it was not until the end of 1990s, hometowns of the workers became a real issue of dispute in public. Within this period, the phrase "agricultural workers coming from South East" emerged in the news—note that calling them Kurdish was inappropriate in public because of Turkish state's denial policy and the specific tensions of the period due to the armed conflict. Through 1990s, news articles in *Milliyet* indicated Kurdishness of the migrant laborers working in Western and Northern areas in various ways. The tensions about Kurdishness of workers has increased throughout the 2000s since the period is marked by the lynch attempts in Western cities towards Kurdish people, part of them targeting seasonal migrant workers which are typically followed by deportations and increased tension between communities. The news reports in 2000s were informative about the ethnic struggle or tension between Kurdish agricultural workers and "local" people in the working places–particularly the news covering local authorities' speculative

[43] Tarım işçisiydi onlar. Gün doğmadan kalkar çalışırlardı. Hepsinin yaşamını tehdit eden en büyük tehlike köylerinden tarlaya kendilerini götüren kamyonlardı… Ancak tarım işçisinin bundan kurtuluşu yoktu.

declarations and interventions to the camp areas of workers are that kind. For example, the news article titled "Puss in the Corner at Ordu" (*Milliyet* 2008, August 7) describes the intervention of Ordu Governorate to the ban the lodging of workers in the city.

As another indicator of the tension in the region, the defense of the Vice President of the National Council of Hazelnuts Onur Şahin, for his words "People of Karadeniz are having difficulty in loving those who do not respect their flag" appeared in the news:

> Hazelnut has different harvest times for different altitudes. We made such an organization so that Southeastern citizens found job here for 25 – 30 days. Those who came are our citizens. But to overlook the worries is the greatest danger... Terrorist organization PKK is harming its own people. By terrorist acts they commit in Giresun two months before the season causes concerns among their own people who came to get provision of their labor. I said people of Karadeniz are having difficulty in loving those who do not respect their flag... If these event continue we may come to such a point there might be some who demand agricultural workers from other regions at the expense of paying 5–10 liras more. This is my concern... I do this job for 10 years. There never is a tension. Terrorist does not go with workers. Besides there is search in the vehicles every 4–5 minutes. Terrorist cannot get among worker. We welcome workers from East (*Milliyet* 2010, July 27)[44].

Besides such practices and statements that openly criminalize workers, there are many news and commentaries the perceived "differences" of the workers from the "local" people (with reference to words and phrases such as ignorance, child marriages, polygamy, blood feuds, tribalism, relations with intermediaries) are the mechanism of othering. In Chapter VII on intermediation, I will discuss in detail the ways in which workers—particularly Eastern or Kurdish workers—are being othered in the literature.

In sum, the research in the database revealed that by 1980s the news coverage of agricultural workers remarkably changed. A new type of visualized news stories emerged in 1983 portraying the misery and hopelessness of workers staying in the tents. Within this new kind of coverage, the strikes and boycotts of agricultural workers, the clash between workers and employers as the major news issues of 1970s disappeared. Employers in fact totally disappeared within the news about agricultural workers. The criticism about the condition of labor camps and dangerous ways of transportation largely pointed to non-clarified responsible public authorities and intermediaries. By 1990s, ethnicity (hometown, cultural difference) of workers started to be referred in the news articles

[44] Fındığın değişik rakımlarda farklı toplama tarihleri var. Öyle bir organizasyon yapıyoruz ki, Güneydoğulu vatandaş burada 25 - 30 gün iş buluyor. Gelenler bizim vatandaşımız. Ancak endişeleri görmemezlikten gelmek en büyük tehlike… PKK terör örgütü kendi insanına zarar veriyor. Sezona iki ay kala Giresun'da yaptığı terör eylemleriyle emeğinin karşılığını almaya gelen kendi insanlarında endişe yaratıyor. 'Karadeniz insanı bayrağına saygı göstermeyene sevgi göstermekte zorlanıyor' dedim…Bu olaylar devam ederse, öyle bir noktaya gelinebilir ki, 5-10 lira fazla vermek pahasına başka bölgelerden tarım işçisi talep edenler olabilir. Bu da benim endişem…10 yıldır bu işi yapıyorum. Hiç bir gerginlik olmuyor. Terörist ırgatla gitmez. Zaten araçlarda 4-5 dakikada bir arama var. Terörist işçinin içine giremez. Doğulu işçinin yeri başımızın üzerinde (*Milliyet* 2010, July 27).

implying ethnic tensions. By 2000s, news stories continued the trend emerged in 1980s (victimization) together with the coverage of ethnic tension through declarations of local authorities, politicians, lynches and deportation of Kurdish workers from some regions.

3.3 Highlights of Contemporary Accounts: Poverty, Hopelessness, Humanitarian Care

By 1980s the press coverage of agricultural workers not only changed but also increased in frequency. The following period has also witnessed an increasing academic interest in migratory agricultural workers in Turkey, which led to the development of the literature on the issue. This part discusses some tendencies of this growing multi-disciplinary literature such as the concealment of employers, emphasis on hopelessness of workers and negation of agricultural work. Like the news stories, many contemporary academic studies approach agricultural workers as a category of the poor (rather than a category of workers) who are in need of humanitarian care.

In this part, I want to shortly comment on the downsides of victimization discourse in the sense that it leads to a perspective naturalizing current conditions of work and negating the agricultural work itself. I question the emphasis on victimization, poverty and humanitarian care with respect to ignored relations of work, responsibility of employers and implied inevitability of hardness of jobs which naturalize the current conditions of agricultural work. The current discourse of victimization works against the idea that agricultural jobs can ever be granted with rights and become a more preferable income earning activity. Agricultural jobs are in fact vital for the society and related to nutrition of everyone, which necessitates questioning the declared inevitability of "victimhood" of laborers who provide the most important element in agricultural production.

I will focus on some repeated patterns, believing that these patterns manifest the limits of political environment rather than just being a peculiar understanding limited to a small group of people. Those themes are entailing the responses of social actors to an assemblage of social structures and changes framing the ground we talk on farm workers today.

Agamben makes a contrast between minimal existence and fully formed life by referring to the distinction between two Ancient Greek terms for life: *zoë* (zoological life, the simple fact of living) and *bios* (biographical life, a life that is properly formed through events such that it can be narrated as a story) (Redfield 2005: 340). He expresses concerns about the "potential dissolution of personhood into a species body" within the state(s) of

exception, like refugee camps, when sovereign uses its power to suspend the law (Redfield 2005: 340, 347). His emphasis on the state of exception and the distinction between *zoë* and *bios* provides a framework to criticize contemporary trend of treating humanitarianism, valuing *bare life*, as an absolute value. Following his account, Fassin (2005) tries to grasp the moral hearth of contemporary refugee policies by linking the political context with the evolution of the institutional discourse in France. Accordingly, in the new economic context—given the redundancy of new labor demand—suffering body/illness of refugees become the sole way to be recognized by the host society (Fassin 2005). Bodily health, therefore, is gaining voice as a legitimate claim for asylum in France. Ong (2009) states that multiple entities beyond the state such as corporations, religions, and NGOs are recently becoming more active practitioners of humanity and setting the standards of human worthiness (699). Redfield (2005), in that sense, casts a light on contemporary ethos by questioning the practices of humanitarianism, as valuing *bare life*, in the case of doctors without borders (MSF) through illustrating its connections with this particular political context and contemporary institutional discourses. He questions if it is feasible to provide humanitarian help without pursuing any political agenda and if it is efficient in itself to limit humanitarian help to bodily health in the case of ongoing political crisis which will eventually reproduce the conditions deteriorating people's bodily health (Redfield 2005). The case of MSF illustrates that humanitarian help is vital; yet, it is impossible and inefficient to limit humanitarian help to bodily health without pursuing a political agenda.

Agricultural workers of Turkey, likewise, are mostly recognized through their suffering bodies in contemporary accounts from news stories to academic studies. The issue of hygiene in the labor camps is given primacy hinting that what migrant workers need is above all a humanitarian intervention helping to improve their living conditions. This line of thought is also parallel with contemporary state regulations and institutional accounts. The spirit of intervention and care they entail fits to the specific kind of humanitarian ethos of our time, valuing *bare life* in Agamben's (1998) words (9-14).

In both contemporary academic studies and news reports, agricultural jobs are represented as jobs of people who are "the poorest of all" and do not have any other chances in their lives rather than working in the fields. In the literature about agricultural workers, the authors emphasize "hopeless poverty" and not "worker poverty" or "poor working conditions". In fact, the general tendency of portraying the problems of agricultural workers under the more general category of the poor is related to 1980s' discursive shift. The discourses of victimization and extreme poverty are distinguishable from the

discourse of rights in many respects. First, such victimization is working against the idea that agricultural jobs can be secured with rights and can be preferable. This is because, victimization is usually accompanied with a vision of emancipation—emancipation from work, being able to not work in agriculture. Given the abundance of statements emphasizing inevitability of hardness, this perspective leads to the negation of agricultural work itself by confirming the inevitability of the current conditions:

> These workers are working and struggling for life under hard conditions because of the *peculiar nature of agricultural production* (Gülçubuk 2012: 79). *(Emphasis added)*
>
> …especially the group of seasonal agricultural workers- among the agricultural employees who are constituting 25% of total employment- are working in hard conditions because of the *peculiar nature of agricultural production*[45] (Erdoğan 2010: 1-2). *(Emphasis added)*
>
> …there is an intensive demand for labor especially in the farms of Western regions. Significant part of this demand has been supplied by seasonal migratory workers who *have to work for low wages*[46] (Erdoğan 2010: 1). (*Emphasis added)*

Unsanitary living conditions of especially migratory workers and the urgency of taking precautions are apparent motives behind these portrayals. Yet, in many cases, the place and the conditions of migrant workers' accommodation is very much the result of their relationship with the employers rather than being the natural consequence of seasonal migration. Putting the emphasis merely on the misery of workers carries the risk of contributing to the naturalization of the conditions in question. Such an exclusive emphasis diverts the attention from the possibility of improvement in working conditions or possible availability of alternative accommodation arrangements within the villages—which in fact is quite debatable in many places—and even permanent settlement of migrant workers in the regions they spend most of their working time. I must state that only a part of migrant workers are staying at the camp areas, in the tents, isolated and away from village and city centers, away from spaces of socialization and facilities such as electricity and clean water. Agricultural employers have often utilized empty houses and many other places for worker accommodation. Two recent studies on agricultural wage-labor processes (Duruiz 2011, Uzun 2015) illustrate ways in which "Western" employers discursively dehumanize Kurdish workers—through dirt, smell, and backwardness—to justify working and sheltering conditions provided to them. Duruiz (2011) analyses employers' distinctive treatment of "eastern" and "western" workers in

[45] İşgücünün yaklaşık % 25'inin istihdam edildiği tarım sektöründe, özellikle gezici işçi olarak çalışan grup, tarımın kendine özgü niteliklerinden dolayı oldukça ağır koşullarda çalışmaktadır.

[46] …özellikle batı bölgelerinde yoğunlaşan tarım alanlarında çalışmak üzere yoğun emek gücüne ihtiyaç duyulmaktadır. Bu ihtiyacın çok önemli bir kısmı ise düşük ücretle çalışmak zorunda olan mevsimlik gezici tarım işçileri tarafından karşılanmaktadır.

terms of providing different conditions of accommodation, which is related to their understandings of community and outside in the Söke region. Uzun's (2015) partly autobiographic study well-describes the evolution of dehumanizing discourses of employers/locals in Akçakoca since the beginning of Kurdish workers' seasonal migration to the region. Pelek (2010) likewise states that in Ordu while Kurds usually stay in tents, the Georgians may stay either in abandoned buildings or the employers' houses; local workers stay in the employers' home (27). The accommodation conditions of workers, in that sense, are not solely the natural outcomes of migration for work, but rather are very much linked to other factor, particularly their relations with the employers (Duruiz 2011).

The emphasis on extreme poverty and hopelessness is also prevalent especially in the academic accounts on the child workers in the sector, again, without mentioning the employers. It is often through—and only through—the poverty of the families the phenomenon of child labor in the farms is explained:

> The seasonal migrant families are taking their children with them because of economical and social obligations. Therefore, to contribute family budgets children are working in agricultural jobs that are not suitable for them (Gülçubuk 2012: 79).
>
> Families prefer them working the farms rather than sending to school… Tendency of some families is not sending their children to school even if transportation is provided… The consciousness level of families about education services is inadequate. Their level of education is low (Erdoğan 2010: 4).
>
> The only reason for families to put their children to work is poverty. The children of these families are obliged to work in order to contribute to the family budget and as a result they are deprived of education; and with the limited education get they cannot enjoy the opportunities that education provides. Besides, the children are also abused by means of getting the lowest wage, in accordance with the waging determined by intermediaries (*elçi*'s and *dayıbaşı*'s). The unfairest payment is rendered to the children (Akbıyık 2011: 147).

Gülçubuk (2012), in his study on child labor, recommends some solutions to overcome the problem of child labor in agriculture in the form of demands from the state including creating off-farm working opportunities for youngsters, informing the parents and consciousness raising programs for parents and public provision of the minimum necessities in the worker camps like electricity, water, toilets and baths (Gülçubuk 2012). Likewise, Lordoğlu and Etiler (2014), in their recent article on child labor in agriculture, recommend more control over the implementation of compulsory education which supposedly help the children to escape themselves from being farm workers in the future because in these circumstances, "the future of these children is at best becoming seasonal agricultural workers" (Lordoğlu and Etiler 2014: 129).

These studies are valuable since they state clearly the problem of child workers in the sector and their limited access to education because of constant migration for work with their families. Yet, I exemplify them to discuss the problems of discourse because the way they explain the issue mainly through "poverty, ignorance, will of the families and intermediaries" exclude the responsibility and role of employers. No child can work in the sector unless employers directly or indirectly pay for their labor. As Çetinkaya (2008) stated out the factor decreasing the child labor in Çukurova's agriculture was indeed the relative increase in the enterprises paying daily wages instead of piece-based renumeration. It is feasible to expect a change in the renumeration, sanctions, and employers' behavior in reducing the amount of child labor more than any social program attempt at raising consciousness of families.

Finally, representatives of migratory agricultural workers often demand solutions to create alternative job opportunities for themselves. For example, in the final declaration of Congress of Seasonal Agricultural Workers in 2013, top 1 of the list of demands from the parliament is the "rehabilitation of the conditions forcing these people to seasonal work" and the following 4 are also detailed descriptions of policies that will emancipate those workers from seasonal agricultural jobs (*FıratNews,* 2013, April 9). The fact that seasonal migratory workers and their representatives demand solutions to end their migration to work for agricultural jobs makes perfect sense. Poverty and relative deprivation of (mostly Kurdish) people in the Southeast are significant social problems in themselves alone. Moreover, seasonal migration for work have an immense worsening effect on living conditions and access to certain citizenship rights of workers such as children's education, access to health care and political participation rights. Therefore, scholarly attention to regional inequality and social projects for social mobility of workers by those who are compelled to extended seasonal migration for agricultural jobs are both necessary and important. Yet, the problem about contemporary accounts on agricultural workers is the exclusive domination of this vision in the literature implying that a change of career is the only way to improve conditions of workers. It is a huge sector in which around 3 million laborers are compelled to perform hard tasks with lowest earnings, endangering conditions to their health within structurally insecure wage-labor processes, even if they do not have to migrate for work. It is worth to remind that even if we emancipate all the current workers; given the seasonal labor demand of agricultural enterprises, some other workers had to face the difficulties of the agricultural labor market, with or without migration, which are naturalized within discourse of victimization.

3.4 Conclusion

In this chapter, I summarized the history on paid agricultural work in Turkey within the light of major sociopolitical transformations of the Republican history.

The presence of paid agricultural workers and migration for farm jobs has a long history in Turkey, even preceding the Republic. Yet, throughout the last decades, workers' migration for farm jobs gained a certain kind of visibility nationwide through the media representations, which also created a public concern about the conditions of work and accommodation of farm workers and child labor in the sector. Current prominent pattern of internal seasonal migration is from Southeast to North and West although this is not the only scenario regarding the complexity of routes and various working patterns in different localities.

I particularly emphasized 1980s turmoil regarding the effects of military coup, restructuring of the economy, high levels of urbanization, increasing deregulation of agricultural market and the major socio-political processes that led to the ethnicization of the agricultural jobs. The press research on daily *Milliyet* revealed a process of replacement of the language of rights and developmentalism with victimization and *othering* as the main framework in the presentation of agricultural workers after 1980s. The continuities and ruptures within the discourse in fact give an idea about the main framework in which the problems of agricultural wage-labor processes are being discussed today.

Today, a glimpse on the newspapers can reveal that the mainstream perception of the "prototypical" workers are Kurdish families seasonally migrating to the other regions for work, staying in their tents far away from village centers and, yet, creating a feeling of discomfort among locals. The abundance of references to hometowns of workers and the specific kind of visualization makes them strikingly different from the press coverage of the issue before 1980s. Reports before 1980 were rather infrequent, seemingly indiscriminate between groups of workers—at the expense of ignoring some groups—and mainly talking about their struggles and negotiations for rights. One of the few continuing themes is the absence of employers in the picture with the exception of 1970s, when the scarcity of labor and the massive strikes in the Aegean region have challenged the landowner employers. Apart from absence of employers, today's portrayals share such prominent themes as visualization of misery, expressions of pity and strangeness and an ambiguity towards the responsible subjects.

The final part was a discussion on the downsides of ongoing victimization through presenting some tendencies in the academic literature on agricultural workers. I highlighted some common patterns in today's portrayal of workers—hygiene, extreme poverty, and humanitarian care—in both academic studies and news articles. I particularly focused on the accounts claiming victimhood of workers and inevitability of the hardness agricultural work, which invalidate the struggle to improve such conditions.

In contemporary accounts workers are typically depicted, on the one hand, as passive objects through the discourses of victimization emphasizing misery, absolute poverty and hopelessness. Simultaneously, a certain kind of subjectivity is asserted to them as anonymous representatives of a particular culture portrayed as backwards and blameworthy. These statements of victimization and othering share a common dehumanizing aspect as neither of them calls attention for actual social lives and/or individual subjectivities of the workers they are "looking at". However, there is a tension between these two lines of statements. I perceive this tension and the specific ways in which it is handled as a central characteristic of textual accounts on agricultural work in Turkey. Apparently, the most popular way of handling this tension is putting the blame on the intermediary. The monolithic portrayal of intermediary as a remnant of the past, as a potential danger and as a representative of authoritarian culture hints the ways in which workers are being *othered* in the contemporary accounts.

CHAPTER IV

CITIZENSHIP, LABOR LEGISLATION AND AGRICULTURAL WORKERS IN TURKEY

This chapter will be a discussion on the role of the state in the structure of the agricultural wage-labor processes through providing employers access to an exceptional labor force. First, I will discuss the equal citizenship ideal of the Republic through the disadvantaged citizens having trouble in realization of their rights. The participants of this study—women agricultural workers—have historically weaker claims on land, little access to formal jobs, trade unions and institutional networks, which have been necessary tools to access social rights in Turkey. Second, I will illustrate the disadvantaged status of atypical jobs, the major type of women employment, within labor legislation and the recent regulations of SSGSS law. Third, I will question the politics of statistics and the invisibility of urban women's paid agricultural work within public surveys. Agriculture and household surveys of the state have not only been blind to women's work but also posit a marginal status to paid agricultural workers through categorizing them together with self-employed farmers and unpaid family workers as "agricultural laborers" of the country. Finally, I will study the state regulations in agricultural labor market as one of the atypical forms of work. I will concentrate on the recent processes of state intervention in the agricultural labor processes following Prime Ministry Memorandum (2010), METİP projects and finally the approach of parliamentary commission on agricultural workers. Atypicality of agricultural jobs have continued to be the emphasis of policy decisions after 2010 which is reflected in state-funded projects to *aid* poor seasonal migrants rather than policies granting their wage-labor processes with rights.

In sum, I offer a framework to think the persistence of legal exceptionalism—the exceptional treatment and unproductive legislation for the agricultural labor market—together with the high shares of impoverished minority groups and women in the sector, who have little access to political and institutional process and networks to ensure their social rights. The insecurity of agricultural wage-labor processes for workers is deeply related to such political processes reproducing the double standard of labor legislation. Agricultural workers, in this context, largely depend on extra-security mechanisms to manage their wage-labor processes, e.g. intermediation. That is why this study

approaches intermediation practices in Adapazarı as one of the extra-security mechanisms of workers to manage wage-labor processes in the absence of protective legislation.

4.1 Citizenship: Women and Minorities

In this part, I offer a critical account on equal citizenship ideal of the Republic through emphasizing disadvantaged groups that experience trouble in realizing their rights. The participants of this study, poor women, particularly Romani and Kurdish women have historically little claim on land, little access to formal jobs and trade unions and also institutional networks, which have been necessary tools to access social rights in Turkey. In fact, the Turkish welfare system has always been a clientelist system, which provides very limited protection to citizens who are not part of the formal labor market (Buğra 2012; Buğra & Keyder 2003; Soytemel 2013). In this context, women's clustering in precarious agricultural jobs also led to denial of their fundamental social rights. Although the "state feminism" since 1923 encouraged education and employment of women, poor women and particularly minority women could not (and still cannot) get access to these opportunities (Hoşgör & Smits 2003). Turkey still has one of the widest male–female employment gaps in the world (İlkkaracan 2012). Moreover, employed women's ratio of working in atypical jobs (outside the formal job market) is significantly higher than men[47] (Karadeniz 2001: 89; Çakır 2008).

Citizenship in modern state is long regarded a principle of equality meaning that everyone living in a given territory regardless of their ties to primary communities are considered as equals. It, thus, implies an equality of status to all members of political community. However, historical reality very much departs from this ideal normative principle. Marshall (2000[1950]) once argued that as the process inevitably evolves to social citizenship, equal citizenship principle in a dynamic society makes it harder to preserve inequalities in the long turn. He tried to point out that citizenship is a process inclined to achieve social rights at the end, which probably contradict with the system itself. We then witnessed the end of social citizenship and acknowledged the discriminatory side of even

[47] Moreover, the social policies of AKP (Justice and Development Party, ruling party since 2002) in the form of charity and aid have contributed to women's low labor market participation and dependence on families. Since 2002, AKP representatives has particularly emphasized values of 'Turkish family' and supported part-time and flexible forms of employment for women who are defined first of all as mothers and care givers. Soytemel (2013) stated that regulations and reforms enforced by AKP alongside with the juridicial and institutional discourses have all contributed to familial dependency for women (77). In this context, the low labor market participation of women continued and the majority of employed women have clustered in precarious jobs, which make them more and more dependent upon their fathers' or husbands' as social security providers (Soytemel 2013).

welfare state since social rights had not been inclusive and egalitarian for all (Castles 2000).

Today, many people are excluded from full participation in societies. Even some of the legal citizens are disadvantaged and unable to secure their social rights such as employment, housing, health care and education. A certain standard of those social rights are also significant for realization of civil and political rights. Castles (2000) states that the probability of individual or collective exclusion is higher for members of ethnic minorities (40-41). Civil rights of citizens (which include freedom, inviolability of the person, freedom of expression, freedom of religion and the prohibition of discrimination on the basis of gender and ethnicity) are violated either by other groups or powerful institutions of state (Castles 2000). For minority members the nationalist violence or even just the threat of it itself can become a major limitation to civil rights. Moreover, all citizens do not share access to information and useful networks equally. Especially minorities and women are disadvantaged in most of these occasions. In this sense, formal possession of political rights (right to vote, stand for public office, freedom of assembly, association and information) does not guarantee political participation for disadvantaged people. In brief, formal equality does not mean inclusiveness and is not enough for realization of citizenship rights of those disadvantaged poor, minorities, migrants and especially women. This, not only necessitates a policy to recognize gender and cultural rights but also a policy of social rights in order to ensure that citizens fully participate in society.

Why the principle of equality in citizenship is not working? It may be appropriate to answer this question by referring to the intrinsic tension in the definition of nation-state and political communities. Nation states generally refer to a traditional (ethnic or religious) identity in the definition of nation, while paradoxically offering citizens to get rid of their primary traditional identities and bonds at the same time. Principle of equal citizenship, in the case of Turkey, as elsewhere, suffers from this internal tension since the political community is identified with some traditional, religious and ethnic references (Gülalp 2007). Turkishness refers to the people who are living in a given territory. Yet, at the same time, it has an ethnic and religious content, which is not inclusive of all citizens. Turkishness is something more than Turkish citizenship in the meta-texts of Republic as well as popular perceptions (Yeğen 2004).

While state defines political community, it also determines the insiders and outsiders. This ethnic content in the definition of political community brought consequences for those who could not or somehow did not have been assimilated into Turkishness, including non-

Muslims, Roma and Kurd[48] populations. Yet, inclusiveness/openness of the political community is ambivalent in the case of Turkey and the logic of assimilation is hardly the sole criteria for acceptance. "Loyalty" should be mentioned among other unstable criteria. As Keyman and İçduygu (2003) pointed out, citizen perception of Turkish state have been the one emphasizing loyalty and duties rather than rights and responsibilities. Likewise, through an analysis on schoolbooks, Üstel (2004) shows how the content of Turkish citizenship is filled with loyalty and duties rather than rights from time to time. According to textbooks, the period after 1980 military coup has been characterized by an expectation of "militant citizens" who are pursuing national ends and fighting with internal enemies of state, such as betrayers (Üstel 2004). These betrayers eventually turn out to be betrayer ethnic group members within the context of armed conflict with Kurdish militia.

Between 1.2 million (official figure) and 4 million (unofficial estimate) Kurds[49] have been internally displaced during the course of armed conflict in 1990s. In fact, this process included more than a resettlement, it was the beginning of an era in which state labeled its own citizens, calls them for duty and labeled the rest as undeserving. Therefore, the process can be read as a spectacular "failure" of an important part of Kurdish population to prove their "loyalty". This violence has a role in turning an ethnic group to "so-called citizens" since distinct ethnic connotations of deserving or disloyal citizens are established (Gökalp 2007; Yeğen 2011). İçduygu et al. (1999) claimed that the political and cultural repression created an environment of insecurity for the Kurds in Turkey alongside economic problems. Sirkeci (2000), likewise, stated that demographic data provide a comprehensive picture of relative deprivation prevalent among the Kurds of Turkey. Beyond violation of rights and impoverishment, political insecurity brought about further discriminatory discourses and practices.

As a consequence of the Ottoman and early Republican attempts of forced settlement of nomadic Kurdish tribes, majority of the Kurds were living in rural areas as sharecroppers

[48] After the Turks, the Kurds form the largest ethnic group in Turkey. The Kurdish population spreads over Iran, Iraq, Syria, Armenia and Turkey. The distribution of the Kurdish population among these five countries may be roughly said to be 45 % in Turkey, 20 percent in Iraq, 20 percent in Iran, 5 percent in Syria, 5 percent in Armenia and last 5 percent in other countries, including Western Europe immigrants although exact figures are controversial (McDowall 1996; Sirkeci 2000). The majority of Kurds are Sunni Muslims, but there are divisions with regard to denomination. There are three main dialects of Kurdish language: Kirmanc, Zaza and Soran (Van Bruinessen 1992).

[49] Given the absence of a general data, Kurdish population in Turkey estimated based on different assumptions and different sources range from 6 % to 23 % for 1990s Turkey. Mutlu (1996) for example projected the numbers of Kurdish population based on 1935 and 1965 census data. He calculated that by 1990, about 12 to 13 % of the Turkish population belonged to the Kurdish (dialects) speaking ethnic groups whereas Sirkeci (2000) estimated that ratio as 15.2%.

or agricultural workers under the authority of *aghas* (rural leaders that the state granted large agricultural lands) until the 1950s (Kıray 1999; Hoşgör & Smits 2014: 419). Then, with mechanization of agriculture, economic change had also affected the region, which triggered migration to cities and also transformed many sharecroppers into paid workers (as cited in Hoşgör & Smits 2014: 419). As Mutlu (1996) indicated, in response to the general trends of internal and international migration, the Kurdish population in the western cities of Turkey has steadily increased after 1950s. Yet, the form of migration in 1990s was remarkably different and devastating for the community in consequences. Through forced migration, on the one hand, material basis of social exclusion was build for displaced population in the cities: informal and seasonal employment, irregular income, lack of social security, and a high rate of illiteracy combined with inability to speak Turkish, especially in the case of women (Çağlayan & Özar & Doğan 2011; Mutlu 2009; Kaya 2009). These became obstacles to fully participate in the labor market, accessing health services, and educational opportunities. On the other hand, this process is very much related to ethnic politicization or ethnicization of poverty and the feeling of injustice among Kurdish citizens. As an unexpected consequence of forced migration, pro-Kurdish contention over ethnicity or ethno-nationalist claims of Kurdish movement has disseminated among the poor worker grassroots in the new context of cities, which became a turning point for Kurdish political movement.

Today, a significant part of Kurdish agricultural workers were displaced villagers who are settled in slums of Southeastern cities. The Kurdish political movement is based not only on recognition demands but also on the striking underdevelopment of the Southeast region, which is mainly populated by Kurds. Representatives of Kurdish Political movement in the Parliament [*HDP*] are constantly trying to call attention to regional deprivation and seasonal migration of agricultural workers through parliamentary questions. Economic conditions of the region had not been promising before, yet, displacement has worsened the situation significantly. There were destructive implications of loosing rural ties as an income supplement for new migrants. Moreover, since forced migration did not occur gradually and people had to migrate in large numbers, the kinship networks in urban areas became less capable of overseeing new migrants, providing accommodation and finding job. Therefore, we can say that those depriving affects of forced migration contributed to degradation of Kurdish migrants as one of the major sources of ethnicization of poverty and ongoing seasonal migration of Kurdish workers for agricultural jobs throughout the country.

In fact, the same period was also characterized by a paradigm change in state-society relations in Turkey through neoliberal restructuring, which had impacts on the characteristics of poverty in urban Turkey in general. As a major transformation of the traditional welfare regime, neoliberal restructuring undermined the ability of former institutions and relationships to provide social protection to the individuals and contributed to inequalities in countryside through agricultural policy (Buğra & Keyder 2005: 21). Internal migration in 1990s in general analyzed with the terms poverty and marginalization for the new comers, as the new Kurdish migrants found no easy entry into urban economic life in contrast to former generations of migrants. This new wave of migration further contributed to class polarization and sharpened antagonisms in large cities (Gönen & Yonucu 2011: 76).

One important aspect of the traditional welfare regime of Turkey is the fact that agricultural income had remained important for urban poor. However, income supplements of urban poor had been diminished more than ever in 1990s[50] (Buğra & Keyder 2005: 22). Within this process, the majority of the participants of this study, new Kurdish migrants and historically landless Roma community are the ones who particularly lack that kind of support. The restructuring process also contributed to further in-formalization of the labor market. Moreover, commercialization of land disabled new immigrants to find housing opportunities by reducing availability of urban public land as one of the non-formal aspects of welfare regime (Buğra & Keyder 2005: 25). Current manifestations of poverty or the phenomenon of "new poverty" in the literature has been generally related to those pressures on welfare regime.

Regarding the poverty of Kurdish migrants, some studies (Saraçoğlu 2011; Gökalp 2007) address to a new phenomenon of "ethnicization of poverty" as a result of the coincidence between the timing of restructuring and massive Kurdish migration to cities. As an alternative to coincidence arguments, Yörük (2009) explained the very success of neoliberal in-formalization with forced migration in 1990s since the process positively contributed to the success of neoliberal restructuring in Turkey through enabling employers to access abundant cheap labor - even if the state had not initially intended to do so (Yörük 2009).

[50] Small-scale landowner urban groups has also been affected since new policies aggravated the inequality in the countryside by rewarding the larger and more successful farmers through revoking various programs of agricultural input subsidy and output price support (Buğra & Keyder 2005: 22).

Urban dwellers, particularly in Western cities, in fact, had not wholeheartedly welcomed newly migrated Kurdish neighbors. As Kılıç et al. (1992) pointed out new-comers had to face with multiple forms of discriminatory actions: handouts warning the citizens not to rent their house to Kurdish migrants; announcements from mosque and municipality loudspeakers for expulsion, shop boycotts, collective expulsions from cities, police-employer engagements to threaten Kurdish workers and so on. The tension has increased throughout the first two decades of 2000s. The period is marked by breaking news about the lynch attempts in Western cities towards Kurdish people, some of which targeted seasonal agricultural workers. Adapazarı, in fact, was one of the cities that worrisome lynch attempts towards Kurds have taken place in recent years.

Through in-depth interviews with the locals, Saraçoğlu (2011) elaborated on discriminatory discourses among urban dwellers in İzmir towards increased Kurdish population in the city. Other researchers (Taşkan 2007; Meçin 2004; Mutlu 2009) also report signs of exclusion by studying this process from the perspective of migrants with regards to urban poverty and social integration.

The fieldwork of this study, likewise, displays exclusion dynamics within Adapazarı, confining residentially segregated Kurdish and Roma community to precarious jobs. Kurdish migration to Adapazarı had started in 1970s and intensified throughout 1990s as in other parts of Turkey. In 1965 census, Adapazarı was one of the places where Kurdish population remained under 1 percent; it rose to level of 1.01-5 percent in 1990s projections (as cited in Sirkeci 2000: 157). Kurds have largely settled in the peripheral *Karaköy, Güneşler, Arabacıalanı* and *Bağlar* neighborhoods in the city. All but one of these, are still largely migrant-worker neighborhoods inhabited by a significant part of agricultural workers of the city and are designated as places of observation for this study. Likewise, Roma neighborhoods in the region such as *Karaköy-Budaklar Mevkii, Erenler-Yeni Mahalle, Sapanca-Gazi Paşa Mahallesi (Kestanelik Mevkii)* were also inhabited by agricultural workers and laborers in other precarious jobs.

As full citizens of the Republic likewise Kurds, Roma[51] community in general is also relatively deprived of social rights compared to mainstream society and clustered in

[51] According to one classification, Gypsies in Turkey are seen under three groups: Roma, Dom and Lom. Roma generally live in Western parts of the country sharing similar linguistic, cultural, and economic characteristics with European Gypsies (Marsh 2008: 23). The usage of the terms Roma and Gypsy are actually a matter of dispute. Some prefer Roma as a comprehensive identity, whereas others attempted to 'deconstruct' the negative image of Gypsy through using the word in defining the community (Aksu 2006; Editorial Note on Gypsy Studies Journal). Within this study, I used the word "Roma" to define the group since the participants expressed their identities with this word. Participants have generally reffred to Gypsyness to define others.

precarious jobs as major sources of income (EDROM 2008; Diler 2008; Önen 2013;Toprak Karaman 2007; Onaran İncirlioğlu 2007). Scholars have reported on the disadvantaged status of the community through institutional discrimination, low access to education and health services, lack of representatives in local governmental councils (Toprak Karaman 2007) and poverty, isolated settlements and exclusion (Onaran İncirlioğlu 2007). Moreover, collective lynch attempts and forced deportation have been one of the problems Roma communities face as in the recent events in Turkey: Selendi (2010), İznik (2013), Edirne (2015). They have also been depicted as undeserving citizens and discriminated against in the legal-bureaucratic texts of the Republic as well as in public representations (Aksu 2006). The autobiographic book of Mustafa Aksu (2006), "Türkiye'de Çingene Olmak" [Being A Gypsy in Turkey] uncovers the exclusion and discrimination dynamics and how hard it is to get education, land a formal job and marry outside the community for Gypsies.

Within the Roma neighborhoods that I visited women were occasionally applying jobs other than agriculture and apartment cleaning but they were either not preferred by employers because of the lack of "references" or they were not guaranteed to be paid fairly. They have to build up trust on their own within the processes of job applications in the absence of overlapping social networks—common acquaintances with employers. Yet, as one of the interviewers in Kestanelik cleared out, it is not easy. The job applications require address information giving an idea to employer about their identity, which often results in their rejection (Field Notes, 2012). Mukhtars that I visited in the city, particularly nearby settlements to Roma residences were highly sensitive about the issue. The mukhtar of Küpçüler, for example, told me about the administrative separation of Yeni Mahalle and Küpçüler as a process demanded by the residents (Field Notes, June 29, 2015). He added that Romas living in Yeni Mahalle occasionally lie about their address information and say Küpçüler although there is no single Roma living within their boundaries. Then, I asked who is living in their neighborhood and he answered as such: "Ours' are all normal... Mostly from Karadeniz, those who migrate here from the villages of Karasu as a step closer to the city... there are also Kurds" (Field Notes, June 29, 2015).

A part of Roma came from Greece through the process of population exchange at the beginning of the 20th century (Diler 2008: 40). In fact, within the interviews, some older Roma women mentioned their families' migration from Salonica to Adapazarı. *Sapanca-*

The women in Romani neighborhoods occasionally referred to their neighbors and the people in nearby neighborhoods as Gypsies while presenting themselves as Roma (Field Notes 2011-2015).

Kestanelik Mevki, for example, was one of the settlements that had been built by a few Roma families coming from Greece in the 1920s. It is still an over-crowded Roma neighborhood looking like a shantytown, which became residence for many Roma families coming from nearby towns expelled through lynches or urban renewal projects. The urban renewal process to evict Roma residents from their homes has been started by the municipality in 2013.

Roma community, indeed, is one of the groups that have been particularly affected from the contemporary urban renewal process (Önder 2013; Arslan 2014). Önder (2013) studied urban transformation processes on Roma community as one of the systematical subversive operations for "normalizing" the Romani communities. On the one hand, Roma neighborhoods have usually been built near to streams and water once at the periphery of the cities become more and more valued in time through the enlargement of cities (Turan 2009; Akgül 2010). Poor Roma residents are usually vulnerable with respect to rights to property. Many Roma residents either have improper papers misrepresenting their property or have papers proving only the ownership of the land on which their houses are built. This vulnerability makes Roma poor easy targets. On the other hand, the discursive process of 1990s depicting urban poor as criminals is paying off as a base for legitimizing such transformation projects. Gönen & Yonucu (2011) powerfully elaborated on such discursive processes of criminalization since late 1990s that constitute urban poor as dangerous criminals. Amongst many consequences of the processes of polarization and growing antagonisms by the late 1990s crime became a focal issue in Turkey as evident in the discursive sphere (Gönen & Yonucu 2011: 76):

> We argue that the association of crime with urban poor legitimizes segregation practices and a remaking of urban space in accordance with neoliberal urbanism. The urban poor are increasingly seen as a 'race apart' and their particular culture as productive of 'degeneracy' and 'criminality' concentrated in the neighborhoods in which they reside. The media are not alone in associating poor neighborhoods with crime. Criminologists and urban planners in Turkey have been increasingly engaging with the spatial relations of crime and have insinuated the 'criminality' of particular neighborhoods. The discourses they produce are aligned with the aim of reconstructing the metropolis of Turkey as 'non-antagonistic' financial, business and cultural centers attractive to foreign capital and global investment., 'secured' and 'freed' from crime and/or urban poor. Such 'non-antagonistic' cities and/or the fantasy of non-antagonistic cities in Turkey are facilitated mainly through the *Urban Transformation Projects* large-scale housing developments in place of poor shantytown neighborhoods (Gönen & Yonucu 2011: 77).

Even within the limited scope of this study, two urban renewal projects—both of which targeting Roma settlements—have been started in *Kestanelik* and *Yeni Mahalle*. These processes are expected to create disempowering consequences for livelihood of current residents following the earlier examples of urban renewal processes. Within the process of

urban transformation projects, the state usually is charging residences with debt while offering small apartments in another neighborhood in exchange for their houses, which have been replaced by new middle-class residences. Özcan Purcu, the single Roma representative in the Parliament explained the problems the community faced through the urban renewal projects as such:

> With the Disaster Act, houses are being destroyed all around Turkey. Then new buildings are constructed there and marketed and sold to other groups. Urban transformation became a disaster for us. Wherever a poor, wretched has a house it is confiscated for a compensation of 20-30 thousand and demolished. Then villas are built there. Who could buy a house for 30 thousand liras? Then these people have to struggle for life outside the city. In addition to all, social life disappear, culture disappears (Yüce, 2015, December 21).

Urban renewal projects often resulted in increased vulnerability for the communities through extorting people's rights to property, impoverishment with debt and forcing people into different ways of accommodation and lives. Another important consequence of the projects is related to the neighborhood-based jobs as vital sources of income. Within Roma neighborhoods that I visited in Adapazarı, alongside basketry and space demanding jobs such as collecting waste (paper, construction wastes, plastics) almost all daily jobs has been organized through the networks that neighborhoods provide. Thus, neighborhood networks are one of the assets of people to reach daily jobs and other income earning activities. More often than not, employers or intermediaries visit neighborhoods to ask for laborers assuming that people seek to find extra income earning activities within these settlements. This was exactly the case for agricultural jobs. Although it is hard to fully grasp the consequences of the urban renewal projects for the neighborhoods in the region, if the community dispersed to smaller groups building shack houses in more peripheral areas (which is happening), it probably will not make women's access to daily jobs any easier.

In sum, this study adopts a critical approach to citizenship ideal emphasizing women and particularly minority women's disadvantaged status as an obstacle for realization of their rights. Labor market status is one of the major reasons in Turkey preventing women and minority groups' access to equal social rights, which are attached to formal jobs. The denial of working rights of agricultural workers is also a crisis of citizenship. The exclusionary bases of the definition of citizenship in Turkey and major policy implications of the last decades were also presented as the processes clustering women more and more in precarious jobs and increasing their dependence on household men to access social rights. Finally, I elaborated on daily discriminatory processes/discourses towards Roma

and Kurd groups and particularly the devastating effects of major policy implications such as forced migration and urban renewal projects on these communities.

4.2 Atypical Workers in Turkey's Labor Legislation

In this section, I will briefly describe the ways in which atypical work—as an area where women, Kurdish and Roma minorities included in this study are intensely employed—is defined in disadvantageous terms in laws regulating labor market. I will touch upon the structural features of social security system that excludes atypical workers and pushes them to work without benefits; mentioning the groups that are most affected by these. I will discuss the regulations of the SSGSS[52] concerning atypical work.

In Turkey, the ratio of people who work as unpaid family workers, who work as daily paid wage worker or who work on their own account are higher than those of European Union countries. In this respect, atypical work is already a common form of work for the poor for a long time in Turkey, in contrast to the European Union countries.

Women's participation rate in the labor market in Turkey was also low and it is getting lower by time. Women usually work as unpaid family workers. At year 2000, 68.8 percent of working women were unpaid family workers and 24.3 percent were waged laborers (Berber & Yılmaz Eser 2008: 6). Participation rate of women, which was 34 percent in 1990, fell to 30.6 in 1995, 26.6 percent in 2000 and 25.4 percent in 2004 (Berber & Yılmaz Eser 2008: 4). The ratio of women employed in atypical work is higher than that of men, a factor which causes this numbers to appear as lower than they really are (Karadeniz 2001: 89; Toksöz 2007; Çakır 2008). Atypical work—in contrast to regular, permanent and secure employment—is used to describes the type of work that is irregular and temporary, characterized by lack of job and income security. A part of the reason for the increase in atypical work in the last two decades is the rise of flexible work in labor market. The term flexible production condenses several strategies: the substitution of permanent workers with occasional workers; the loosening of job demarcation; the reorganization of work from individual to teamwork (Ortriz 2003: 401). This also causes the deregulation of labor market. Workers are forced to work in temporary precarious jobs, without unions or social security (Karadeniz 2011: 85-7). Currently, two policies are proposed for increasing the rate of women participation in the workforce. First, improving flexible work opportunities for women, and second advancing women entrepreneurship

[52] Social Securities and Universal Health Insurance Law *[5510 sayılı Sosyal Sigortalar ve Genel Sağlık Sigortası Kanunu]* was enacted in 2006 (Retrieved from http://www.sbn.gov.tr).

(Toksöz 2007: 50). Yet, the fact that these initiatives of increasing flexible work and entrepreneurship are limited to women indicates continuation of gender-based discrimination in labor market (Toksöz 2007: 50). In this respect, the rise of atypical work in women employment reflects a will to create a flexible and cheap labor force (Temiz 2004: 64).

The varieties of atypical employment for women includes working as unpaid family member or daily-waged laborer in agriculture, industry and service sectors; home-based, part-time or temporary employment. Social security system is structurally having an effect of pushing women working in atypical jobs out from the social security network. Karadeniz (2011) making use of State Statistical Agency Household Workforce Survey of 2009 (HHİA, 2009) and Household Budget Survey (HHBA, 2009) has shown in his study that vast majority of women employed in atypical jobs are poor, they work unregistered and social security system is excluding these women and does not provide a safety network for them. According to data he provided (2011: 92), 56.8 percent of women working as unpaid family workers, 65.2 percent of women working in daily-waged jobs and 51.7 percent of self-employed women are amongst the poorest quarter of the population.

Karadeniz's (2011) study also reveals that for different kinds of atypical employment, there are distinct exclusion mechanisms in labor legislation. For example, part time work is defined in disadvantageous terms for the workers, even when they work formally. Since in SSGSS part-time workers are not entitled to paid weekend breaks, part-time workers need to work 15-25 percent more than full time workers in order to secure the same social security premiums (Karadeniz 2011: 97). Another example is one of the major reasons why women work informally (i.e., out of the scope of the law) in agriculture. Until the change by law no 4956 in 2003, women were eligible for social security only when they were "head of the household." This was (according to Law no. 2926) only possible in the absence of a man in household (Ecevit 2003: 90). This section of the law played a discriminatory role against women in the extension of social security. Although this law is not in force anymore, SGK refuses to apply the new law retrospectively, continuing discrimination against women who have worked under the previous law.

Atypical agricultural work is considered as "daily-waged, temporary work" in TUİK data. All women workers in agriculture, and 92.9 percent of women workers in other sectors are

working informally (Karadeniz, 2011). Informal work is most widespread in agricultural sector[53].

Agricultural work, an area of work in which atypical women employment concentrates, is out of the scope of labor code in Turkey. Before SSGSS law was enacted, thanks to the previous regulations, workers in the sector were eligible to social security, provided that they personally pay their premiums. SSGSS law continued to exempt private agriculture businesses from the obligations of compulsory social security regulations; and premiums were tripled for optional subscribers (Karadeniz 2011). Law no. 6111 (which is known as the "Omnibus Bill") has made it possible for irregular agricultural workers to be covered under social security, by paying premiums of 18 days per month over the minimum wage (SSGSS, amend. no 5). The number of days necessary was to be increased one day per month for every year. The increase in the premiums (which were already over the budgets of agricultural workers) made it almost impossible for them to join social security network. Besides, there is evidence suggesting that the said option is used to subscribe to social security relatively easily primarily not by seasonal agricultural workers but other persons with the ability to pay. Some authors interpret the curious disparity between the data of SGK and TUİK on the number of seasonal workers (the number of seasonal workers according to SGK exceeds that of all agricultural families according to TUİK) as an evidence of this fake-insurance of people reporting themselves as agricultural workers. (Karadeniz 2007; Yıldırak et al. 2002: 15). Regarding my case study, none of the women workers interviewed (with the exception of a women paying her husband's premium) was paying social security premiums and none of them was planning to achieve social security in the future by using this option. SSGSS law also discriminates between temporary agricultural workers in public and private sectors (Gü zel & Okur & Caniklioğlu, 2010: 126).

With the introduction of SSGSS law, premiums of farmers (who previously were paying less premiums than workers, artisans and craftsmen) were increased as well. By 2011, 48 percent of farmers are indebted to SGK (SGK 2011). According to the law, just like the agricultural workers, farmers need to pay premiums for 18 days per month, and the days necessary was to be increased one day per month in the incoming years. Increasing the premiums of low-income farmers and workers, while the share of agricultural sector in GDP was shrinking results in exclusion of these groups from social security system.

[53] According to TUİK, in July 2014, informal workers comprise 36.4 percent of the total work force. The ratio of informal workers for agricultural and non-agricultural sectors is 84 percent and 22.7 percent respectively.

In short, the new regulations presented under the name of "social security reform" have created a more unfavorable atmosphere for women employed in atypical works. With the new regulations, they are further excluded from the social security programs and become more dependent to male members of their households. Part time workers are subject to loss due to rising premiums, home-based workers and informal workers are in jeopardy because of being excluded from social security network. Accordingly, women in any branch of atypical work are subject to severe insecurity and they cannot defend their social rights under these unfavorable conditions (Karadeniz 2011: 120).

4.3 Politics of Counting: Agricultural Workers in Public Surveys

Turkish public surveys make it hard to distinguish between working patterns within the agricultural sector as unpaid family workers, farmers, paid workers, public employees are all recorded together as a group called "laborers of agriculture":

> It is not possible to come across clear data about paid labor force employment in agriculture in Turkey. Official statistics do not indicate real values since they cover those above the age 15. Neither TÜİK, nor SGK nor İŞKUR can provide real data since almost all agricultural workers are unrecorded and uninsured (TBMM 201: 192).

First comprehensive agricultural survey of the Republic was carried out in 1950. Based on this count we may say that the majority of paid agricultural workers (about 70 percent) were working in seasonal jobs (Makal 2001: 118).

Through public surveys, it is particularly hard to reach the peculiar data on agricultural worker women who are residing in the cities. The main problem about past surveys of agriculture is the presumed exclusiveness of rural-urban sectors as if all the people in rural areas are working in agricultural sector or as if they migrate to urban areas for only non-agricultural jobs. Consequently, such public records are blind to agricultural work relations of urban-dweller women and also non-agricultural incomes of women in the rural areas [such as *dokumacılık* as mentioned by Makal (2001)]. Yet, women in the urban neighborhoods have always been the main labor supply of agricultural jobs in the hinterland of Adapazarı as pointed out by elderly informants in the region. In fact, rural transformation and migration have not been experienced and resulted in the same way throughout the country and led to a wide range of strategies and in-between solutions[54]

54 Conventional accounts on internal migration tend to explain the transformation with references to push and pull factors. Push factors are the conditions forcing the peasants to leave rural areas such as insufficient land/income, rural labor surplus in the process of mechanization of agriculture and pull factor are the dynamics of migration to cities such as job opportunities, health, and education. The people, however, have been experiencing these push-and-pull factors in different degrees through their situational contexts, especially regarding their position in the labor market (Makal 2001: 124).

(Makal 2001: 124). Some stayed in rural areas, yet, largely rely on urban sector for income as in the case of farmers in the hinterland of Adapazarı. Some families split between urban and rural areas. Many women continued to work in agricultural jobs after migration to the city. Among the participants of this study, Kurdish and Turkish women's career in agricultural jobs had typically started after they migrated to the city (rural-urban migration) and many Roma participants had relocated themselves from Ankara to Adapazarı to work in agricultural jobs (urban-urban migration) (Field Notes 2015).

Despite the problems with the recording of agricultural workers, all indicators point to the marginal share of paid workers within Turkey's agricultural sector until recently. In 1970s and 1980s, the relative share did not changed much, increased from 4.5 percent to 4.9 percent. (Teoman 2001: 55). The remarkable increase in the relative share of paid workers within agricultural sector happened in 1990s. The ratio of seasonal/atypical/temporary paid work relations within Turkey's agriculture steadily increased within agricultural sector since 1990s (Bakır 2011: 33). In the two decades between 1990 and 2010, the ratio of regular/formal workers in agricultural sector who collect salaries has decreased from 1.7 percent to 1.5 percent; whereas ratio of daily paid atypical/informal workers has increased from 3.3 percent to 7.8 percent and the ratio of employers has increased from 0.6 percent to 1.7 percent (Bakır 2011: 32). Please note that the increase in the relative share do not mean a peak in numbers of paid workers since it is accompanied by a sharp decrease in the total population of agricultural sector formed by unpaid family laborers, farmers, sharecroppers after 1995 (Bakır 2011: 33). TÜİK data, in fact do not reveal a nominal increase in the population earning income from agricultural sector so far, although paid workers' share relatively increased within the sector.

Nevertheless, employment in agriculture still largely depends on those who self employed farmers and unpaid family workers who work for the former group. Yet, within the last decades the share of self-employment and unpaid family work has decreased while that of paid work has increased (Bakır 2015: 35).

Agricultural sector is the only sector in Turkey in which there are more or less equal numbers of men and women are employed. Yet their employment patterns exhibit an asymmetry. Women employed in agriculture are usually unpaid family workers. On the other hand, men working in agriculture are usually self-employed (Bakır 2011: 34). The difference between the wages of male and female agricultural workers should also be assessed. There is a tendency for larger wages for male workers (Makal 2001: 132). The difference between wages due to gender in agriculture is still apparent in TUİK data.

4.4 Agricultural Exceptionalism

In Turkey, agricultural exceptionalism—particularly, the dual standard of protective labor legislation—enabling agricultural employers to access a distinctive supply of labor has been able to stay unchallenged for most of the private farms. Although current Turkish labor code clearly defines who will be regarded as a worker and will enjoy legal rights, it is much less definitive when it comes to agricultural sector. Rather than defining a worker, the laws confine themselves to list those who cannot be regarded a worker and enjoy the related rights. This list consistently includes daily waged agricultural workers of the private farms. The excuses for this exclusion are agriculture being an atypical work, the hardness of inspection, the extensiveness of agricultural activities and the plentitude of population in the agricultural sector (Görücü & Akbıyık 2010: 190).

According to TÜİK Household Labour Force statistics, 6 million 143 thousand people were employed in agriculture sector in Turkey (TÜİK 2011: 12). 46.7 percent of them (2 million 866 thousand people) were unpaid family workers (TÜİK 2011: 12). The regular and casual employees within the agricultural sector are recorded as 623 thousand. The report of Parliamentary Investigation Committee (2015) asserts that the estimates of different institutions for the waged agricultural workers vary between 485 thousand and 1.2 million. Only about 200 thousands of those are contained under work law. Of those only 40 thousands are signing any contracts (TBMM 2015: 192). The relevant legislation to secure fair payments of the majority of agricultural workers in the private sector has been Borçlar Kanunu (the Code of Obligations, law no. 816) (Görücüa& Akbıyık 2010: 194). The law merely requires the basic obligation of employers to pay (freely determined) wages to workers, which is different than protective labor provisions.

Essentially, excluding agriculture from the scope of laws that regulate labor relations is in contradiction with the constitution, the principal of social state, and international treaties signed by the state. In the third chapter of the constitution, attributes of a social state is included under titles such as “right and duty of education, land ownership, freedom of work and contract, right and duty to work, provisions of fair wage, health services and protection of the environment, and finally right to social security”. As Görücü & Akbıyık (2010) asserts, a social state should recognize these rights for all its citizens, including agricultural workers (193-4). Moreover, Turkey has already ratified ILO conventions no. 87, 98 and 11 (TBMM 29-30). According to the 90th article of the constitution ILO conventions ratified by Turkey have the force of Law (ÇGSB 2014). The ILO conventions such as “Freedom of Association and Protection of the Right to Organise Convention”

(1948 no. 87), "Right to Organize and Collective Bargaining Convention" (1951 no. 98), "Convention concerning the Rights of Association and Combination of Agricultural Workers" (1921, no. 11), "Rural Workers' Organizations and Their Role in Economic and Social Development Convention" (1975, no. 141) all recognize the right of agricultural workers (as is the case for other workers) to organize and to defend their interest by means of collective bargaining and collective contracts. However, in Turkey, agricultural workers' right to unionize is still blocked by national laws and regulations.

4.4.1 History

In the Labor Act of Law 1936 (no. 3008) agricultural sector was excluded from the scope of the law causing agricultural workers to enjoy the protective clauses of the said law, especially regarding personal work relations (Makal 2001: 127). During the preparations of the act, there were rumors about an upcoming separate act for agricultural sector, yet after the enactment of the Labor Act a separate agricultural labor act was put aside and never revisited seriously.

In 1950s, while Press Labor Law and Maritime Labor Act regulated two sections not addressed by the Labor Act, agricultural sector was not included in a similar framework (Makal 2001: 128). The sole protective regulation concerning agricultural workers was the establishment of a minimum wage, starting from 1951 (Makal 2001: 128). Yet, the minimum wage was applied only regionally and its scope stayed limited both in terms of the provinces and in terms of branches. Moreover, the minimum wages set were considerably lower than the medium agricultural wage, which in turn was considerably larger than that of other sectors (Makal 2001: 129). Starting from 1963, all types of agricultural work were considered as a single branch, and agricultural minimum wage was set up accordingly (Makal 2001: 133). But agricultural minimum wage continued to stay well below (about 50 percent of) medium agricultural wage (Makal 2001: 134).

After minimum wage began to be set to encompass "the whole country and workers of all sectors" in 1969, Turkish Confederation of Employer Associations (TİSK, Türkiye İşveren Sendikaları Konfederasyonu) sued Ministry of Labor. Their case was based on the premise that since agricultural workers were outside the scope of Labor Act, they were ineligible for the minimum wage. TİSK case was defeated at the court, rendering agricultural workers eligible for minimum wage[55]. However, until 1988 minimum wage for agricultural workers was set lower than that of other workers. Starting from 1989,

[55] Further information is available in the official website of TARIM-İŞ: http://www.tarimis.org.tr

public agricultural workers began enjoying the same minimum wage with workers of other sectors.

In all laws, enacted before the implementation of 1964 Social Security Act (Law no. 506), the eligibility for social security was limited by the 1936 Labor Act. This caused the exclusion of agricultural workers from the system of social security. 1964 Social Security Act has founded the Social Security Agency, but agricultural workers were still denied the right to participate in the social security system. The path for agricultural workers to be included in the system was only opened after 1977, with the enactment of Law no. 2100 which amended the Social Security Law (as cited in Makal 2001: 129).

Still, workers who can use the clauses of equal minimum wage with other sectors and the right to social security are limited to public workers and workers employed by corporations that are subject to Labor Act. These constitute only a small section of agricultural labor force. For private sector agricultural workers, only available form of minimum wage is an advisory daily minimum wage enforced by the office of the governor in some provinces where seasonally migrant workers are concentrated. This advisory daily minimum wage is (in a non-negotiable fashion) set up to be equal to one thirtieth of the national gross minimum wage (Ulukan & Ulukan 2011: 20). There is a commission to set up the advisory daily minimum wage; but the commission consists only the representatives of employer associations and local state officials and does not involve any worker or intermediary representatives. All the commission does is to divide the national gross minimum wage to 30 (without regarding weekends and other paid leaves). The burden of social security premiums is put on the workers themselves. This whole procedure is inherently disadvantageous for the workers in the sector.

There are remarkable differences between 1970s Turkey and today, concerning the nature of promises made by politicians regarding agricultural workers' rights. Reformulation of work law to include agricultural workers was one of the topics on the political agenda during 1960s and 1970s —as seen in the newspaper articles in Chapter III. It might be unlikely to happen in the past as well; yet, it was on the agenda for a long time and was one of the popular political promises of Turkish politicians. Today, on the other hand, Turkish state's current approach to agricultural workers reflects a different political language excluding worker rights and employer responsibilities. A comparison of statements from labor ministers of 1963 and 2013 hints this transformation of the general framework. Minister Bülent Ecevit made this statement in 1963:

> … agricultural workers are in the condition of half workers. A law proposal on this respect will be prepared. Agricultural workers are entitled to the rights of collective bargaining and strike in the proposal on strike and collective bargaining. It is possible as long as they are able to convince their employers for collective bargaining. Agricultural workers are out of social security system. New social security law will include security rights for groups. Agricultural workers will be able to benefit from that. Minimum wages will be assigned for rice, beet and tobacco workers[56] (*Milliyet,* Workers' wages are subject to bargaining: Minister Ecevit's declarations: 1963, January 19)

The statement below belongs to minister Ömer Çelik and is from 2013, March 19:

> Through spending 80 thousand Liras and new regulations we had important progress in alleviating agricultural workers' conditions of work, transportation and access to health services in the last two years. However, we (as the Ministry of Labor and Social Security) have more responsibilities. We are about to accomplish all of these with this protocol through contributing to their security and work in healthy conditions[57] (Retrieved from http://www.haberler.com).

The recent state regulations in agricultural labor market very much reflects Çelik's declarations in the sense that the solutions offered to problems of agricultural workers are limited to state-funded projects to alleviate conditions of workers. The state funded projects (METİP) to improve conditions of seasonal migratory agricultural workers were also presented as a part of struggle with poverty by way of increasing the living standards of seasonal migratory workers (Erdoğan 2010). The next section will briefly present the recent process, which started by the Prime Ministry Memorandum (2010) and followed by METİP projects. At the end I will review the report of Parliamentary Commission—to investigate solutions for problems of seasonal agricultural workers, which is written as a sharp criticism of post-2010 policies.

---

[56] …tarım işçileri yarı işçi durumundadırlar. Bu konuda bir kanun tasarısı hazırlanacaktır. Grev ve toplu sözleşme tasarısında tarum işçilerine toplu sözleşme ve grev hakkı tanınmaktadir. Yeter ki işverenlerini toplu sözleşme yapmak için ikna edebilsinler. Tarım işçileri sosyal güvenlikten yoksundur. Yeni sosyal sigortalar kanun tasarısı grup sigortalarını da içine almaktadir. Tarım işçileri bundan yararlanabilecektir. Çeltik, pancar ve tütün işçileri için asgari ücret tesbit edilecektir (İşçi ücretleri pazarlığa tabi: Bakan Ecevit'in açıklamaları, *Milliyet*, 1963, Ocak 19).

[57] Son 2 yılda 80 bin lira harcayarak çalışma koşullarını iyileştirme, ulaşım imkanlarını kolaylaştırma, sağlıktan yararlanmalarını gerçekleştirme adına önemli düzenlemeler, önemli adımlar attık. Ama bakanlıklarımıza daha da düşen sorumluluklar vardı. Protokolle bunları da yerine getirerek, onların güvenliğine ve sağlıklı ortamda çalışmalarına katkı sağlamış olacağız.

4.4.2 Post-2010 Process: Memorandum, METİP, Parliamentary Commission

Memorandum

The recent major state intervention in agricultural labor market was triggered by the controversial Prime Ministry notice[58] published in 2010 with the title "A Memorandum for the Improvement of Social and Working Conditions of Seasonal Migrant Workers."

The memorandum was precisely reflexive on the problems of "security, accommodation and relationship with villagers" which are concentrated on the ethnic tensions and population flow related to migration for work. The text was calling for a direct intervention of local administrative authorities through defining a budget for the improvement of the conditions of workers' camps. Following the notice, Ministry of Labor and Social Security started to carry on the "Project for Rehabilitation of Working and Social Lives of Seasonal Migratory Agricultural Workers" (Mevsimlik Gezici Tarım İşçilerinin Çalışma ve Sosyal Hayatlarının İyileştirilmesi Projesi, METİP). Both the notice as a text and the projects implemented afterwards were all remarkable sources for understanding current meanings of agricultural exceptionalism in contemporary Turkey.

One of the main characteristics of the Prime Ministry notice is that it approaches the problems of agricultural workers as mere problems of poverty somehow regardless of the relationship of work going on. Second, the notice was criticized frequently for its security-oriented language and its 10th article, which states that local security forces will perform regular security oriented patrols on worker settlements, day and night. The term "security oriented patrols" were not clearly defined in the notice. Parliamentary commission was also critical of the memorandum, which paved the way for security-oriented policies:

> Practices due to security oriented policies such as to demand regular patrols around worker settlements, to inform security forces in case of any disturbance etc. are enlarging the problems of seasonal agricultural workers rather than solving them... In this way, seasonal agricultural workers are treated as potential criminals rather than endowing them with social security. It is not possible to argue that the policies of collecting the ID cards of the workers and reporting their names to security forces, and to demand that disturbances be reported reflect a consideration for agricultural workers who work their board under unhealthy conditions. This practice is totally discriminative and is the product of security-oriented policies (TBMM 2015: 200-1).

In short, the memorandum became under criticism for several aspects in the report of Parliamentary Commission, because of regarding the matter only as a problem of security

[58] Memorandum for the Recovering the Social and Working Conditions of Seasonal Migrant Workers (Mevsimlik Gezici Tarım İşçilerinin Çalısma ve Sosyal Hayatlarının İyileştirilmesi ile ilgili genelge) is ratified in 2010, March 24, and announced in the Official Gazette, no: 27531 (Retrieved from http://rega.basbakanlik.gov.tr)

and traffic control; criminalizing workers (treating them as if they were bound to create security problems wherever they go; and because of overlooking employer-employee relations (TBMM 2015: 109). On the other hand the memorandum initiated METİP projects. These projects helped in some provinces the lodging problems of migrant workers and contributed their children's right to access education. Through METİP projects, worker settlements were established in several provinces that have electricity and running water, portable tented schools, portable lavatories, toilets and bathrooms.

METİP Process

METİP was launched following the prime ministerial memorandum, in 2010. In the process 65 local projects submitted by 38 governorates were supported. These projects were conducted by Provincial Special Administrations or by Union of Village Delivery Services. The total funds allocated to the projects was approximately 96.2 million Turkish Liras; 72 million of which were spent on lodging, 5 million on education, 3 million on health and the remaining 16 million on other expenses (TBMM 2015: 95). The projects were targeting to reach 300 thousand workers. If we consider the size of the target workers, the inadequacy of funds allocated will become apparent. In a period of three years, money spent per worker was barely enough to pay a single month's social security premium of these workers[59]. Moreover, it was stated in the report of the Parliamentary Commission—based on the statements of invited experts from universities and non governmental organizations—that settlement areas established through METİP were quantitatively very inadequate and were also dysfunctional hence they are not used by workers (TBMM 2015: 95). The report states that the reason for not using these settlements were remoteness of the settlements, the preferences of employers (the objection of employers to transportation expenses, employers' demand that workers be lodged adjacent to fields for some crops that may need instant intervention to prevent loss), preferences of workers (their wish to utilize commodities provided by landowner such as electricity, running water and fuel, their wish to be in the vicinity of local population, or to the road network in order to socialize, and their regarding the lodgings unfit for their customs and traditions) (TBMM 2015: 95). In 2014, the funding for METİP

[59] It is revealing to compare the total budget of METİP with the incentives paid to hazelnut farmers in Sakarya province. According to the governorate figures, the amount of agricultural incentives and supports paid increased quintupled from 2003 to 2014. Hazelnut farmers received most of the incentives and supports. For example, in 2013, hazelnut formers were paid approximately 113.2 million liras in incentives (TC Sakarya Valiliği 2015: 49). According to this figures, the funds for METİP project, which targeted to reach 300 thousand workers in the whole country were only half of the incentives paid (approximately 180 millions) to the farmers of a single crop (hazelnut) in a single province (Sakarya) in the same three years.

was cut stating the difficulties of inspection and the assessment that the funds were not used effectively and efficiently (TBMM 2015: 160).

Through the METİP projects, Turkish state, on the one hand, fund at least a part of agricultural producers indirectly by providing services to migrant workers with these projects for alleviation of the conditions of labor camps. However, the current state projects are exclusively relevant for migrant workers, though not even all of them. The Prime Minister notice was simply an advisory text leaving the project designing to the initiatives of local administrators. Given the ongoing eradication of agriculture supportive policies particularly threatening the future of small-sized farms, the whole project can be regarded as part of a current state policy leading to the deepening of inequalities between agricultural producers. Nevertheless, the very implementation of the projects and the various bureaucratic text(s) justifying the state action made it clear that the accepted exceptionality of agricultural labor market and favoring larger agricultural enterprises is not the main, or the only, rationales for state action. Rather, the texts and regulations on migrant workers reflect some other concerns such as to govern and control "unsupervised" human flow (Erdoğan 2010).

For a deeper understanding of the rationales behind METİP process, Erdoğan's text (2010) is highly informative. As a member of METİP preparatory commission, Erdoğan's article is published in the periodical of Ministry of Labor and Social Security to clarify the institutional approach and the proposed solutions to the problems of agricultural workers with METİP. The text is also important as it includes a defensive argumentation to justify the allocation of public budget to aid agricultural workers. The remarkable difference of the text that distinguishes it from the academic reports on agricultural workers is the emphasis placed on "control" as a problem related to free movement of workers. In this sense, he emphasized the critical role and responsibility of intermediaries in regulating relations with employers, security forces and workers. The article therefore displays peculiar rationales behind the institutional support of intermediary system despite the popular portrayals of (modernizing) state institutions and (traditional) intermediary system as opposing sides. Within the text, Erdoğan (2010) repeatedly mentions central importance and responsibilities of intermediaries: "Agricultural intermediaries are the guarantors of workers for employers and guarantors of work and payment for workers". In various ways, he points to workers who work without intermediaries as a source of problem, a source of chaos since they are not recognizable (Erdoğan 2010):

> Migrant seasonal agricultural workers who travel to agricultural areas on their own and seek employment—other than those brought by agricultural intermediaries—cause more security problems (5).
>
> There are great difficulties in recording migrant seasonal agricultural workers who travel to agricultural areas on their own and seek employment, other than those brought by agricultural intermediaries (8).

The role of intermediaries is thus related to the order and control of the movements of migratory agricultural workers. Erdoğan also argues that workers without intermediaries loose their bargaining power and work for low wages:

> In cases where migrant seasonal agricultural workers travel to the employment area without establishing work relations beforehand, they lose their bargaining power and are either forced to work for lesser wages or search for work. Migrant seasonal agricultural workers who travel to agricultural areas on their own and seek employment -other than those brought by agricultural intermediaries- works for lesser wages. These workers are less controllable. They cause an increase in the circulation of workers (Erdogan 2010: 7).

Under the title of work and social security, Erdoğan, following a similar logic, describes their efforts to make intermediation contracts compulsory in agriculture. That is to say, we can note a tendency to make a contract between the employer and the intermediary -and not a contract between the employer and worker- compulsory:

> In order to materialize the practice of compulsory agricultural contract signed by intermediaries and landowners, controls by province and district local authorities will also be ensured. Intermediaries who do not have agricultural intermediation contracts will be ensured to sign contracts with the landowner. Intermediaries will be audited in terms of the fees they collect and the procedures they conduct (15).

The language of Erdoğan's text, other than intermediary issue, displays parallel tendencies with the rest of the literature on agricultural workers. The article is full of passive voices and invisible subjects that make it hard to find any other clear subjects who are being pointed at other than workers and intermediaries. He describes the current situation of agricultural workers and the problems leaving the perpetrators or respondents unclear as invisible subjects unless it is the workers themselves. Pollution of the environment, for example, is pointed as the source of contagious diseases among workers because: "The wastes of agricultural workers are not being discarded and left open" (Erdoğan 2010: 4). He does not state whose responsibility is to collect the wastes but announces that the project will provide specific trainings for workers that will make them conscious of environmental pollution and cleanness. Likewise, the perpetrators were unnoticed in such statements in the article: "Foreign labor is widespread in some regions since it is seen as cheap labour" or "In most of the times there is no clear water source or network. The need for water is provided from rivers nearby. The waters they are drinking are not analyzed" (Erdogan 2010: 4). There is a remarkable difference between invisibility of subjects of

these statements and the clarity of the worker-subject here: "Seasonal agricultural workers' attempts of swimming and cleaning in the irrigation channels are causing drowning cases" (Erdogan 2010: 5).

Throughout the text, Erdoğan refers to different modes of justification such as human rights, discourse of security and modern/izing state (as opposed to backward workers who need education and consciousness raising). His statements about agricultural workers go back and forth between victimization and othering. In the parts that are written to justify the projects victimization statements are foregrounded: "The fundamental premise of this project is to help at least a little bit to alleviate the conditions of agricultural workers, help them to have minimum conditions of living as dignified human beings". On the other hand, the statements of othering are on the front in the issues of child labor "families prefer them working the farms rather than sending to school" (Erdoğan 2010: 4); internal conflicts between workers "conflicts between tribes, blood feud" (Erdoğan 2010: 14); being open to manipulation "…the activities of manipulation and exploitation against national unity and order through using seasonal migratory agricultural workers shall be prevented. Precautions will be taken in the camp areas and farms in order to prevent manipulation of seasonal workers"[60] (Erdoğan 2010: 14). Throughout the text, a certain kind of subjectivity has been attached to workers as representatives of a particular culture through over-focusing on the areas where workers are displaying cultural characteristics that are depicted to them. Yet, at the same time, he refrains from direct references to ethnic identities of the workers. Nevertheless, his concluding remarks for justifying the project are remarkable for contrasting modern Turkey versus seasonal agricultural workers and displaying the underlying ethnic tensions while responding to the "expectable" concerns of taxpayers:

> On the other hand, seasonal migratory agricultural work is not a system that is promoted and approved. This is by no means an appropriate form of work for modern Turkey of 21st century. The project does not aim to promote this system. It is just an attempt to solve a social problem through taking a reality into account… In the camp areas, permanent residence will not be tolerated in any shape or form…[61] (Erdoğan 2010: 18).

---

[60] Mevsimlik gezici tarım işçileri kullanılmak suretiyle ülkenin milli birliği ve bütünlüğüne aykırı yönde istismar ve kışkırtmalarda bulunulması önlenecektir. Mevsimlik gezici tarım işçilerinin istismar edilmelerine karşı, konaklama alanında ve tarlalarda gerekli önemler alınacaktır.

[61] Öte yandan, mevsimlik gezici tarım işçiliği uygulaması kesinlikle teşvik edilen ve tasvip edilen bir sistem değildir. Bu çalışma şekli hiçbir şekilde 21. yüzyıl modern Türkiye'sine uymamaktadır. Bu projenin hiçbir şekilde amacıkbu sistemi teşvik etmek değil, sadece bir realiteyi dikkate alarak toplumsal sorunu çözmeye çalışmaktır. Bu amaçla, proje kapsamında hiçdbir şekilde kapsamdaki kişilere ayni veya nakdi yardımda bulunulmamaktadır. Sağlanan elektrik ve su gibi imkanlar da diğer vatandaşlarımız gibi ücret ödeyerek kullandırılacaktır. Barınma yerlerinde kesinlikle kalıcımyapıya müsaade edilmeyecek, uzun vadede bu işçilerin kalıcı konutlarda sürekli iş imkanlarıyla sabit ikametli çalışma imkanları araştırılacaktır.

Since the project was formulated as a direct transfer of public budget to agricultural workers through disregarding the responsibilities of employers, this is an institutional self-defense displaying the underlying ethnic tension and the concerns about workers' permanent settlement in the area as an outcome of provided services by the state. With this explanation, Erdoğan tries to clarify two points; first, this form of work is not modern—belongs to past and tradition—will disappear and it is the responsibility of modernizing state to intervene in this process; and second, the state aids are not going to help the workers to settle down in the area, instead, the state intervention and regulations is to ensure that permanent settlement of workers is not going to happen: "The opportunities for permanent jobs of workers within the permanent residences will be investigated provided that it will not be in the migrated region" (Erdoğan 2010). Literacy courses and occupational training were also proposed under the plan of METİP to create alternative job opportunities for agricultural workers (Erdoğan 2010: 11). Likewise, "National Employment Strategy 2014-2023" categorized seasonal agricultural workers as the most disadvantaged group envisioning a transfer of agricultural workers to other sectors as a solution to the problems of agricultural workers. The question again remains; who is going to handle these agricultural tasks and under which conditions?[62]

As it was before, after the implementation of METİP projects, the state has mostly been visible for migrant agricultural workers in the form of police/gendarme actions that is often hostile as routine identity checks and/or interventions to their travel and working rights. Intermediary position as regarded responsible for the actions of workers by the state agencies as something significant for the smooth running of these tense interactions[63].

Parliamentary Commission

During the METİP process, as a result of continuous parliamentary questions by parliamentarians from different parties, a parliamentary investigation committee was

[62] I have not yet come across any proposed solutions about how to supply the remaining seasonal labor demand in agriculture—setting aside bank credit commercials promoting the values of family farming and advising youngsters not to leave the villages *[e.g. The Şekerbank commercial]* (Öğünç 2014).

[63] Through the METİP process, we continued to witness various forms of conflicts in the area. In Sakarya, there were instances that Kurdish workers had been deported following disputes with locals which ended up in lynch attempts. Within the METİP process teams of police have been authorized to wait in Arifiye/Sakarya train station in order to forcibly return those workers without an intermediary or already established work connections. Although most of the farm workers are full citizens that gave them every right to move and travel they are latently accused for their political motives or agendas of resettlement when they seasonally migrate to western regions. I must add the speculative actions and declarations of local authorities expressing their concerns about terrorism.

established "to study the problems of seasonal agricultural workers, determine their needs and take necessary measures, and to carry out studies to improve their professional and social lives". The Turkish Grand National Assembly decided the establishment of committee on 11th November of 2014. The committee was composed of 17 members and was named "Parliamentary Investigation Committee to Study the Problems of Seasonal Agricultural Workers and to determine the Necessary Precaution". In 2015, the committee published a 256-page report, which includes statements about the problems of workers and solution suggestions (TBMM 2015).

The report of Parliamentary Commission on seasonal workers is highly critical of post-2010 (Memorandum and METİP) regulations and proposes to sign ILO-184[64] and include all agricultural workers in Work Law:

> Law no. 4857 leaves agricultural businesses employing less than 50 workers out of scope. Every farm, in which seasonal agricultural workers are employed, even when only a single worker is in question, should be included in the scope of this law. In order to secure the protection of the legal rights of agricultural workers, there is an urgent need for a comprehensive legislative regulation that defines agricultural workers and secures their legal rights (TBMM 2015: 201).

The implementation of ILO convention no. 184 "Safety Health in Agriculture Convention" in 2001, guarantees by international regulation, the rights of paid agricultural workers (without considering their permanent, temporary or seasonal status) to enjoy the same protections and occupational health and safety measures with workers of other sectors. The convention also regulates minimum accommodation facilities, work periods, protection against occupational injuries and diseases. Extensive obligatory safety measures are listed in the convention. There are also articles concerning "the special needs of women agricultural workers... in relation to pregnancy, breastfeeding and reproductive health" and young workers and hazardous work. According to the convention, it is necessary to specify the rights and duties of employers and workers, and to form an adequate system of inspection for agricultural workplaces, provided with adequate means, corrective measures and appropriate penalties (Articles 4, 5).

The parliamentary questions suggesting the establishment of the commission did also have clauses that suggest creating alternative means of employment to seasonal migrant agricultural workers. Particularly representatives of Kurdish region (representatives of out-migrating provinces) have asked for poverty alleviation measures such as

[64] C184 - Safety and Health in Agriculture Convention, 2001 (Entry into force: 2003, September 20) Adoption: Geneva, 89th ILC session (2001, June 21) (Retrieved from www.ilo.org).

redistribution of agricultural land, projects for returning to villages, investment to the region to provide new employment opportunities for these people to stop seasonal migration to other regions. In fact, public representatives of seasonal workers ranging from small associations (e.g. MEVTİDER: Seasonal Workers Association *[Mevsimlik İşçiler Derneği]*) to municipalities (Diyarbakır Municipality) have also been engaging in projects to provide extra employment opportunities in the hometowns of seasonally migrant workers. It is expectable for representatives of out-migrating provinces to focus on demands of current workers and ask for state-funded projects to stop seasonal migration. Yet, it is questionable for the government and public institutions to approach the issue merely as a problem of migration and poverty in a way disregarding the wage-labor processes and labor demand as the cause of that migration. The insecurely structured agricultural labor market putting workers in a vulnerable and disadvantaged position *vis-a-vis* employers is neither created nor limited by seasonal migration. The report of Parliamentary Commission displays a balanced account in this sense through addressing both the peculiar problems of seasonal migratory workers and emphasizing the necessity of working rights in the sector.

4.5 Conclusion

This chapter illustrated the role of the state in the structure of the agricultural wage-labor processes providing employers' access to an exceptional labor force. I questioned the equal citizenship ideal of the Republic through the disadvantaged- minority and women agricultural workers having trouble in realization of their rights due to their labor market positions. The dispute on working rights of agricultural workers in this sense is categorized as a citizenship crisis. I offer to think the persistence of legal exceptionalism in the sector together with the high shares of impoverished minority groups and women in the sector, who have little access to political and institutional process and networks to ensure their social rights. Second, I presented the disadvantaged status of atypical jobs within labor legislation and the recent regulations of SSGSS law. Then I questioned the politics of surveys and the invisibility of these urban women's agricultural work within public surveys. Finally, I discussed the state regulations in agricultural labor market with a particular emphasis on post-2010 process.

In brief, Turkish state has been present in and intervened/shaped the agricultural labor market in many ways; not only through dual legislation and exceptional treatment of agricultural labor market, through police/gendarme actions, through funding projects which are directly intervening in the lives of workers but also with repercussions of

structural violence towards minorities. As Duruiz (2011) points out, especially in the case of Kurdish people, “the state … haunt the present as an entity which killed their friends and family, evacuated and burnt down their villages, fields, animals and homes, depriving them of any means of sustaining their lives” (49-50). Despite all, in most of the mainstream accounts problematizing the conditions of agricultural workers the state is presented as a neglecting actor whose presence is needed in the field as a carer. The popular implications of cultural backwardness rests on hegemonic dualities (West/East, modern/traditional) which posits a contrast between traditional (eastern, backward) culture of the workers and modern(izing) state by ignoring the political processes including dual labor legislation, state support of the intermediary system, and also the repercussions of the structural violence of the state towards minorities. That is precisely why it is necessary to question the role of state in the current structure of agricultural labor market.

CHAPTER V

THE FIELDWORK, PLACES OF OBSERVATION, PARTICIPANTS

In this Chapter, I will present the data and the details of fieldwork, places of observation and the basic information about the participants of case study in 2015. The fieldwork consists of 2 years (2011-2) of participant observation and unstructured interviews and a case study in 2015 including semi-structured, in-depth interviews with 52 participant agricultural workers.

5.1 The Fieldwork

5.1.1 Data

The data used in this study consist of official and personal accounts on agricultural workers, the historical (keyword) search of a national mainstream daily newspaper *Milliyet* since 1950s and the data collected during fieldwork. I tried to combine and discuss the fieldwork data with the findings of discourse analysis.

Secondary Sources

A significant part of this research is discourse analysis through scrutinizing the academic literature, news articles, bureaucratic texts and declarations of politicians. I do not approach to the contemporary discourse on agricultural workers, simply as intended distortions of reality by scholars, bureaucrats and news reporters, but as a sign of a hegemonic language which has been constructed within the course of history and setting the main framework for the ways in which we are talking about agricultural workers today.

The preference of looking at the evolution of the discourse(s) and the concept of discourse, utilized here, owes much to the post-structuralist accounts on social reality, and particularly inspired by Laclau and Mouffe's understanding of discursive structures. Rather than referring to a broad language use, in post-structural discourse analysis "discourse" refers to an epistemological system through which subjects and objects are brought into being (Pascale 2013: 14). In *Hegemony and Socialist Strategy*, Laclau and Mouffe (2008) challenged the established categories and dualities of Marxism through emphasizing the material character of every discursive structure and rejecting the

exclusiveness of thought and reality (171, 174). A discursive formation is, as Laclau and Mouffe (2008) pointed out, structured not only through language, but also through institutions, practices, and rituals (174). In fact, every object is constituted as an object of discourse because they cannot constitute themselves as objects outside any discursive condition of emergence (Laclau & Mouffe 2008: 171). Since all social acts are composed of both linguistic and non-linguistic elements, we cannot separate language from actions. A discursive structure is, therefore, not a merely cognitive or contemplative entity; "it is an articulatory practice which constitutes and organizes social relations" (Laclau & Mouffe 2008: 156).

This framework of utilizing discourses for the analysis contributes to our understanding as a way of transcending the limitations of an analysis of particular individuals or groups. Discourses transcend individual formulations because they demarcate the perspectives and standards used to elaborate concepts, theories, and knowledge (Foucault 1972, 1994). Discourse analysis, in this sense, aims to situate meaning in historical contexts and links it to power dynamics as we inherit a ready-made language which is a product of social history.

Harper (1996) explains the benefits of such an account on the issue of poverty while he was arguing for the necessity of exploring the public explanations and images of poverty to examine the systems that maintain poverty:

> …arguing against individualist analyses of poverty- or utilizing a discursive framework… might provide a more adequate understanding of such explanations and also extend research beyond merely individualistic accounts to include the texts and images produced by both individuals and organizations, and in which those individuals and organizations are themselves located (262).

A focus on discourse, he puts, enables research to bridge the traditional individual/society divide since when we are looking at how discourses work it is, in a sense, irrelevant whether that discourse is produced by an individual or by government or another organization (Harper 1996: 257). He, then, points out the lack of connections between poverty and richness in the media compared to the abundance of expressions on the ties between poverty and culture (Harper 1996: 257). That's particularly why the analysis should include both the details of the current literature on agricultural workers and what is missing in that literature. The historical analysis of discourses (news research on daily *Milliyet*) on agricultural workers (Chapter III) in that sense will be particularly helpful to see what is missing in the current literature, which is above all, an emphasis on the rights of workers and responsibilities of the employers. The lack of employers within the picture is inherently related to the ways in which intermediaries are fore grounded within

contemporary accounts on agricultural work. Consequently the discussion on intermediation in Chapter VII is also built on a discourse analysis on the particular tendencies of academic scholarship in reporting on agricultural wage-labor processes - in a way that is pointing at intermediaries rather than employers as responsible agents.

The Fieldwork Data

The fieldwork data collected throughout two periods (May-September 2011/ June-August 2012) of participant observation/unstructured conversations and a later visit (June-September 2015) for semi-structured interviews with agricultural workers in Adapazarı. While the data of the first two years is day-to-day field notes of the researcher and occasionally taken voice records of the conversations; the data of last visit (52 interviews) consist of voice records of semi-structured interviews and the questionnaire forms filled by the researcher during the interview (Appendix A) which are transcribed to SPSS for descriptive and comparative information to portray the patterns in a more systematic way. The interview forms are designed as a combination of open-ended and survey questions and partly filled throughout the interviews.

The patterns of distinct wage-labor processes of groups of women had been observed in the first two years of fieldwork made it possible to define the places and the participants of the in-depth interviews in 2015. The participants were thus selected for theoretical purposes, rather than statistical ones. Snowball sampling was used in selecting the participants of in-depth interviews throughout the study. Following the lead of participants was both rewarding for providing a relaxed atmosphere for interviews in the presence of mutual contacts and for giving clues about the relations between women.

5.1.2 Entrance to the Field: Questioning Pre-conceived Categories

My first time in the field was in May 2011. That year, I spent most of my time in the neighborhoods and villages that are close to the city center except visits to the Northern coast for hazelnut harvest. Within three months, I had the chance to talk with workers, farmers as landowners, wives of these farmers, intermediaries and officials from the chamber of farmers and provincial directorate of agriculture, police and military police. I tried to learn about the organization of farm work, working hours, wages, transportation of workers, availability of food and water in the workplaces, the role of intermediaries and crew leaders and accommodation in the cases of seasonal migrant workers. I had planned to be able to make a comparison between the conditions of two groups of workers that I categorized as “migrant” and “local”.

The initial plan included hazelnut harvest[65] as the major source of demand for seasonal migrant labour in the region. Every year, thousands of workers come to the region between July and October to work in hazelnut harvest. An important part of those seasonal migrant workers come from southeastern cities, especially Diyarbakır, Mardin and Şanlıurfa, as I learned from the police[66]. The bulk of workers arrive by train and they are usually "welcomed" by a group of police waiting at the train station to question their intentions, check their criminal records and restrict their mobility if needed (Field Notes, 2011).

Seasonally migrant workers have been paid less compared to "local" ones as stated in many research and reports (İHD 2008; Yıldırım 2015; Ulukan & Ulukan 2011; Pelek 2010[67]). With respect to this information, my initial research question was questioning the vulnerability of these Kurdish workers with regard to the interaction between those workers and police, state officials, farmers and local people. The police occasionally limit their rights to travel. They have usually been isolated in their areas of accommodation during the season and subject to violence and insult in their interaction with local people (Field Notes, 2011). They frequently had to defend themselves by claiming that they have no intentions to stay and they were here just for work although there is no law against it (Pelek 2010: 89; İHD 2008, Mazlumder 2008; Ulukan & Ulukan 2008)[68]. National press had released instances disclosing the environments of violence as threats and lynches towards agricultural workers in the region. I did not witness any incident, but the tension was present in locals" (farmers and officials) own stories/narratives. I have been told about violent events including assaults to the workers, which were claimed as triggered by "terror events in southeast Turkey" in the expressions of farmers (Field Notes, 2011). I tried to understand how stigmatization works in the daily life, questioning the effects of

[65] Hazelnut is the largest income-generating product for the region and it is harvested by thousands of migrant workers arriving to the region between August and October. Hazelnut production is almost the only agricultural activity of the districts near the shores of Black Sea especially that has a high altitude. Highest share of agricultural product aid is reserved for hazelnut garden owners in this city. For example in 2013, 53% of (app. 70 million TL) all the agricultural aid of the province was provided to hazelnut garden owners in Sakarya (Sakarya Valiliği, 2014).

[66] The police officers in Karasu (Sakarya) showed me their records of the hometowns of workers and the communication information of their intermediaries (Fieldnotes, 2011).

[67] Pelek (2010) claimed that the wage hierarchy is ranked from top to bottom as local workers, Georgians and Kurds, respectively (8).

[68] Parallel to the NGO reports, Pelek (2010) also noted workers' apologetic explanations for seasonal migration to Ordu: 'If we had land in our hometowns, we would have never come here'. (89). Likewise in Ordu, Ulukan & Ulukan (2011) interviewed an intermediary coming from Urfa who complained that people treated them as terrorists and they do not want to come and would have not come if they have either jobs or land to cultivate in their hometowns' (14).

inadequate social networks of seasonal migrant workers, temporality of work relations, negative impacts of police pressure while trying to compare their conditions with the local workers[69]. I visited a couple of villages that year, interviewed hazelnut employers/farmers and two groups of migrant workers coming from Edirne and Diyarbakır. However, 2011 was a low year for hazelnut with a minimum demand for workers. The authorities banned the labor camps and the police limited the workers' entrance into the city except for the ones who had a deal with the employers beforehand. The absence of labor camps limited their public spaces and my access to workers. I experienced difficulty in entering in one-to-one conversations with the migrant workers in the presence of whole crew and crew leaders in the workplaces. At the end of that summer, my focus had already switched to the settled groups and I decided to limit the scope of the study with the workers in the city after facing with the inadequateness of the preconceived duality of local and migrant workers to analyze the complex patterns of agricultural labor market in the region. Apparently, the hierarchical duality between local and migrant workers can be misleading since these are not two mutually exclusive categories even in the case of hazelnut harvest. A significant portion of local labour force is coming from either Roma associated or the former migrants' neighborhoods in the city (from East, South East, and Black Sea regions). The categories of local/migrant workers can also be questioned regarding a part of "local" Roma's are also migrating seasonally to other regions for working in agriculture. Moreover, an appropriate analysis of the "local" worker category requires an investigation of the complex labor patterns in rural Sakarya (which includes those unpaid family laborers and labor exchanges making it harder to define the limits and bases of their paid work) that seemed unattainable with the (human and capital) sources of this study.

By May 2011, I had also started to search for agricultural workers in the city. Yet, it seemed like a hopeless try at the beginning. From almost all the people I met and even from the officials I got the same response: "No"… "There are no farm workers in the town"… "Not anymore"… "No, except from those coming for hazelnut in the season" … "There were women working in agriculture in our neighborhood in the past, but they are not working any more" (Field Notes, 2011).

[69] The differences between local and seasonally migrant workers' wages had been reported within different studies (Ulukan & Ulukan 2011; Yıldırım 2015; Pelek 2010).

People were referring to the mechanization in agriculture and its role in reducing the demand for labour due to widespread corn farming as feed grain in the region[70]. But there were still other crops that have been cultivated around the city requiring labour force. Who were picking them? It took a while for me to realize that the bulk of agricultural workers are now from "other" neighborhoods where new migrants and ethnic minorities are concentrated and that is why I got those definite "no"s from officials, mukhtars, farmers and former farmers at the beginning. In the peripheral areas, particularly settlements of relatively new migrants and Kurds and Roma, a significant part of the inhabitant women have been involved in agricultural work as paid laborers.

5.1.3 Fieldwork 2011-2

In 2011, I visited a couple of villages and neighborhoods such as Büyük Rüstmeler, Çökekler, Güneşler Yeni Mahalle, Yeni Mahalle (Erenler), Arabacıalanı (Serdivan), Kuyumculu (Karasu), Kurumeşe (Karasu) and the wholesale market for potato and onions (Patates Hali), and interviewed the muhtars and officials from farmers association (Ziraat Odası), provincial directorate of agriculture (Tarım İl Müdürlüğü), the local police and gendarme forces:

To see the places visited in 2011-2 in MAP 1, please copy the URL:
https://www.google.com/maps/d/edit?mid=zQ42j5dGWDKo.kdN3M0sU9Z0s

Or scan the QR code below:

MAP 1: Fieldwork: Visited Locations in 2011-2

Additionally, I started meeting landowners through my personal acquaintances and extended the network with snowball sampling. They helped me in reaching out to the well-known intermediaries in the city who were located within large networks of women. The interviews with these intermediaries were a huge help to understand labor processes in the city; yet, it was not an option to contact workers through them because of their

[70] The harvest process of corn that will be feed crops (*silaj*) is highly mechanized requiring minimum amounts of manual labor.

unwillingness and also my concerns for the researcher's independent status in the eyes of workers.

Among the worker groups, I initially became involved with the women workers that I randomly met in the wholesale market through house meetings and tea gatherings in their neighborhoods. Then, I went to the office of Peace and Democracy Party *[BDP]* and asked help from the representatives for finding a contact with Kurdish workers. With their help, I first met with a group of young Kurdish women who were working in lettuce harvest in Güneşler Yeni Mahalle. My contacts with the larger group have enlarged in time and I met a former seasonally migrant worker Kurdish family in Arabacıalanı who not only kindly hosted me in their house a number of times but also provided the bases for reaching a network of workers in the neighborhood. Within this network, I got particularly involved within a crew (6) professionalized in corn harvest. Despite my low performance, joining the crew at 4 *am* and my efforts to help had a positive effect on our connection and mutual trust. I have kept my contact with this group of workers since then and visited two of them again in 2015 for in-depth interviews. Meeting women as groups enabled observation of the relations between them, particularly the networks of solidarity.

The real challenge for the researcher was finding mutual contacts with the Roman groups which are supposed to help through conducting interviews. In fact, I realized the scope of their involvement in the agricultural jobs in the region after weeks of misguidance by my informants. Even when I went to Karaköy (as one of the Roma settlements in the region), the commanding officer of the gendarme (the gendarme building is at the entrance of the neighborhood) made me return, strongly arguing that Romas are not working in agriculture and it is dangerous for me to walk around. That neighborhood, however, later became one of my designated places of interviews in 2015 and all the Roma residents that I met in the neighborhood have been working in agriculture. In 2011, I had interviewed 6 women within the Romani settlement of Yeni Mahalle (Erenler). Before that visit, I had met with a representative of a non-governmental organization providing micro-credits to women and she led me to learn about the importance of agricultural jobs for the Romani communities in the region. She had personal acquaintances within the community and kindly accompanied me in my first visit to the neighborhood. I have stayed in touch with these groups of women afterwards and returned to two of them again in 2015 to carry out in-depth interviews. Yet, at the end of the first year of fieldwork, I returned back to Ankara with a concern about the inadequateness of my Roman contacts to carry out a balanced case study in the city.

In the spring of 2012, I had volunteered in a youth project called "Living Library"[71] designed for raising awareness on the biases towards misrepresented groups in the society. The project called for human books such as Armenians, trans-women, feminists and Roma that are willing to be questioned one-to-one by the participants. As an unexpected coincidence, during the activities, I met with the Roma participant, which opened a way for me to meet different Roman communities in Adapazarı and Sapanca through establishing mutual contacts. After the project, the Roma participant introduced me to another active member of Roma Association who was extremely helpful not only through providing a rich personal network and contact information but also through his valuable insights about the community. He guided me through a few family visits around the Ankara Castle including a seasonally migrant family from Çanakkale working in agriculture. Just like Roma neighborhoods in Adapazarı, eviction was already on the agenda within the ongoing process of an urban transformation project on the settlements around the Ankara castle.

I found the chance to interview two distinct Roman groups in the summer of 2012 in Güneşler Yeni Mahalle and Gazi Paşa Mahallesi (Kestanelik Mevkii - Sapanca). I initially started with the acquaintances of the families that I met in Ankara. After I met my first contacts with references and explained my project and intentions; the women I interviewed helped me to meet others. This time, I devoted more time to one-to-one interviews with women at their houses, which turn out to be a major source of data and an insightful guidance for me throughout the end of the study. The data of the fieldwork in 2012, consisting of field notes and (14) voice records, are very rich in expressions, emotions, and nuances of women.

5.1.4 Fieldwork 2015

In June 2015[72], I returned to the field once more, to systematize the data and check the patterns that I had observed. This time, I limited the scope of observations to mainly five places: two Roma (in Yeni Mahalle and Karaköy) and two Kurdish (in Arabacıalanı and Bağlar Mahallesi) identified settlements and the potato wholesale market as different places of organization of agricultural work in the city. The conversations with mukhtar's were also a huge help for not only limiting these places to study but also grasping the demographics, history and the transfer of agricultural jobs between neighborhoods.

[71] Further information about the project is available in the website: http://www.yasayankutuphane.net

[72] I could not visit the field for two years because of maternity leave in 2013 and because of visiting researcher position abroad in 2014.

The places of observation within 2015 Case Study are marked in Map 2. The Google Map website can be seen by copying the URL:
https://www.google.com/maps/d/viewer?mid=zQ42j5dGWDKo.k_gHZanB_s04

or scanning the QR code below:

Map 2: 2015 Case Study

As seen in Map 2, the settlements of observation hardly overlap with the officially defined boundaries of the neighborhoods. Most of the time, the referred settlement is a separated area that is physically distinguishable from the other parts of the neighborhood as in the case of Karaköy. In the case of Arabacıalanı, the boundary of the settlement is drawn by the researcher following the accounts of the residents since there were just small signs of separation from the other parts of the officially defined neighborhood. During my first visit of the group in Arabacıalanı, my contact person described his home referring to invisible signs distinguishing the (older) Kurdish settlement from the other parts of the neighborhood. When he said "when you turn right from that the street, you will see the entrance of the neighborhood" it didn't make any sense to me since there were not any space of vacancy and two/three floor apartments continued throughout my way. In time, I have developed a sense of such boundaries not only through locating the old houses but also observing the social signs distinguishing the new middle-class residents who cautiously lock their garden gates and exterior doors.

Through in-depth interviews, I gathered information on the individual work histories, experiences and expectations of women from mainly three different groups: two groups living in peripheral areas of the city center, associated with either Kurdish or Roman identities, and those living closer to the center, who are mostly migrated from Black Sea region or nearby towns and villages. I asked how and why they started working in agriculture, the composition of the working teams, and relationships with employers along with the information about their family, migration history, land ownership and social ties. By tracing the patterns and change through work histories, experiences and expectations

of workers, I tried to understand the different patterns of recruitment and wage-labor processes.

The analysis will be heavily drawn from the personal accounts of women especially in the discussions of work experiences and expectations which is collected through in-depth interviews and unstructured conversations throughout the fieldwork. In discussing the cases, I will specify the date and context of observation/quotation and the way it is recorded such as field note or voice file.

5.2 Description of the Field

In this part, I will briefly present the history and social structure of Adapazarı[73] to introduce the field. The next section will be a detailed analysis of the places of observation within the city.

There are two main reasons necessitating an examination of the history and social structure of the city with regard to the research question. Firstly, although Sakarya is a province in which agrarian population and production density are preserved, the hinterland of Adapazarı is a migration receiving and growing industrial area. Güneşler, Arabacıalanı, Karaköy, Bağlar neighborhoods, which constitute a major part of the field research, are living spaces that were built upon the agricultural lands and expanded essentially as migrant-worker settlements in 1990s. Here the point I want to emphasize is that, women who work in agriculture sector in Adapazarı, keep doing so within an area, where indeed there are other job possibilities, with higher wages and secure employment, generated as an outcome of expanding industry and service sector. This situation gives one an idea about the women's condition in job market. Moreover, the finding that majority of the (Turkish) women agricultural workers in the central neighborhoods of the study will not likely to transfer their profession to the next generation, indicates that those who are going to live on precarious agricultural jobs will mostly be those, who live in the migrant-worker neighborhoods at the outskirts of the city. Within the scope of this study, the finding that women agricultural workers and their families living in Karaköy/Roma settlement and Bağlar (Van) neighborhood—which are predominantly identified with a single ethnic group—are mostly located outside of the secure/formal labor market is even

[73] Adapazarı is the central district of Sakarya that is a separate province since 1954 and the name of the city. This duality about the city's name, which has always been confusing, became even more inextricable after having metropolitan status in 2000. Along with this status change, Adapazarı Municipality, which formerly worked within its urban space together with the affiliated municipalities, became one of the equivalent municipalities that is responsible for a specific part of the urban space. The signboards stating Adapazarı at the city entrance was replaced with Sakarya. Throughout this study, Adapazarı is used as the name of the city in the way it has been and is still being used, exceeding the boundaries of the Adapazarı Municipality today.

more striking considering that Adapazarı and its surrounding area provides a growing and developing labor market.

Secondly, this study suggests having a different look to the multi-cultural, peaceful city argument that is frequently used with regards to Adapazarı through the participants of the study. The discourse of multicultural city of tolerance, which seems to be appropriated by city historians, politicians and residents with whom I had the chance to converse, not only rises upon the forgotten history (1915) but also from the invisibility of some lives and labor processes. It will be possible to dramatically demonstrate the invisibility of agricultural labor process, when this perception of the city as multicultural and peaceful is analyzed along with the feeling of exclusion expressed by many of the Kurdish and Roman participants of this study and their lives spent between their neighborhood and fields.

5.2.1 Adapazarı

History

Adapazarı is one of the cities in hinterland of İstanbul and the capital of Sakarya province. The city is built on agricultural lands on the junction of motorways of Ankara-İstanbul and Bursa-Eskişehir. In Armenian sources the settlement is referred as *Donigaşen* and has became an Ottoman city only in 19th century along with the growth of its population. The city owes its development after 1852 as a district of Kocaeli (İzmid) and its present name to the bazaar that was set up on the area called *ada*. The crafts that were present at the bazaar via various salesmen now live on the street names in Adapazarı, also showing that the city transformed from a bazaar into a city (Edecin 2007). The neighborhoods of the city were formed as a result of unification of the villages that were built-up by craft guilds. These neighborhoods are still known by craft names: *Tığcılar, Semerciler, Pabuççular, Hasırcılar, Celepciler, Yağcılar.*

The returns records of 1844[74] reveal that throughout Adapazarı, the number of households that did not own agricultural land in the hinterland is very few. According to the records, in comparison to other regions, the welfare of farmers is at higher levels in Adapazarı (Odabaş 2007: 51-3). One of the factors that increased the economic importance of Adapazarı and its surrounding area in 19th century was rich forestry land. These forests

[74] *Temmettuat Defterleri* replaced the records called *Tahrir* by 19th century. These records include information regarding the name, title, profession, movable and immovable property; the amount of land that obligant owns or is at disposal, other income, taxes and such of the householder (Öz 2000; Odabaş 2007: 24).

provided timber to the navy for shipbuilding and also supplied the Palace and İstanbul with coal and wood (Narin 2004: 12). Agricultural goods cultivated in Adapazarı had a major importance for İstanbul's food supply, which had a population of over half million in 19th century (Narin 2014: 13).

In the end of 19th century, a branch of the Régie Company that had the buyers' monopoly of tobacco (the Régie Company[75]) was opened at the city center. The conflict between the producers and the company, which set the prices of tobacco being the buyers' monopoly and possessed its own police force, is remarkable (Narin 2007: 80-5; Narin 2009). In 1913, as Muslims start to constitute a bigger part of commercial life, Islamic Bank of Commerce was established to provide an alternative to credit companies run by the non-Muslims in Adapazarı and its surrounding. The bank, which occupies an important place in the history of Turkish national banking, continued to be active until 2000s under the name of Turkish Bank of Commerce.

At that time, Ahmet Şerif Bey[76] describes Adapazarı as follows:

> As soon as you take a step to Adapazarı, you will be amazed to see Rumelian and Caucasion, Bosnian and Crimean, Turkish and Kurdish, Laz and Yuruk side by side. That is why this place is different than others. All these people belonging to different groups still preserve their language, the way of life and habits they had in their hometowns (*Tanin*, no 1757, 1913, November 15, as cited in Tuna: 2009, May 6).

As Ahmet Şerif observed, the real development of Adapazarı district was realized as a result of the migration movements in the second half of 19th century. After 1850, with the effect of Crimean War, Ottoman-Russian War and Balkans War, refugees were settled in İzmit/Adapazarı area in four big waves (Bayraktar 1997). In 1876, because of the Ottoman-Russian War, those refugees who came from Caucaus were generally located in the villages; refugees of the 1912 Balkan War were located in villages and cities; those that came from the Black Sea bank during World War I to forestland and mountainsides; and among the refugees who came from northern Greece after Lausanne Treaty and

[75] The Régie (*la Société de la régie co-intéressée des tabacs de l'empire Ottoman*) was a foreign investment company formed in 1884 after *Muharrem Kararnamesi* (Narin 2007: 80). The Ottoman government granted it a monopoly over the domestic tobacco market. Yet, despite being granted monopoly rights, the Régie Company had to compete with producers (smugglers) whose operations surpassed that of Régie particularly during the early years of the monopoly (Nacar 2014: 535).

[76] Tanin newspaper, which is the publication of Committee of Union and Progress, sent Ahmet Şerif—one of its reporters—to Anatolia in 1909. The excursions that contiuned from 1909 to 1914, took place on a wide area including Bursa, Balıkesir, Isparta, Eskişehir, Ankara, Adana, Mersin, Bayburt, Karadeniz, Adapazarı and Bolu (Şirin 2013: 526).

population exchange, those who came from villages were relocated to villages and those who came from the city to city[77] (Edecin 2007; Selvi 2005).

As a result of these migrations, the population, which was around 16 thousand in 1831, reached 120 thousand by 1913 (Selvi 2005). Another outcome of migration movements is that, it caused proportional downsizing of non-muslim population in the region, which will be subject to massacre and forced displacement in 1915. According to the population data dated 1831 regarding *Cezayir-i Bahr-i Sefid* Province, Adapazarı (Adapazarı *maa* Sapanca[78]) population was 9611—male population of 5337 Muslim and 4274 *reaya*[79] (Narin 2007: 30; Karpat 2003: 154). Adapazarı-Geyve census data shows that in 1881/1893, 10.702 and in 1914, 16.461 Armenians were registered at Adapazarı (Selvi 2005). Considering the two essential objectives of Committee of Union and Progress, namely food supply of İstanbul and ethnic population policy, it can be said that in this period, the state favored settlement of muslim population in the area in order to ensure an increase in the agricultural production and a change in population balance in favor of muslims[80].

The city kept growing after 1920s too with continuing migrations. It is remarkable that in Sakarya until 1990s migration was not only towards cities but also to villages. Moreover, the first migrants that came directly to the city and settled there are the Kurdish migrants in 1970s. Thus, during the period between 1955 and 2000, city population in Sakarya was below the country average, whereas rural population has always been more than urban population (Edecin 2007: 44). When the development of rural and urban population in Turkey is observed, it is seen that according to the first census realized in 1927, urban population is 24.22 % of the total population, whereas rural population is 75,78 %. The result of census 2000 shows that 65% of Turkey's total population lives in the cities and the remaining 35% in the villages. In Marmara region, which has ⅓ of Turkey's city population, the proportion of city population is relatively high due to social and economic

[77] At that period, for refugees who were relocated as a result of population exchange, residential area was decided depending upon where they previously lived (from villages to villages, from city to the urban settlements). (Edecin, 2007)

[78] Adapazarı was within the borders of Kocaeli shire at 1831 census, it is mentioned along with Sapanca and it was under control of Sapanca. The census included only men. (Narin, 2007: 3)

[79] With regards to this census, the concept of reaya refers to the non-muslim taxpayers. However, in the classical age reaya refers to taxpaying people.

[80] For a detailed analysis of Committee of Union and Progress's settlement policy and 1915 massacre see Dündar, F. (2008). Modern Türkiye'nin Şifresi: İttihat ve Terakki'nin Etnisite Mühendisliği, 1913-1918. During the years between 1863-1864, Moşnin the Russian Consul of Trabzon addressed the situation as follows: "Circassians were relocated at places wherever the Ottoman State wanted a population increase in favor of Muslims" (Kasumov and Kasumov 1999: 96, as cited Düzenli 2006).

developments. With regard to the development of city and village population in Sakarya, it is observed that the situation is the other way around compared to Marmara region and Turkey in general. In Sakarya, the population of the villages has always been higher than that of the city, due to existence of fertile agricultural lands and the high revenue received from agriculture. Despite the closeness of Adapazarı to İstanbul and İzmit–except sugar, wagon and agricultural equipment factories and foreign invested Uniroval-Goodyear—only after 1980s big industrial plants turned towards Adapazarı (Yıldırım 1997: 197). Especially beginning from 1990s with the effect of the decrease of available areas for industrial plants in industrial centers such as İstanbul, İzmit and Bursa, along with the increasing cost of land and labor, industrial investments turned towards Adapazarı, which provided cheap labor and is located on the transportation network (Ufuk 2008). Particularly in this period, industrialization led to migration and vice versa. That is why, in and around Adapazarı in particular, fertile agricultural lands were misused (Ufuk 2008). Many of the neighborhoods within the scope of this study—*Güneşler, Karaköy, Bağlar and Arabacıalanı*—were developed and turned into a living space during this period.

Together with the development of industrial sector in Sakarya urban population exceeded rural population for the first time in 2000 (Edecin 2007: 42). In this period, although there was an increase regarding urban population, rural population maintained itself too, with a small increase. A reason for that is the intensity of the agricultural activity in the villages (Edecin 2007: 46). By 2007, the rate of rural-urban population in Sakarya reached Turkey average. Urbanization rate of Adapazarı, on the other hand, has always been above province average that by 2007, 91% of its population lived in the city (Edecin 2007).

Between the years 1955 and 2000 the population of Sakarya province had a constantly increasing trend (Işık 2007: 39). When the migration data is observed, it can be seen that, except for the period of 1995-2000 (probably because of the effect of 1999 earthquake), Sakarya has always had increasing rates of migration and its population density is way above the average rate in Turkey (Edecin 2007: 47). As for the period after 2007, we can say that, according to the statistical data provided by TUİK it still shows a stable though little population increase (TUİK, Population of Provinces By Years, 2007-2014).

Among the domestic migration Sakarya received, Black Sea region occupies an important role. In 1975 census, the rate of people who were living in Sakarya but born in another province amounted to 16 percent. 40 percent of those people migrated from Trabzon, Artvin, Giresun, Ordu, Rize and Gümüşhane (Bayraktar 1997: 129). Kurdish migration to the region was intensified after 1980s (Bayraktar 1997: 130). In 2000's, other than close

regions like İstanbul, Ankara, Bolu, Düzce, İzmit, those cities that take the lead regarding the migration Sakarya received are still Ağrı, Artvin, Giresun, Ordu, Erzurum and Trabzon (Edecin 2007: 80). A considerable part of those who work at agriculture in Adapazarı are women that are born in the nearby villages and those who recently migrated from Black Sea region and the East. Güneşler, Karaköy and Bağlar neighborhoods as places of observation for this study are still developing residential places welcoming these migrants.

Diversity

Despite the violent deportation of non-muslim population of the city in the near history, its inhabitants, scholars and political authorities have frequently described today's social life in Adapazarı with reference to its multi-cultural character reflecting a "peaceful togetherness of cultures". Representatives of conservative parties, particularly the representatives of Justice and Development Party—that have been consistently supported by the inhabitants of the city at the elections—have praised the city in their public declarations as a remainder of Ottoman social structure and a model of tolerance. President Recep Tayyip Erdoğan has denominated the city as the "last Ottoman city" setting an example of cultural togetherness for Turkey's future (*Sakarya54*: 2015, April 11).

Similarly, in his article called "The Last Ottoman City: Adapazarı", city historian Fahri Tuna[81] describes the city as follows: "Adapazarı is a city of peace today in which people of 14 different ethnic origin, a part of which migrated together with the old Islamic community Manav, another part's grandfathers, fathers or themselves migrated from Ottoman lands, live in harmony" (Tuna, *Medyabar*, 2010 January 13). The article named "Last Ottoman City" that was published in newspaper *Zaman* and written by Ülkü Özel Akagündüz, also praises Adapazarı as a city where different identities live in harmony and describe the city as "little Ottoman". Akagündüz, who mentions that she has been to the city in order to do a research on social life, describes the settlement of those who came with the migration by Ottoman generosity and tolerance of the locals. She says, "Manavlar, sedentary Turkish people, who accepted migrations to Adapazarı with maturity and favor. They are silent, calm and patient" (Akagündüz, *Zaman*, 2009). Another newspaper article is by Aynur Tartan published in *Hürriyet*, tells about her

[81] The author's articles on the history and social life of the city have recently collected in a book. For a good example of historical account praising the city through multicultural togetherness without mentioning Armenian heritage see Tuna, F., (2011). Aynalıkavak Yazıları, Değişim Yayınları.

interviews with the artists and politicians from Adapazarı with an emphasis on how proud they all are of the cultural mosaic of their hometown (Tartan, *Hürriyet*: 2012, April 7). For example, she mentions Şaban Dişli, parliament member from AKP of the time, expressing how great his proud is for everyone living in peace and the city being a cultural mosaic. It is possible to find more examples looking at the local newspapers and magazines:

> The city, migrations to which date back to a hundred years, itself demonstrates an examplary harmony by hosting more than 20 communities such as Laz, Circassian, Abkhas, Bosnian, Muhajir, those from Black Sea region and Manavlar, who are locals… (Hüsamettin Yılmaz, *Sakarya Rehberim*, 2014, October 14)

> Adapazarı is a land of peace and quiet, which is composed of many people from different origins (Malkoç N., *Somuncubaba*, 2014).

The writers' claim that their general perception of the city as peaceful relies partly on how cavalier people are to ask the question: "what is your nationality?" This is long regarded as a must question to ask for an acquaintance in Adapazarı. This questinoning has a meaning different than the other places within the country. For instance, if you answer, "I am from Artvin", the question repeats, "Which nation, are you Georgian or Laz?" The writers emphasize that this equalizes different identities at a certain ground. According to this rationale, being an Abkhas, Georgian, Laz, Bosnian or *Manav* in Adapazarı does not mean not being or being less Turk. These identities are not considered as a threat or alternative to Turkishness. At this point we need to ask: which identities and when? As for the Kurdish and Roman participants of this study, the hierarchy of identities in Adapazarı is clearly experienced and the question, which is a source of pride as it is asked cavalierly, becomes annoyance for them as a base of discrimination.

Even if we put aside 1915 and the bloody history of ethic conflict in Adapazarı, looking at the lynching attempts and social events between 2005-2008 will be enough to question themes of harmony, peace, tolerance that are brought forward by writers and politicians right after these events. Between 2005-2008 in Sakarya, alarming incidents of lynching attempts and attacks towards the Kurdish happened. In 2005, a group that wanted to make a press release in protest of the lynching attempt towards TAYAD in Trabzon was subject to an attack alike at the city center. At March 29, 2006, again at the city center, the conflict between youngsters, who wanted to put up posters for the anniversary of Mahir Çayan and his friends, and the police officers transformed into a lynching attempt by the interference of other citizens. The group that grew more and more crowded and was

unsuccessful with their lynching attempt against youngsters, later headed towards DTP[82] office, vandalizing it and another office in the same building—SAÜDER, whose members are university students (Livane, 2006). In 2007, a crowded group battered two people that were allegedly wearing Ahmet Kaya[83] printed shirts. The same year in Akyazı, a fight broke out between seasonal Kurdish agricultural workers and locals. After the detention of Kurdish youngsters, locals surrounded the police station. The crowded group wanted the detained youngsters to be released. In 2008, during "Peace and Fellowship" night of DTP, a crowded group attempted to bust and burn down the ceremony hall. One of the people that were marooned on the hall had a heart attack and lost his life. Following this event, Beşir Atalay, the minister of internal affairs then, made a press statement telling he gave instructions to civil and police inspector to investigate what happened (*Akşam*, 2008, May 4)[84]. According to the minister's claim, the inspectors were to prepare a research report on why Sakarya "is a center of provocation", after which the related institutions will take action and social projects concerning Adapazarı will be carried out (*Zaman*, 2008, May 4)[85]. However, within a year, via pro-government media, this research and social project gave way to praising of the city as an Ottoman heritage, land of multi-ethnicity and peace.

To sum up, as a late period Ottoman city, along with intense migrations from the Balkans, Caucasus and Black Sea regions; a population islamized and concentrated by slaughter and deportation, Adapazarı made it to 20th century. As the density of rural population is high, agricultural production at small family farms continued to be the main means of living until 1980s in the hinterland of the city. Although the conservative politicians present it as the city of tolerance and peace, at the beginning of 2000s the city came up to Turkey's agenda *via* worrisome lynching and attack incidents towards the Kurdish residents and migratory agricultural workers. On the other hand, as the field study will also demonstrate, the Romas are constantly subject to discrimination in labor market and daily life, and to a great extent they live an isolated life in their neighborhoods[86]. I hope

[82] The Democratic Society Party (2005-9) was political party representing Kurdish political movement with a social democratic agenda.

[83] Ahmet Kaya is a well-known Kurdish singer in Turkey who announced that he wanted to produce an album in Kurdish in 1999. His announcement triggered an enormous lynch campaign which led to a prosecution case making him leave Turkey. He was charged for spreading separatist propaganda and died a year later in exile because of a heart attack.

[84] Türkyılmaz U., (2008, May 4) Sakarya'ya Sosyolojik İnceleme. *Akşam*. (Retrieved from http://www.tumgazeteler.com)

[85] Güneç, S., (2008, May 4) Sakarya'ya Sosyolojik İnceleme. *Zaman*. (Retrieved from http://www.zaman.com.tr)

[86] As far as I understand the discourse regarding togetherness of cultures and the identity of being from Adapazarı comprises a constitutive outside since the beginning. Today, contextually, Alevi, Roma, Kurdish

that this study, which concentrates on the agricultural labor market, contributes to future studies through the data it provides regarding state of Romas and Kurds within the labor market.

5.2.2 Places of Observation

Places of observation of this study are mainly the places where agricultural laborers are recruited and organized as teams. Except Potato Wholesale Market, agricultural jobs in the city have been mostly organized within or across settlements, i.e. where workers live. Among those settlements of workers and neighborhoods, *Güneşler, Arabacıalanı, Yeni Mahalle, Bağlar, Karaköy* are chosen to be the major places of observation.

Potato Wholesale Market is a market, which is built up separately from the vegetable market when production density of potato was high. Here, potatoes and onions that are mostly picked up for merchants from outside the city, are cleaned and packed by women daily workers and are wholesaled. All the merchants at the market are male: fathers and sons. Hamal(s) (carriers) are also male. Those who weed out potatoes and onions and who get the lowest pay are women. The daily wage was 25 TL in 2011, and it is 45 TL by 2015 (Field Notes 2011, 2015).

As farmers and merchants use the market as a source of workers (when it is necessary they come and ask for workers), for these workers the place at which agricultural affairs are organized is the potato market. The Potato Market and the places where women who work there live can be seen in the MAP 3: Tepekum, Hacıoğlu, Tabakhane, Yeni Cami and Pabuççular neighborhoods and the area surrounding Çarşamba Pazarı.

To see the Potato Wholesale Market and Neighborhoods of the Workers in the MAP 3, please copy the URL: https://www.google.com/maps/d/edit?mid=zQ42j5dGWDKo.kH-ISd94WG3E&usp=sharing Or scan the QR Code below:

MAP 3: The Organization of Agricultural Labor in the City

identities seem to be candidates to be this other, whereas at the beginning, the city constructed its identity against Armenians/non-muslims.

Yellow and red signs around it show the potato market and places women who work there live (see Level 1 in Map 3: Potato Wholesale Market and Neighborhoods of the Workers). As it can be seen from the MAP 3, women that work at the market live in the surrounding neighborhoods at walking distance to the market.

The second level of the map has green signs, showing the neighboring quarters, where agricultural work is organized, and also the places where the workers live. Merchants and farmers first come to these neighborhoods or contact with an intermediary to ask for workers. That is why these places that are relatively far from the center is where agricultural work is organized. The business connections build in this way may also turn into long-term patron-worker relations.

Yeni Mahalle, which is one of the Roma neighborhoods within the scope of the study, has a relatively old (40 years) history and it is located in the middle of one of the developing areas in Erenler. As soon as you enter the neighborhood, it is obvious that the municipality neglects the place: Roads are rough, there is a giant garbage pile demonstrating it is never collected, it is filthy except the street alleys where the houses are. The majority of residents of the neighborhood work in agriculture. Apart from agriculture, what Roma women do are peddling, *süpürge bağlama*, plastics (recycling) and occasionally cleaning stairs, which are all daily jobs. As for men, some work at automotive sector and shopping malls, junk dealing is also common.

The urban transformation project aiming at the destruction of this neighborhood started in 2005. The project, which involves two neighborhoods, started first with the construction of TOKİ houses on the agricultural lands that are located on the periphery of the neighboring quarter. Then, without any predictions about under which conditions it will happen, Yeni Mahalle was evacuated and TOKİ houses were built here as well. As an authorized person on this matter, in an interview with a local newspaper mayor of Erenler answers the question regarding where the Roman citizens are supposed to go as follows: "I cannot say anything precise on this matter. That disturbing view will definitely be abolished. A more modern and cleaner area will be built on that region" (*Sakarya Rehberim* 2012, September 5). According to a research conducted in the neighborhood, the residents of the neighborhood are mostly property owners and their sense of belongingness is strong due to living in this region for a long period of time (Karakuzulu et al. 2013). Recently, Karakuzulu et al. (2013) implemented questionnaires within the area to grasp the approaches of residents to the upcoming urban renewal project. They reported that 50% of the respondents settled in Yeni Mahalle and Küpçüler neighborhoods

between 1960 and 2000 and 75 % of the respondents were property owners (Karakuzulu et al. 2013: 80). They did not differentiate their data to expose the differences of the Romani settlement. Yet, up to 40 years of settlement history fits to some of my interviewers' migration histories in the fieldwork.

Considering what happened during other urban transformation projects involving Roman neighborhoods, I can say that, one of the troubles awaiting the residents of these neighborhoods is their house priced way below its actual value (due to lack of documents etc.). The other is the possibility that they will not be granted the right to live in the same neighborhood. Within the current circumstances, it seems like the neighborhood residents, becoming indebted too, will leave the houses they have been traditionally living—which are one or two floored with verandas and convenient with their life styles and income earning activities—and move to apartment blocks in an area relatively isolated from the city. This situation may have negative effects on source of residents' means of living, not only via violation of the right to housing, but also it will affect the jobs that are organized and done within the neighborhood. It can be predicted that, when their living space is destroyed, women will have a restricted access to daily jobs, considering the contribution of the "neighborhood" regarding access to jobs. They let each other know of the agricultural jobs *via* the social networks they extended through neighborhood based social relations, they call out each other when they are off for a new job and bosses come to the neighborhood to look for workers. Within the scope of this study, I have interviewed with Roma women in Yeni Mahalle/Erenler, who work in agriculture and intermediate for workers during 2011-2015 through home visits (Field Notes 2011; Voice Records 2015).

Güneşler, as one of the metropolitan area municipalities of Adapazarı between 1994-2000[87], is today a migrant-worker neighborhood that has a dense population and ethnic diversity. It is a neighborhood, which was build nearby Dernekkırı[88] district, which is known as the vegetable center of Adapazarı and has high agricultural product diversity, and has grown bigger with migrants coming from the Black Sea and the East. Especially in 1990s the neighborhood received a lot of migration, according to the data population of the neighborhood was 4.603 in 1990 and in 2000, 11.417 (Eken 1997: 9). Today Güneşler is an important center of agricultural labor market, both due to its population and

[87] Nehirkent, Yazlık, Hanlı, Arifiye, Erenler, Serdivan, Adapazarı and Güneşler districts were regarded within the area of Adapazarı before Sakarya had metropolitan municipality status. Some of these have very old [Serdivan and Arifiye (1956), Erenler (1964)] municipal organizations whereas the other municipalities were established in 1990s (Eken 1997:8).

[88] From Güneşler to Çağlayan 23 separate villages are referred as *Dernekkırı* (Field Notes, Interview with Mukhtar of Çökekler, 2011, May 19).

existence of established intermediaries with rich networks. The neighborhood's closeness to the villages and the established relations between workers and current intermediaries provides relatively rich job options for resident women. The women who work at agriculture in Güneşler are mainly from Black Sea region and they work almost everyday (Field Notes, interview with Mukhtar 2015).

In the interview, mukhtar of Güneşler (Yeni Mahalle) stated that 60-70 % of women worked in agricultural jobs, namely corn, lettuce, potato and anchor, for 11 months a year (Field Notes 2015). He added "It has been like this for 32 years, women always go." According to the information received from Mukhtar, the neighborhood host's people from 70 cities, most of which are from the Black Sea villages. 70-80 households are Roma and they also work at agriculture. Those who came from the East go to the fields less, as their husbands do not allow women to work.

Within the scope of this study, I made interviews with women in Güneşler neighborhood who work at agriculture and with intermediaries, through home visits in 2011, 2012 and 2015. The interviews in 2012 focused on Roma women and those interviews provide insight about the ways they are excluded from the labor networks and working teams (Field Notes, Voice Records 2012).

Arabacıalanı (Serdivan) neighborhood, which is between the city center and the region where mass housing were build and state offices were moved after the earthquake, was rapidly overbuild in 2000s. Today, it is one of the most prestigious regions of the city and rents are very high. Yet, before the earthquake, the neighborhood was thinly populated and mostly it was composed of agricultural fields. Arabacıalanı, then, was surrounded with agricultural fields; it expanded after receiving Kurdish migrants. By 1990s, women of the neighborhood worked at precarious jobs in agriculture, textile, and stock farming; whereas men were mostly construction workers and market sellers. However, today, it is a rising middle class settlement, where constructions of new building complex and houses continue, and the biggest shopping mall of the city is located. The sudden and immense increase in rents resulted in the old residents (and the Kurdish) moving to other farther neighborhoods. Now the remaining households are those, which are living in the region for a relatively longer period of time, although they have agricultural work history. Today, the typical agricultural workers of the neighborhood are students who are saving Money for their education. Yet, it is possible to say that, the uncertainty continues for the old and ruined buildings within the neighborhood and their worker-migrant owners assuming that there will be an end of the agricultural lands that are zoned for construction. In 2011 and

2015, I made interviews with women agricultural workers and intermediaries at Arabacıalanı's districts populated by Kurdish residents (Field Notes 2011; Voice Record 2015).

Lastly, I should add two other places, which host the most vulnerable groups considering property rights and that have the least job variety in this study. One of them is Bağlar (also known as *Van*) neighborhood, which is a small dwelling unit of approximately 200 households, in which migrants from Ağrı, Van, and Muş live. The other one is an area within Karaköy neighborhood where Romas settled. Both places, which mainly emerged and developed as migrant-worker areas in 1990s, the essential services regarding urban settlement, namely sewerage system, reconstruction permit, community health center and such, were not provided. Although Bağlar had its status as a neighborhood with a mukhtar, solidarity center, houses and better roads, the residents are in a vulnerable condition regarding property (housing) rights. Before the 2015, June 7 elections, the penalties/fines considering construction permit towards the residents of the area, demonstrates how this vulnerability is used as a means of threat by the government against the residents of the neighborhood (Çaksu[89] 2015). The residents of the neighborhood, who were given the "word" of municipality for housing and construction permit, are kept waiting for the construction permit and infrastructure work for years.

In Bağlar neighborhood, generally young women, elderly women, and some middle aged women from relatively poorer households work in agriculture. Occasionally landowner employers come to the Bağlar neighborhood to ask for workers. According to the information received from Mukhtar, there is settlement in this area for 42 years. Yet, for only 3 terms now they have a particular Mukhtar, previously it was affiliated to Güneşler municipality. Mukhtar said that, the previous period was better for the residents of the neighborhood in terms of using their democratic rights and accessing city management. The biggest problem of the residents is infrastructure:

> At the time of Güneşler municipality it was better. It is easier to find someone to tell your problems in small municipalities… The authorities of Adapazarı municipality insist that construction will come first and then infrastructure that is why they made us wait for years. But, in Güneşler, first infrastructure came, and then construction permits. Now if we wait for construction, even if they give the permits today, with the objections, we will be devoid of infrastructure for 3-4 years. You see the roads. The neighborhood is in sewer.

[89] According to Çaksu's news and what the neighborhood people say, after Governer Coş saw HDP flags in the neighborhood during the opening ceremony of "Emine Erdoğan Memorial Forest", which was built on the public forest within the neighborhood, a demolishment decision was sent to some houses in the neighborhood (Çaksu 2015, Özgür Gündem, May 13). The residents considered this decision as a threat before the elections.

> The residents see, they go to everywhere in Sakarya to work from here. They see that blacktop goes all the way up to the highest hazelnut garden's owner's house…

The area at which Romans live in Karaköy is smaller than Bağlar. This area is within the boundaries of Karaköy neighborhood but lacks the entire infrastructure including roads that the rest of the neighborhood has. Like the other Roma neighborhoods, garbage lay at the entrance of it as a giant pile. The houses are single floored, rambling or barrack like. People who live here are predominantly described by their ethnic identities as in Van neighborhood. In both neighborhoods, women usually do not have social networks beyond relatives and acquaintances and their main means of living is agricultural work. I made interviews with agriculture workers in these two dwellings zone—Bağlar and Karaköy Roma settlements—in 2015.

5.3 Introducing the Participants

The informants of the study are in fact all the workers, farmers and officials and the other locals with whom I have contacted within three years of fieldwork. In the last year of fieldwork (2015), I carried out a case study with 52 workers through in-depth interviews, which include structured questionnaire parts that translated into SPSS. I will hereby present some basic information (the profiles, household characteristics and work processes of the participants) from 2015 case study to introduce the participants to the readers before the discussion of the labor market. However, throughout the analysis, I will utilize both the data of case study in 2015 and the data collected in 2011 and 2012 through un-structured interviews and participant observation.

5.3.1 Profiles of the Participants

Table 5.3.A The Profiles of the Participants (2015 Case Study)

No	Name***	Age	Residence	Birth Place	Marital Status	Health Insurance
1	Adalet	40	Bağlar	Ağrı	Married	Yeşil Kart
2	Zeynep	14	Bağlar	Residence	Single	Yeşil Kart
3	Arzu	29	Karaköy	Sakarya	Married	Yeşil Kart
4	Asiye	48	Karaköy	Sakarya	Married	Yeşil Kart
5	Yeşim	20	Karaköy	Sakarya	Married	Yeşil Kart
6	Asuman	20	Karaköy	Sakarya	Seperated	Yeşil Kart
7	Zerrin	22	Karaköy	Sakarya	Married	Yeşil Kart
8	Ayfer	23	Karaköy	Sakarya	Married	Yeşil Kart
9	Nuran	43	Karaköy	Sakarya	Married	Yeşil Kart

Table 5.3.A The Profiles of the Participants (2015 Case Study)						
No	Name***	Age	Residence	Birth Place	Marital Status	Health Insurance
10	Yaprak	25	Karaköy	Sakarya	Married	Yeşil Kart
11	Ayşegül	41	Karaköy	Sakarya	Married	Yeşil Kart
12	Başak	35	Karaköy	Sakarya	Married	Yeşil Kart
13	Belkıs	53	Yeni Mah-Erenler	Sakarya	Widow	None
14	Suna	40	Yeni Mah-Erenler	Residence	Married	SGK (family)
15	Begüm	34	Yeni Mah-Erenler	Residence	Married	None
16	Dilek	29	Arabacıalanı*	Residence	Married	SGK (self)
17	Binnaz	60	Yeni Mah-Erenler	Sakarya	Widow	SGK (family)
18	Niran	46	Yeni Mah-Erenler	Residence	Married	Yeşil Kart
19	Çiçek	23	Yeni Mah-Erenler	Residence	Married	SGK (family)
20	Dilara	34	Arabacıalanı	Diyarbakır	Single	SGK (family)
21	Elif	18	Yeni Mah-Erenler	Residence	Single	SGK (family)
22	Emine	65	Arabacıalanı	Ağrı	Married	Yeşil Kart
23	Nurperi	60	Yeni Mah-Erenler**	Sakarya	Married	SGK (self)
24	Fazilet	16	Yeni Mah-Erenler	Residence	Single	None
25	Ferzane	38	Tabakhane	Sakarya	Married	SGK (family)
26	Figen	60	Tabakhane	Bolu/Düzce	Married	SGK (family)
27	Sezen	53	Tabakhane	Bolu/Düzce	Married	SGK (family)
28	Ferhunde	59	Tabakhane	Giresun	Widow	None
29	Gülbahar	43	Tepekum	Sakarya	Married	SGK (family)
30	Mehtap	54	Tepekum	Bolu/Düzce	Married	SGK (family)
31	Kıymet	51	Tepekum	Bolu/Düzce	Married	SGK (family)
32	Güler	67	Güneşler	Trabzon	Married	Yeşil Kart
33	Gülnaz	65	Bağlar	Muş	Widow	SGK (family)
34	Hacer	15	Bağlar	Residence	Single	SGK (family)
35	Sabahat	18	Bağlar	Residence	Single	SGK (family)
36	Hicran	30	Bağlar	Residence	Single	SGK (family)
37	İclal	50	Karaköy	Sakarya	Married	Yeşil Kart
38	İrem	37	Karaköy	Sakarya	Married	None
39	Özlem	35	Karaköy	Sakarya	Married	Yeşil Kart
40	Kader	25	Karaköy	Sakarya	Married	Yeşil Kart
41	Kevser	31	Karaköy	Sakarya	Married	Yeşil Kart

Table 5.3.A The Profiles of the Participants (2015 Case Study)						
No	Name***	Age	Residence	Birth Place	Marital Status	Health Insurance
42	Gülderen	29	Karaköy	Sakarya	Married	Yeşil Kart
43	Leman	39	Karaköy	Sakarya	Married	Yeşil Kart
44	Gülçiçek	45	Karaköy	Sakarya	Married	None
45	Mehtap	19	Karaköy	Sakarya	Married	Yeşil Kart
46	Oya	53	Karaköy	Sakarya	Married	Yeşil Kart
47	Sedef	37	Karaköy	Sakarya	Married	Yeşil Kart
48	Nursel	43	Hacıoğlu	Trabzon	Married	SGK (family)
49	Nuray	62	Tepekum	Sakarya	Widow	SGK (family)
50	Aylin	44	Tabakhane	Sakarya	Married	SGK (family)
51	Vuslat	17	Yenigün	Sakarya	Single	SGK (family)
52	Perihan	49	Yeni Mah-Erenler	Sakarya	Married	Yeşil Kart

** Dilek had actually moved from Arabacıalanı (Serdivan, Sakarya) to Istanbul a while ago. She got a job there and then married. She was a member of the crew that I had gone to work with in 2011. I visited her again in her parents' house in Arabacıalanı in July 2015.*
*** Nurperi and her husband has kept their houses in the neighborhood and have been visiting and staying for 4 months in the summers, but her primary residence is still Germany. She stopped working in agricultural tasks after she had migrated to Germany.*
**** The names of the participants that are presented above are pseudonyms.*

At first sight, the frequencies remark the participants as mostly married middle-aged women who were born within the region and had little or no education. 38 of them (73.1 percent) are married. 32 women (61.5 percent) had no education at all and only 7 women (13.4 percent) continued after primary school. 30 participants (57.7 percent) were born in the villages of the Sakarya province and 12 others (21.2 percent) had been born within the same neighborhood that they currently inhabit.

This general demographic characteristics, however, is valid with an exemption of Kurdish participants who were concentrated as either single youngsters or elderly women within the case study. The single participants are concentrated in Kurdish neighborhoods (5 out 8) where agricultural jobs acclaimed to be a part-time job of students by the inhabitants of the neighborhoods.

Within Kurdish groups in the region, married middle-aged women have also been working in agricultural jobs as I observed throughout the study, yet, there is also an apparent trend in sustaining housewife position for the brides particularly within extended households. Kurdish migration to the city goes back to late 1970s and 1980s, which is also parallel to the migration histories of participants and their families. Throughout the interviews, I

have been told that the first generation migrants had usually worked as a whole family whereas today's households (as participants of this study) are including housewives and students (who are just seasonally working in agriculture). Within the extended families of the participants, the availability of jobs for men within such households - especially in the construction sector - was helpful for such allocation providing the children a chance to continue their education and increase their job opportunities (See the Part: Expectations for details). In fact, many Kurdish men that I met in Karaköy, Arabacıalanı, Bağlar and Güneşler neighborhoods proudly acclaimed their wives housewife status: "We do not let our wife work[90]" (Field Notes 2011, 2015). This remark probably suggested their negative perception of the other communities (particularly Romas) and a claim for their higher (more masculine) position *vis-à-vis* their neighbors. Yet, within their households, either their mothers or daughters—or together—has been continuing to work in agriculture. Nevertheless, among the households of agricultural women that I have contacted housewife members are extremely rare and that distinguishes such extended Kurdish families from others. The data of 2015 case study reflects this trend.

Age

Some women did not know their exact ages and in these cases I rely on their estimates. The ages of the participants' ranges from 14 to 67. The mean age is 38.58. There is a loose balance between the age groups (see Table 5.3.B below), which can be expected since balancing the age groups has been attempted by the researcher.

Table 5.3.B Age Groups (2015 Case Study)

Age Groups	Frequency	Percentage	Cumulative Percentage
14-24	12	23.1	23.1
25-34	9	17.3	40.4
35-44	13	25.0	65.4
45-54	10	19.2	84.6
55-67	8	15.4	100.0
Total	52	100.0	

Yet, the attempts to cover all age groups are limited by the actual patterns within the groups since snowball technique relies on women's own networks. Therefore, the data also gives an idea about the age patterns within residence groups. One but all participants

[90] Biz kadınlarımızı çalıştırmayız.

from the Turkish group is above 35. Romani group on the other hand, is more balanced since the number of women above 35 is close to those under 35 within the group. Kurdish group, as mentioned, is composed almost exclusively of youngsters and elderly with just one woman between the ages 35-54.

While discussing ages of the participants, I must also note that to me most of the women were looking a lot older than their age displaying consuming and backbreaking effects of their life on their bodies. I had hard times trying not to drop another brick especially after I had expressed my assumption about a Roma woman as the mother of someone who turned out to be her husband.

In fact, our confusion was reciprocal since my informants have also interested in entering into conversations about my age. In 2011 and 2012, many women had perceived my age with an amusement as a surprising fact probably contradicting with the expectations I created by introducing myself as a student researcher. I had been repeatedly mocked with respect to my age. I remember one time Dilara (34) had introduced me to one of her friends as a student in Turkish while adding quietly "she is 30" in Kurdish. As a response, I had kept calling her *abla* (older sister) until 2015 when I realized that we are age mates.

Education

More than half of the women, 28 participants (53,8 percent) are illiterate out of 32 who had no schooling at all. Only 7 of them continued their education after primary school and they are the youngsters of the group below the age of 18 except Dilek (29) who had already graduated from the university when we first met in 2011 and eventually landed a better job in another sector. In sum, those women except a few youngsters are not educated, consequently, not much equipped with skills to find jobs other than agricultural work.

Birth Places -Locality

This is a local group with respect to birthplace criteria as 86.5 of the participants were born in the villages and towns within the borders of Sakarya.

The number of the participants that have personally migrated from East and South East of the country are only four. It makes more sense with respect to the fact that migration from the region has a history up to forty years and the proportion of youngsters among Kurdish agricultural workers is relatively high.

The migration history of Romani group on the other hand is more complicated. A part of the groups in Yeni Mahalle and Karaköy had first migrated from villages of Sakarya (they

call Çarkasamiye to the region combining two villages) to Ankara. Therefore, elderly participants have up to 30 years living experience in Ankara. They started to return one after the other fifteen year ago. They emphasized their local identities as *Adapazarlı*. In fact, some of them hesitated to mention their Ankara period as I later learned their migration history from their relatives. They explained their return referring to the deadlock of *bohça* business and the availability of agricultural jobs in Adapazarı.

Finally, I want to clarify that birthplace criteria is not adequate to declare "locality" of a group since it is always an issue of dispute reflected in ongoing historical and political struggles on place making and identity making processes. As Gupta and Ferguson state there is always a specific relationship between place making and identity. Also, place making involves construction rather than merely a discovery of difference (Gupta & Ferguson 1997: 13). Boundaries of a community as a categorical identity that is premised on various forms of exclusion and construction of otherness has often been taken as granted as boundaries of 'locality'. Therefore, the claims on locality are also related to the processes of exclusion and othering, which is structuring collective and individual subjects.

Within the case of Adapazarı, struggles over locality and place making has been a layered and complex process creating a hierarchy—over who belongs more to the space. While city center has been the space of struggle (as we see in the instances of lynches, shop boycotts, and discriminatory behavior towards excluded groups) as the place of the acclaimed locals of the city; the peripheral neighborhoods have usually been associated with ethnic identities[91].

Language

All the interviews of 2015 case study carried out in Turkish. In fact, all but two of the informants throughout the study understand and speak Turkish well although it is the second language of some within Kurdish and Romany groups. First exception was in 2011 when I interviewed with an old woman, who was the cook of a seasonal migrant group from Diyarbakır. I visited her in one of the "hazelnut houses"—a brick building without windows, which are built for migrant workers in the villages of the region—and our

[91] Different ethnic groups lived in Adapazarı in distinct neighborhoods since the beginning. According to Yerivan (2012) before 1915 Armenian, Turk, Bosnian, Elen and Jews, lived in neighborhoods that are as clearly separated from each other as possible. By the end of the century as Muslim immigrants increased they also start living in neighborhoods reserved for their identities. And neighborhoods out of the center were labeled by identities among the people. Even today one may learn simply by asking in which neighborhoods Albanian, the Macedonian, Romani, Kurdish or Bulgarian immigrants live.

conversation, was limited by my little language skills in Kurdish. Second one was in 2015 when I met a Kurdish speaking woman in Bağlar district. In this case, I interviewed with her daughter who is also an agricultural worker in order to partly compensate the lack of a mutual language.

Social Security and Health Insurance

Turkish social security system was based on protection covering regular employees and self-employed persons who have been paying their social insurance contribution fees. The citizens had been covered either through their employment status or through a family member recorded in the system. It is coded as SGK (self) and SGK (family) in the table. Within this system, the unpaid family workers, casual agriculture workers and daily house workers (cleaner, house keeper etc.), unemployed were out of the scope of compulsory health insurance (Karadeniz 2012).

As seen in the Table 5.3.A, the majority of the participants are *Yeşil Kart* holders. It is a type of health insurance provided for low-income citizens, who are not entitled to or cannot afford other types of health insurance. *Yeşil Kart* program was implemented in 1992 for people with one third of minimum wage income level in a household. The program aimed to provide health insurance for the poor until the introduction of general health insurance (Law no: 38163, article: 1, from Karadeniz, 2012).

After 2008, when the General Health Insurance came into effect, the government has compensated the insurance premiums of the Yeşil Kart holders. In other words, the implementation of the *Yeşil Kart* is continuing under another name (Karadeniz 2012). Therefore, I used the name *Yeşil Kart* sticking to participants' self-descriptions of their insurance although the name of the system had changed.

Cross tabulation between residence groups and types of health insurance marks differences between the employee statuses of the family members of the participants. While 83.3 percent of the women in Turkish group and 55.6 percent of Kurdish women has covered by public health insurance through a family member. This ratio within Romany groups is just 12.9 percent. According to this while Turkish participants' insurance coverage fit with the average data for the province[92], Kurdish participants' coverage is less than the average. On the other hand Romani participants have

[92] According to the statistics of active work force and retired population of Sakarya, revealed by the governor, most of the population in Sakarya is included in social security system in 2015. 86.97 % is covered and 25.75 % is actively working while 15.58 % is retired (Sakarya Valiliği, 2015).

significantly less insurance coverage. While 86,97% of the Sakarya population is covered by social security system only 12.9% of the Romain participants of this study are covered.

5.3.2 Household Characteristics of the Participants

Table 5.3.C Household Characteristics of the Participants (2015 Case Study)

No	Name	Residence	Household Arrangement	Household Population	Household Children	Household Members with Formal Jobs	Household Members with Insecure/ Precarious Jobs	House Owner
1	Adalet	Bağlar	Extended	8	5	No	2	family member
2	Zeynep	Bağlar	Extended	10	8	No	5	family member
3	Arzu	Karaköy	Nuclear	4	2	No	2	family member
4	Asiye	Karaköy	Nuclear	3	1	No	1	family member
5	Yeşim	Karaköy	Nuclear	4	2	No	2	No House - Shack
6	Asuman	Karaköy	Nuclear	3	2	No	1	No House - Shack
7	Zerrin	Karaköy	Nuclear	3	1	No	2	family member
8	Ayfer	Karaköy	Nuclear	2	0	No	2	family member
9	Nuran	Karaköy	Nuclear	4	2	No	2	family member
10	Yaprak	Karaköy	Extended	6	0	No	2	family member
11	Ayşegül	Karaköy	Nuclear	4	3	No	1	rental
12	Başak	Karaköy	Nuclear	3	1	No	2	family member
13	Belkıs	Yeni Mah-Erenler	Extended	5	3	No	2	rental
14	Suna	Yeni Mah-Erenler	Extended	8	4	Yes	3	rental
15	Begüm	Yeni Mah-Erenler	Nuclear	6	4	No	1	rental
16	Dilek	Arabacıalanı*	Nuclear	3	1	Yes	0	rental
17	Binnaz	Yeni Mah-Erenler	Extended	11	5	Yes	3	self
18	Niran	Yeni Mah-Erenler	Nuclear	6	4	Yes	3	rental
19	Çiçek	Yeni Mah-Erenler	Nuclear	3	1	Yes	1	rental

Table 5.3.C Household Characteristics of the Participants (2015 Case Study)								
No	Name	Residence	Household Arrangement	Household Population	Household Children	Household Members with Formal Jobs	Household Members with Insecure/ Precarious Jobs	House Owner
20	Dilara	Arabacıalanı	Extended	7	1	Yes	1	family member
21	Elif	Yeni Mah-Erenler	Nuclear	8	4	Yes	3	rental
22	Emine	Arabacıalanı	Extended	5	2	No	2	family member
23	Nurperi	Yeni Mah-Erenler**	Nuclear	2	0	Yes	0	family member
24	Fazilet	Yeni Mah-Erenler	Nuclear	5	3	No	3	rental
25	Ferzane	Tabakhane	Extended	7	3	Yes	2	rental
26	Figen	Tabakhane	Nuclear	3	0	Yes	1	rental
27	Sezen	Tabakhane	Nuclear	3	0	Yes	1	family member
28	Ferhunde	Tabakhane	Nuclear	1	0	No	1	self
29	Gülbahar	Tepekum	Nuclear	4	2	Yes	1	family member
30	Mehtap	Tepekum	Nuclear	3	0	Yes	1	family member
31	Kıymet	Tepekum	Extended	4	0	No	1	family member
32	Güler	Güneşler	Extended	8	0	Yes	2	family member
33	Gülnaz	Bağlar	Extended	8	5	Yes	3	self
34	Hacer	Bağlar	Extended	8	5	Yes	3	family member
34	Sabahat	Bağlar	Extended	8	5	Yes	3	family member
36	Hicran	Bağlar	Nuclear	4	0	No	1	family member
37	İclal	Karaköy	Extended	7	1	No	4	family member
38	İrem	Karaköy	Nuclear	5	3	No	2	family member
39	Özlem	Karaköy	Nuclear	5	3	No	2	No House
40	Kader	Karaköy	Extended	6	2	No	2	family member
41	Kevser	Karaköy	Nuclear	4	2	No	2	family member

Table 5.3.C Household Characteristics of the Participants (2015 Case Study)								
No	Name	Residence	Household Arrangement	Household Population	Household Children	Household Members with Formal Jobs	Household Members with Insecure/ Precarious Jobs	House Owner
42	Gülderen	Karaköy	Nuclear	5	3	No	2	family member
43	Leman	Karaköy	Nuclear	5	3	No	1	family member
44	Gülçiçek	Karaköy	Extended	6	2	No	3	family member
45	Mehtap	Karaköy	Extended	9	2	No	5	family member
46	Oya	Karaköy	Nuclear	2	0	No	2	No House
47	Sedef	Karaköy	Nuclear	7	5	No	3	family member
48	Nursel	Hacıoğlu	Nuclear	4	2	Yes	1	family member
49	Nuray	Tepekum	Extended	4	2	No	2	family member
50	Aylin	Tabakhane	Nuclear	4	2	Yes	3	family member
51	Vuslat	Yenigün	Nuclear	7	5	Yes	2	rental
52	Perihan	Yeni Mah-Erenler	Extended	7	1	Yes	3	rental

As seen, 32 (61.5 percent) participants are living within their nuclear families, while the rest 20 are living within extended family members -with their in-laws. Household population mean is 5.21 and household children mean is 2.25. This is higher than the average household population size in Sakarya (3.73) and in Adapazarı (3.58) (TUİK 2013). Household children of participants are also higher in numbers than the average of Sakarya- 1.8 % (TUİK 2013).

76.9 percent of the participants have 3 or fewer children. 11 households are without children constituting 21.2 percent of the group. Only one exceptionally crowded family with 8 children was in Bağlar district[93].

[93] Within this Kurdish family, two daughters were working in the fields whilst continuing their education; one of them is included in the list as participant 2 - Zeynep. Their mother was also occasionally accompanying them in the fields, although the girls expressed their attempts to not let her work in agriculture.

Labor Market Positions of the Household Members

21 participants' households have at least one member working with social security and have a regular income. The majority of those wage earners are men exceptionally including women. 6 of them are factory workers, 3 of them are civil servants and one of them is a police. And the others are also wageworkers in the construction and service sectors in addition to those working as personnel in hairdresser, furniture repairing and carpenter's shops.

Among factory workers four of them are working in automobile factories. They all are from Yeni Mahalle where there are also automotive workers within the former generations of these households. A son of Binnaz (60) is working in an automotive factory like his deceased husband who had a tragic work incident that made him a disabled pensioner. Binnaz's brother-in-law was also working in the same tire factory and he then also lost his arm in the same machine. His daughter Begüm (34) claimed that they could not take any pension for the incident ending her father's working life. Between two families of brothers who had similar incidents, Binnaz's husband had managed to get compensation and retirement rights while Begüm's father could not get any of them. With her retirement salary, Binnaz is now supporting her extended family living in one of the biggest and well-off houses in the street with her two married son's with regular incomes. She said they built the house with the help of the compensation. Begüm, on the other hand, is living in a rented shack like house in the street with four children and a jobless husband. There is no one in her extended family having a regular income. Therefore, there have been men in Roma neighborhood that worked in automobile industry which rapidly developed within the region in 1990s; yet, it will be misleading to assume the benefits that would have prevented the clustering of the next generation in daily precarious jobs.

There are also significant differences between labor market positions of household members among the participants. While 75 percent of the women from central districts have at least one member in their houses with a regular income with social security benefits; that ratio is 22.6 percent in Romani households and 55.6 percent within the Kurdish group.

This table also reveals differences between women's relative share in household labor. While Kurdish and Romani household members are tended to work in the precarious jobs together, 58.3 percent of Turkish women state that they are the only one in the family

working in informal sector. This ratio is 19.4 percent between Romani's and 22.2 percent among Kurdish households. This difference partly stems from the childrens and youngsters (14-18) involvement in the agricultural jobs within Kurdish and Romani groups.

House Ownership

Among the participants, only three women were the owners of the houses they are living. Total ratio of the houses owned by the participants or by a member of their families is 69.2 per cent. Apart from rentals, 2 families were living in shacks in Karaköy. There are also two families who do not have a house or shack. Oya (53) and her husband were trying to build a house for themselves by collecting scrap from construction sites with the help of their neighbors since their own shack had flooded and became useless. They were temporarily staying in a neighbor's shack and they had seasonally migrated for a shepherd's job. Oya's husband had a motorcycle accident injuring his head, which made him almost incapable of working. They have children but they were also living in shacks with their children and i.e., moving with them is not an option for them. Özlem, on the other hand, was living with her husband and children in a barn (in Akyazı/Sakarya) as hired shepherds. At the time I met them, they were staying in a relative's house in Karaköy district. They have been visiting the neighborhood in long-terms in summers to work in agriculture and also in winters to work in scrap business. Özlem and her husband uttered their efforts for saving money to build a house in the neighborhood.

Although the majority of participants were living in the houses owned by their family members the legal security that their housing documents provide are highly variable. The urban transformation project including Yeni Mahalle/Erenler had already started in 2015. Karaköy and Bağlar residences were legally farmlands bought by the migrant residences. They were verbally promised by political authorities to provide occupancy permits in the near future. Yet, their right of property is still very vulnerable. *Arabacıalanı*, on the other hand, is a different case. It had been a similar settlement place for Kurdish migrants throughout 1980s and 1990s in the middle of the farmlands. After 1999 Earthquake, the settlement has started to be surrounded by middle class residences with enlargement of occupancy permits in the area. In the meantime, the largest shopping mall of the city has been built near to Kurdish settlement that is reflected with a boost in real estate prices. Consequently, rents remarkably increased resulting in the relocation of renters within Kurdish group to peripheral neighborhoods leaving behind only relatively well-off house owners.

5.3.3 Migration Histories and Landownership

I asked the participants whether their parents or in-laws have ever been holding agricultural land of their own. 36 women (69.2 percent) said "no". Cross tabulation with residence groups revealed that 93.5 percent of Romani group said "no, no one in my family has ever hold an agricultural land" while within the group of women working in potato wholesale market, only 16.7 percent (2 women) said "no".

Apparently, the majority of Turkish participants were daughters of farmers once cultivating their own lands. Yet, none of them had claimed their father's land. The statistics displaying gradual dispossession of land in the case of small-sized farmer families in Turkish agriculture has been a major focus point of studies on agricultural workers (Yıldırım 2015; Makal 2001). Dispossession has usually been discussed with the projections of migration and proletarianization of ex-farmer families that may become workers in someone else's land. Yet, women have historically been landless in Turkey's agriculture regarding the fact that the majority of the women in rural areas do not have a personal claim on agricultural land and/or livestock (Ecevit 1994; Candan & Günal, 2013; Alkan & Toksoy 2009). For example, Alkan & Toksoy (2009) in their research on 68 forest villages in Turkey pointed out that only 8 percent of women have title deeds despite the significance of their labor in every stage of production (104).

Ecevit (1994) elaborated on the historical landlessness of women as a factor ensuring the invisibility of their labor. The participants of this study as daughters of landowners had been productive as both unpaid family laborers and then paid laborers of agriculture. Yet, their fathers and husbands have been entitled as "producers". As Ecevit (1994) pointed out as a consequence of women's dispossession of land in Turkey such entitling of man is legitimizing the ideological accreditation of manhood as productive sex. The unequal distribution of land between sexes ensures women's dependency on their husband's economic status since they could not claim on their own family's land. Moreover, as Hoşgör and Smits (2006) reported, following migration to cities, women in Turkey tend to become more depended on their husbands since their labors are further marginalized and very few of them are gainfully employed. Indeed, most of the married Turkish participants of this study explained their involvement in agricultural jobs through unique personal histories related to their husbands. They declared their exceptional situation with respect to their equivalents in their extended families and neighborhoods. Apparently, the processes led them to work in agriculture is related to their- broke, lazy, disabled, ill, undutiful, irresponsible, unemployed- husbands. Their personal acknowledgements are

radically different from Kurdish and Romani women's community-based explanations of their involvement in agricultural jobs.

Roma in Turkey, on the one hand, has been a historically landless group earning living through craftsmanship in the villages. All but one participants from Romany group mentioned traditional crafts that their family professionalized in the past; 20 participants pointed out shammer (*kalaycılık*); 5 participants referred to smithery (*demircilik*) and 5 participants mentioned basketry (*sepetçilik*) as family occupations of their parents and/or grandparents. Additionally, 11 women also indicated that *bohçacılık* was one of the occupations of their family. Moreover, six participants stated that being a shepherd is one among their family occupations and one of the families was continuing to be shepherd.

On the other hand, within the Kurdish group the women with landowner parents seem nearly equal to the women who declared landlessness of their family even before migration. Before interpreting this data it is important to notice that the women in this group are mainly from Eastern provinces of Muş, Ağrı, Van where the major livelihood has been livestock rather than land/farming. Some of them indeed mentioned their families' ownership of cattle in the region. Eastern regions as hometowns of Kurdish group of workers have been suffered from both economic insufficiency and armed-conflict between the Kurdistan Workers' Party [*PKK*] and the State's security forces triggering people's migration. As a result of armed conflict, evacuation, and restricted economic activities, a great number of people in the villages were forced to migrate throughout 1980s and 1990s.

For the migrants coming from East and South East Turkey a dual categorization have been made within sociological research: voluntary and forced migrants. The voluntary migrants are regarded as the ones who migrated mainly for the purpose of socio-economic betterment. Yet, in most of the cases, the stories of two groups are intertwined. Throughout the armed-conflict, some villages were entirely burned down and turned into ruins. That also affected previous voluntary migrants since they lost the access to assets that they left behind. Nevertheless, there were some aspects of forced migration causing additional difficulties for the people involved since they were not prepared and planned the migration both psychologically and materially. It is not only material resources but also traditional social capital, or social networks that migrants lost in the process of displacement (Him 2010: 140).

The Kurdish participants of this study declared economic betterment as the major motivation for their migration. Migration through marriage is a common pattern between

second-generation migrant women in Bağlar district. I asked the women whether they felt loneliness and had any difficulties in adapting the neighborhood. Those migrant women are either mothers or brides of agricultural workers as participants of this study. They replied negatively with counting close relatives within the neighborhood that came before them. That is also a characteristic distinguishing voluntary migrants from forced ones who tend to only have a very few relatives within the city because of sudden unprepared migration (Him 2010: 172). With this regard, the subsequent and marriage-based enlargement of migration networks of Kurdish participants resembles conventional voluntary migrants in other parts of Turkey. However, distinguishing effects of armed-conflict is also noticeable in some of the Kurdish participants' accounts of migration. For example, Dilara (34) mentioned village guard system[94] as a factor effecting her father's decision to migrate since he was compelled to be a village guard:

> …they tell my father that he will be village guard that year. But my father was scared, scared outside at night. Then someone said him "come here." We were not planning to come here. He came to visit some relatives here; they are also not well off. And we do not know anyone else. They convinced my father "since you are afraid and cannot be a guard, migrate, bring your home"[95] (Dilara, Interview no: 20, Arabacıalanı).

5.4 Limitations of the Study

The major methodological limitation in this study is the lack of total numbers and of information about the agricultural workers in the city, which increases the possibility of selective bias. Yet, the selective bias is partly intended within concerns for highlighting the vitality of the agricultural jobs for certain groups in the city. The most feasible solution to the problem appears to limit the conclusions and avoid empirical generalizations.

Second problem was about the conflict of my identity as researcher as well as "local". I have grown up and stayed in Adapazarı eighteen years as a member of a former migrant family with Balkan and Georgian origins. Although my "local" identity and my personal network was an advantage while contacting farmers, mukhtars and other official representatives in the city, it was a source of discomfort (at least for me) while contacting the excluded and the stigmatized neighborhoods of the city. Women from minorities have

[94] The political authority responded to the guerrilla offensive unleashed by the PKK by establishing a similar Kurdish militia, the "village guards" (Bruinessen 2002: 14) Village guard system is launched in 1985 to promote peasants' involvement in self-defense against PKK (Kirişci & Winrow 1997: 110). Village guards have been paid monthly in turn for their services for the Turkish state.

[95] …babama da o senesi korucu olacaksın dediler, babamda da korku var, gece dışarda korkuyor, ondan sonra biri demiş ki ona haydi gelin. Hayalimizde bile değildi buraya gelmek. Akrabaları ziyarete gelmişti buraya. Geldik buraya, onların da durumları zaten iyi değil, bizim de başka hiç kimsemiz yok. Babamın aklına koymuşlar, madem korkuyorsun korucu olmasıyorsun, göç et, evini getir demişler.

easily identified me as a “Turk”, which might have drawn a barrier between us. Some participants clearly identified me with the other side of the city against which they interactively constructed their identities. Their relations with the other parts of the society have been built on years of experiences beyond my control. A worker woman in Yeni Mahalle, for instance, said that “the intermediary is either one of your kind or one from us” while clarifying that she is working with both Turkish and Romani intermediaries. Therefore, I was not perceived just as a stranger/researcher but as a member of a group they have been interacting. In Karaköy, likewise, I had to make it clear again and again that I was not an officer or inspector regulating state aids. The rumors were expectable since they naturally recognize the other through the filters of past experience, which probably is not full of voluntary visits of unfamiliar women. Therefore, my perceived identity as the “other” for the Kurdish and Roman women might have immeasurable effects on our conversations. Nevertheless, let me also note that throughout the conversations the women have kindly found paths to embrace my presence and increase familiarity often through praising my labor and efforts to gain income and graduate with this research.

Unfortunately, the problem was not just about how they perceived me. Throughout the fieldwork, I have also faced with my own barriers in the city. With a retrospective look, I usually had a personal company during my first visits of Roma settlements and I postponed my visit to Karaköy for years, till August 2015, probably partly due to the rumors and warnings. Even though I had found nothing but poverty and hospitality in the previous Romani residences, which were all subject to same kind of rumors, I had hesitated to go alone to Karaköy and asked my husband to come with me. In my defense, after a few minutes of interaction with the people I sent him back. The neighborhood was just like the others but poorer. It is not easy to admit my own biases but I feel an urge to write this down as a sign of the effects of stigma even on a researcher who had intended to write against prejudices.

I was supposed not to be judgmental during the interviews and I had considered myself successful. Yet, while listening to the voice records of 2012, I was struck by my little jokes and murmurs on extended breast-feeding practice of a woman and remembered my feelings of discomfort within the scenes of Roma women’s relaxed breastfeeding practices in public. In the record, I was asking the age of a child breast-fed in such a way that is replied by the informant with an explanation/excuse for her behavior. Such questioning fits into the mainstream way of othering women through motherhood with respect to an ideal version which had been shaped through baby food commercials and moral

judgments on the public behavior and dressing of urban women[96]. It was embarrassing to face my previous self after two years of motherhood experience that led me become one of the supporters of long-term breastfeeding and rights for women to freely breast-feed in public. Therefore, these voice records presented an opportunity for me to anticipate the importance of the barriers of experience between women that can become an obstacle for a mutual understanding and can be a limitation for a qualitative research.

Finally, I carried out some of my interviews in the Potato Wholesale Market (2015) in a stressful environment that might have affected my connection with the participants. Since Potato Wholesale Market was under surveillance of employers it was the most difficult area of field research. Some employers were uncomfortable about my presence and my interviews with workers. Some of the employers in the wholesale market refused to talk with me and did not let me talk to the employees. One employer intimidated his employees by shouting at me in the middle of the interview claiming that he is paying for his workers insurance on daily basis. As a result I could not complete my interview in that workplace. Another said he was disturbed by my interviews and questioned my identity. Yet another sent someone in advance and prevented me from approaching the workplace. The records of the interviews with insurance demands and the workers questioning their legal rights show that this tension was not unfounded in the Potato Wholesale Market (Field Notes 2015). When I started interviews in the neighborhoods, I preferred to go to the same place everyday for a while not to lose the sense of familiarity. But in the wholesale market I had difficulty in returning the next day after the days I was interrogated and snubbed by the employers. Therefore, there are long periods between my visits to wholesale market. Hence I could not have builded close and relaxed relations with the workers in the Market as my interviewees in the neighborhoods.

5.5 Conclusion

This chapter was written to present the data, fieldwork process, places of observation and the participants of the study. Apart from fieldwork, the study takes into account the written literature on agricultural workers and historical representation of workers with daily press in Turkey. The place of observation was decided as Adapazarı that not only manifests a typical structure of Turkish agriculture with the extension of small commercial farms in the area but also reveals a rich framework to grasp the job

[96] In fact, the perception of modern/acceptable motherhood and the emphasis placed on breastfeeding has been subject to change recently - as a result of public campaigns, family doctor's encouragement and advice for two years of breast-feeding and mother groups' activism.

stratification and relative isolation of minority associated neighborhoods in a context of rapid industrial growth in 1990s. At the end I shared some concerns about the fieldwork, which may be regarded as limitations of the study.

CHAPTER VI

WAGE-LABOR PROCESSES IN THE CITY: A CLOSER LOOK AT THE AGRICULTURAL JOBS IN ADAPAZARI

The literature analysis in Chapter III revealed that the catastrophic conditions of work and settlement of some migrant workers, the condition of labor camps, urgency of finding solutions to health and education problems led researchers to focus on seasonal migration as the major problem of Turkey's agricultural labor market. Consequently, researchers overlook "local" laborers as an advantageous category compared to seasonal migrant workers. Yet, the category of local laborer also needs an examination since laborers working nearby fields to their homes at a moment are actually a very heterogenous and layered group. Locality, in fact, is not simply a status achieved by permanent settlement in an area. It has always been an issue of dispute reflected in historical and political struggle over who belongs more to the space. Therefore, this chapter attempts to scrutinize this overlooked "local worker" category through elaborating on wage-labor processes of different groups of workers in Adapazarı.

This chapter will illustrate, on the one hand, that low wages, insecure contracts, extra-gainings of intermediaries, exclusion, isolation and dangerous ways of transportation as problems usually coded with seasonal migration have also been evident in the wage-labor processes of workers when they work in nearby fields as in the case of Adapazarı. This is not an attempt to deny or undervalue the catastrophic conditions of seasonal migratory workers but an emphasis on the common problems of agricultural workers as they are all working within a structurally insecure labor market putting them in disadvantaged positions against the employers.

On the other hand, this chapter will present wage-labor processes of agricultural workers in Adapazarı within its heterogeneity through illustrating different patterns of work, intermediation practices and different prospects of future between the groups. In fact, it is precisely the structure of labor market unaccountability of employers and absence of tracking for fair treatment of workers—which enhances the inequalities between wage-labor processes of different groups of workers. In case of Adapazarı, this inequality appears as more layers (people) between employers and workers within wage-labor processes especially for those workers who have lesser chance to access the resource-rich

networks to ensure better contracts. Therefore, different vulnerabilities of workers (such as their accessibility to certain social networks, regular income of household men and the effects of stigma) is very much linked to the multiplicity of intermediary positions within this local agricultural labor market.

In the first part, I will elaborate on the findings of the fieldwork revealing the patterns of agricultural work in the hinterland of Adapazarı including wages, terms of contracts, relations with employers, tasks, working periods of workers. Then, I will discuss the dynamics of solidarity and exclusion in the labor market to elaborate on the way Roma, Kurd and Turk women act within the labor processes. Apparently, Roma women tend to invest more in kin and neighborhood relationships; Kurdish women are able to extend their networks beyond neighborhoods through wider ethnic ties and relations with co-workers; whereas Turkish workers in the city mostly invest in relationships with co-workers. I will try to illustrate the contexts and conditions that make these different strategies significant parts of women's working lives. Finally, I will illustrate some findings indicating a handover of jobs from Turkish group to others within the city, particularly to Romas based on age gap between worker groups and future prospects.

6.1 Different Patterns of Work

6.1.1 Wages

Table 6.1.A Average Wages of Agricultural Workers in Turkey[97]						
	Average daily wage of seasonal agricultural workers (TL)			Average monthly wage of permanent agricultural workers (TL)		
	Female	Male	Average	Female	Male	Average
1996	0.47	0.68	0.55	10	14	13
1997	1	1	1	26	30	30
1998	2	2	2	51	58	57
1999	3	4	3	90	108	107
2000	4	6	5	123	141	139
2001	5	7	7	163	203	200
2002	7	9	8	195	248	244
2003	9	12	11	232	306	297
2004	12	15	13	286	362	360
2005	14	18	15	314	403	391
2006	16	22	18	377	511	488
2007	19	26	22	550	706	694
2008	21	29	25	641	822	803
2009	23	32	27	650	836	806
2010	25	35	29	732	906	884
2011	29	38	33	748	1 022	979
2012	33	43	38	858	1 128	1 090
2013	36	48	42	1 032	1 262	1 232
2014	41	54	48	1 118	1 304	1 284

The table above (which is compiled by TUİK using data provided by the farmers) shows the average monthly salaries of permanent agricultural workers and average daily wages of temporary agricultural workers between the years 1996 and 2014. According to these figures, in addition to the benefits of social security, permanent workers enjoy better salaries compared to the daily wages of temporary workers. According to this table, seasonal workers can only secure an income in the vicinity of minimum wage, provided

[97] Source: Agricultural Holdings Wage Structure (TUİK)

that they work regularly and six days a week; yet they are expected to pay for their premiums personally in order to be covered by social security system.

The table also indicates that men working in agriculture either as permanent workers or on a seasonal basis enjoy better salaries than their female counterparts. Similarly [referring to data from Turkish Statistical Institute (TÜİK, 2011), Household Labour Force Survey (HHİA, 2009) and Household Budget Survey (HHBA, 2009)] Karadeniz states that in 2009, in atypical jobs wages of women (or their incomes, if they are not wage earners but working independently) are lower than those of men (Karadeniz, 2011). According to this study, the ratio of men earning less than half of minimum wage is 63.1 % whereas the same ratio for women is 91.9 %. For those who work independently, these ratios are 30.2 % and 69.1 % for men and women respectively (Karadeniz 2011: 94).

To compare the data from Turkish Statistical Institute with the findings of my fieldwork first of all I have to point out that in the period I observed, male and female workers doing the same work with the same crews were paid the same wages[98]. Wage differentiation between men and women workers within the same crew was possible when coupled with a differentiation of duties.[99] For example, employers were paying higher daily wages for male *kasacı* (carriers) and drivers. In fact, since the main body of workers in reaping, hoeing and planting were women, I saw no adult men working in the field with women workers and doing these same tasks (except for Roma groups). Nevertheless even in Roma groups, the ratio of men working in higher income tasks was higher than that of women workers. For example in work groups where men and women work together, women intermediary/crew leaders are not that common.

Other than these, wage differentiation was possible only when different crops, different areas, or different work teams are involved. Jobs like pea harvest where people working as families (Romas and other seasonal migrant workers) are heavily involved are priced by the piece and hence can be regarded as a separate category. Jobs priced in this fashion by employers are preferred as income generating works only by groups that work as families

[98] Pelek (2010) also noted that employers equally pay women and men within the same crews in Ordu and Polatlı, but they pay different amounts to local, Georgian and Kurdish crews (105)

[99] Yet I heard an exception from a hazelnut garden owner (60) in Karasu/Kuyumculu. He owns a relatively large land (approx. 100 decare) and regularly hires workers throughout the year for maintenance tasks apart from the harvest season. He told me that he has been paying different amounts to women and men for cleaning and pruning the trees within the year. Those workers he declared were coming from Kocaali. As I did not have the chance to observe these labor process, I do not know if this wage inequality is also accompanied by task differentiation or not (Field Notes, 2011, September 5).

(generally with the use of child labor)[100]. The existence of workers who (being excluded from work market in general) are willing to work as families (i.e. Romas) and the existence of seasonal migration is the way in which employers can maintain piece-based renumeration for crops such as peas that necessitates intense short-term labor.

In short, based on my fieldwork experience, agricultural wage differentiation in Adapazarı is seen only among different work teams and/or coupled with a differentiation in task-function. The functional differentiation between women and men is reflected in wage differentiation favoring men. Employers pay higher wages for tasks usually carried out by men, such as *kasacılık* and *sulamacılık,* which are generally legitimized through the physical requirements of the tasks.

For the crops demanding *en masse* migration of laborers to an area, an official minimum wage and a minimum standard of shelters is being advised, such as the case of migrant hazelnut workers. In hazelnut harvest tasks, where a state authorized commission proposes an advised minimum wage, employers were paying equal wages for men and women workers. Nevertheless, in 2011 there were still regional wage differences. In 2011, the workers in Ordu were receiving higher wages yet the workers I interviewed in Adapazarı were not considering this as a reason for protesting their employers. On the other hand in 2010, learning that reference wage was higher by 3 TL (25 Turkish Liras) in the neighboring district of Kocaali, the intermediaries organized among themselves and visited first chamber of agriculture and then *kaymakam* and governor to protest the situation[101] (Field Notes 2011). As a result, the wage was raised from 22 Turkish Liras to 23 Turkish Liras. Mahsun (aged 37) who brought 76 workers from a village in Diyarbakır (young men and women between the ages 15 and 20) summarized this instance as follows:

> The wage in Karasu was 25 Liras initially and the farmers had protested and have this lowered to 22 Liras. It was said that this year it is 28 Liras. We are content. Our protests last years has borne their fruit his year. We never had a 5 liras increase before. This is a good raise. I think our objections last year proved effective (Field Notes, 2011, September 7).

In this case of hazelnut harvest, Kurdish intermediaries' network of communication enabled them to utilize their power for wage bargaining. Within the report of parliamentary commission for finding solutions to seasonal agricultural workers, the

[100] As Ortiz (2002) states piece rates allow laborers to enhance their earnings by drawing on family labor (405). Large families with many dependents can benefit from piece remuneration and task contracts.

[101] Daily reference wage is determined by dividing monthly minimum wage by 30. The discrepancy between the reference wages for agricultural works occurred due to some commissions dividing the net wage and some other dividing the gross (before tax) wage.

precautions such as advised minimum wages and institutional *arabuluculuk* were exclusionary offered for the wage-labor processes of seasonally migrant agricultural workers (TBMM 2015: 169).

Yet, neither minimum wage defined by authorities nor collective bargaining is an option for most of the agricultural jobs in the area. Nonetheless it should be noted that state intervention in hazelnut work-labor processes is not a factor that increased wages (Field Notes 2011). As a matter of fact, recommended wage serves as a wage ceiling and daily wages of seasonal workers in hazelnut harvest was the lowest among agriculture related wages in the region.

The workers in the city have their own mechanisms. An independent increase in the wages of a crew, if heard by other workers, can easily become an issue of dispute between workers and employers. A farmer shared his amusement about the momentarily spread of the news among women crews. Nevertheless, employers have their methods to prevent that discomfort (Field Notes 2011). Most of the time, the employers themselves have their own meetings and agreements on the wages each year. Landowner employers usually have the chance to communicate daily in the coffeehouses whereas traders organize regular meetings once in a year to decide wages of different tasks. Throughout the fieldwork, I came across three independent groups of employers (potato traders, corn traders and lettuce traders) who have their own social networks and regular meetings to decide terms of wage-labor processes one-sidedly. Those employers were exclusively men, whereas the bulk of their employees were women.

In general, wage differences among agricultural worker crews I interviewed in Adapazarı were negligible. By 2015, employers were paying 50 liras for a daily field/garden job such as picking, cutting, planting and hoeing. An exception was workers in wholesale market as they are paid about ten percent lower wages compared to those that work in the fields. Women largely perceive this difference in the wages in terms of the difficulty of the works, and may prefer working in the hall (Field Notes 2011, 2015). On the other hand, women workers' demands of social security and their protests about its lack and the uneasiness of employers about the subject were evident in the hall.

During the field study, the main difference among different work groups manifested itself in the quality of the work contract with the employer. As Ortiz (2002) states labor contracts generally include clauses about hours of work, privileges, discipline, how the task is to be carried out, benefits, the rights to some resources, and the right to rest (406). Oral labor contracts in the region were indeed binding about these details. In this respect,

factors such as personal acquaintance or the continuous nature of work relations were in favor of the workers. Since the contract entails a fixed price for picking up and loading a certain amount of crop, working hours may differ among different work groups. As a worker from Karaköy says: "They will not let anybody go home until that truck is full[102]" (Field Notes, 2015). For that reason, although the daily wage was usually clear and stable within the season, work hours were highly variable and inconsistent even for a worker herself. In this case, the real negotiation between the employer and the intermediary was usually about the number of workers to recruit for a certain task. For example, six workers loading a truck in a workday usually form corn-dismantling crews. There are specific terms for differentiated tasks within the field and the established division of labor ensures the efficiency and speed of the team. Based on this established division of labor that I observed in the field; six seems to be the minimum number for an efficient crew. Yet, I once asked Dilara (34) that who decides the number of the people in a crew. As a crew leader, she intermediary told me about her occasional disputes with the employer:

> It is about the task at hand. Usually the boss. And intermediary. Six people for a truck, three trailers. If you add three more trailers it will be 12 people. The boss says -for example- 11 is enough. And then the crew leader says "11 is not enough, it should be 12". That is to say, if the boss causes any trouble, the intermediary deals with it[103] (Voice Records, 2015, Interview no: 20).

In the case of Roma groups who work with more than one intermediary between the employer and the worker, the differentiation in the tasks and working hours were more marked. For example in a worst-case scenario, a merchant buys the crop on a field from the landowner with an advance payment. Then the merchant sends one of his employees to make arrangements regarding the workers. The functionary in turn makes a deal with a local intermediary with a large network. This intermediary makes deal and shares benefits with other intermediaries when she needs additional workers (usually after sending her own workers elsewhere to more preferable tasks). If these additional workers are from Romani *Karaköy* or *Yeni Mahalle*, than the employer most probably do not pay for the transportation and the workers pays drivers within the neighborhood for their own transportation. And even if they work in the same field with other workers, they form separate work crews and are subject to different terms. I believe this hypothetical depiction of a work relation where there are multi layers between the employer and the

[102] O kamyon dolana kadar kimseyi göndermezler.

[103] Yapılan işle alakalı o da. Patron genelde. Ve aracı. Kamyona 6 kişi gelir, üç römork. Üç tane daha römork eklersen 12 kişi yapar. Patron sana diyor ki mesela 11 kişi yeter. Bu sefer de işçibaşı diyor ki yetmez. 12 kişi olacak. Aracı ayarlıyor yani aksilik çıkartırsa patron.

Roma workers (which I observed in the field) is noteworthy in pointing out the non-wage differences between worker groups.

The variety of forms of labor renumeration and contractual conditions are generally related to differences in tasks, in the size of the producing unit, in the method of production, in market conditions, in skill requirements, in state intervention with labor legislation and monitoring, and in the balance of power between employers and laborers as reported in studies on agricultural labor (Ortiz 2002: 403). More often than not, renumeration and tasks themselves have designated through the characteristics of available labor supply. Therefore, I perceived wage-labor processes in the region as an area of dynamic interaction between tasks, rewards and labor supply rather than as a one-directional management strategy to fill predefined tasks. The emergence of new tasks or continuation of others, are sometimes related to the characteristics of the available labour supply. Farmers in the region were frequently talking about their choices of crops with references to the amount of labour required (Field Notes, 2011). And they claimed to take their decisions to avoid "the troubles of dealing with the workers" meaning the difficulty of finding, recruiting, managing, paying every single time (Field Notes 2011). For example, within the interviews some farmers referred to difficulties of worker recruitment and management while explaining their preference of *silajlık* corn which can be harvested with machinery alongside with the increasing demand to the crop by poultry firms in the area (Field Notes 2011).

Some of the employers have more means to reach and manage the cheapest labor in the city. On the one hand, lettuce farming with high labour requirements has spread in the region recently. Within the region, the availability of new seeds that are durable in winter and high demand for crops, are supported by successful transactions between lettuce farmers and traders. These transactions have exempted farmers from recruiting and managing the labor processes. Kurdish traders are buying the crops before the harvest and by utilizing their networks, hold a stable labour force mostly composed of young (mostly Kurdish) women in the area. Such long-term employment of day laborers benefits employers who want to ensure the laborer's availability. Long-term contracts also offer employers the opportunity to build trust through patronage (Ortiz 2002), which fit perfectly to the case of lettuce traders in the region. In fact, Kurdish traders have the means for reaching out to the families and build trust ensuring that those young women will work for them through all year.

On the other hand, pea producers are concentrated in a particular area and demand a large amount of labour during short high seasons. Rather than assigning daily wages for pea harvest, these employers pays workers by the piece to ensure a fast harvest. In the hinterland of Adapazarı city, the high season of peas have attracted seasonal migration of workers and many local Roma groups who are able to work as whole families—often with underage helpers. In that sense, the availability of excluded groups from the general labor market and utilization of child labour in the absence of effective labor monitoring makes the crop profitable, i.e., preferable for farmer employers of the region. In addition, working with these seasonal migrant and local Roma groups provides farmers to delay or diminish workers' wages in the absence of control mechanisms-. A farmer once described a fierce argument he witnessed in a coffeehouse between a representative of Roma workers and an employer. He was regarding the case as typical:

> Farmer made them work in the pea harvest, but since they are Roma, the farmer did not give their wages believing that nobody will back them up, then their intermediary came to the coffeehouse to ask for money[104] (Field Notes 2011).

6.1.2 Employers

In fact, pea farming was one of the rare cases that small-sized landowner employers in the region collectively engage in labor recruitment. Pea producers are concentrated in an area (close to Güneşler-Karaköy) that makes it possible to attract laborers who migrate for short terms and work with piece-based renumeration. Nevertheless, landowners cultivating other widespread corps in the region (lettuce, corn) usually left the labor processes to traders through selling the product before harvest. Owners of the agricultural lands in the hinterlands of Adapazarı usually have other occupations in the city and rarely rely on agricultural profits as the only source of income. Throughout the fieldwork, I met wageworker, trader, taxi driver, grocer, civil servant, and mukhtar landholders living either in the nearby villages or in the city.

The majority of the employers who have hired the participants of 2015 case Study were traders. This result may partly be related to the focus of study of Romani and Kurdish worker groups who have least connections with farmer communities and rural Sakarya. Traders in the region appear as a layer between landowners and workers, actively recruiting workers for harvesting tasks. Traders often develop a more steady relationship

[104] Çiftçi arakayı toplatmış, şimdi bunlar Roman ya, arkaları yoktur diyerek vermemiş adam paralarını. Aracıları geldi kahveye. Para istemeye…

with the workers (compared to farmers who demand extra-labour for short terms) since they recruit workers for longer terms to work in multiple lands.

6.1.B Employers (Case Study 2015)		
	Frequency	Percentage
Landowner	2	3.8
Trader	33	63.5
Both	17	32.7
Total	52	100.0

Through a case study in Polatlı, Geçgin (2009) also states that the "peasants" prefer to leave the job of harvesting to others "in order not to deal with seasonal workers" (136):

> Peasants are usually landowners. They generally refrain from the production process through pre-made contracts with traders and *ekici's*. *Ekici's* are the ones who rent the land on behalf of a trader. There are also peasants who work with their own intermediaries and sell the product to traders after the harvest[105] (Geçgin 2009: 135).

Çetinkaya (2008), likewise mentioned an increase in the share of non-farmer employers as (agent companies and business firms) in Çukurova which he interpret as a result of the recession of cotton-based agricultural structure and the intensification of new production patterns like citrus and glass housing (114).

Some elderly participants of the study witnessed this transformation process that increasingly replaced farmer employers with traders in the city. Binnaz[106] (60) was a former agricultural worker who quitted the sector when she migrated to Germany 43 years ago. She was living in Romani Yeni Mahalle before migration and has been still spending her summers in her house within the neighborhood. She told it was the landowner in those days that take them to work from the neighborhood:

> Landwoners were taking us from the neighborhood. At those times, landowners were coming the night before and taking us by a truck. We used to work for two persons. THey were coming to the neighborhood… They were supervising us while working[107].

[105] Köylüler genellikle toprak sahipleridirler. Genellikle topraklarını baştan anlaşarak tüccara ya da ekicilere vermektedirler. Ekiciler ise toprağı tüccar adına kiralayanlar olmaktadır. Kendi elçileri ile çalısan ve ürünü toplama işi bittiğinde tüccara veren köylüler de bulunmaktadır.

[106] Interview no: 23 [Table 5.3.A The Profiles of the Participants (2015 Case Study) and Table 5.3.C Household Characteristics of the Participants (2015 Case Study)]

[107] Tarla sahibi mahalleye gelip götürüyordu. O zamanlar tarla sahibi akşamdan gelip sandıklı motorla götürüyordu. Devamlı iki kişiye giderdik. Mahalleye geliyorlardı… Çalışırken başımızda dururlardı.

Emine[108] (65) was one of the early settled residents and intermediaries of Kurdish Arabacıalanı and she remembered that employers were knocking on her door to ask for workers. She worked in the different branches of food industry, agricultural fields, sugar beet and strawberry factories and chicken farms. Her personal work history is very informative about the transformation of daily jobs within the city:

> Women were not going to work in my hometown. After we had come here from Ağrı (40-45 years ago) employers started to knock our doors to find workers. We were living in Yorgalar before. Then we moved to this house. I first worked in a strawberry factory, then I cut raw meat (chicken-fish) for livestock farming companies, I worked in the agricultural jobs (field jobs) in the summers. I have never been insured. In the old times, there were plenty of employers. We worked more than one job in a day… Now, corn and sugar beet mostly become mechanized… Sugar-beet factory and livestock farmers are not asking from workers from the neighborhood anymore, they are asking İŞKUR… Intermediaries were getting double wages… In 1990s, when we go to a daily waged job, landowners were supervising us working, they were taking us to the fields by their vehicles[109].

Within the 2015 case study the percentage of workers whom work only for the farmer was 3.8. More than one employer typically employs workers. Only 4 of the participants (8.2%) declared that they work for a permanent employer. Whereas 25 workers (48.1%) declared that they work for more than one employer but consistently. 20 workers (38.58 %) however state that the employer keeps changing. This group, which includes women, represents 48.1 % (25 worker) of the participants who never met and/or does not know their employer.

When we study, via cross tabulation, residence groups and relations with employers we see that the rate of working only for merchant is higher among Romas. Whereas 74.2% of Romas said that they were employed only via merchants, these ratios were 41.7 for Turks and 55.6 for Kurds.

When we compare residence groups according to the consistency of the relation with the employer Turkish group stands out. 16.7 % of women in this group stated that they work for a fixed employer, 75 % state that they work for more than one fixed employer. Continuous work relation with one or more employers adds up to 91.7 % for Turkish women whereas this ratio is only 50 % for Roma women and 59.2 % for Kurds. In other

[108] Interview no: 22 [Table 5.3.A The Profiles of the Participants (2015 Case Study) and Table 5.3.C Household Characteristics of the Participants (2015 Case Study)]

[109] Memlekette kadınlar işe gitmezdi, Ağrı'dan buraya geldikten sonra (40-45 yıl önce) patronlar kapıya gelirdi işçi aramaya, Yorgalar'da otururduk önceleri, sonra bu eve taşındık. Önce çilek fabrikasında çalıştım, sonra kışları tavuk-et-balık kestim, yazları tarlada çalıştım. Hiç sigortam olmadı… Eskiden işveren çoktu, günde birden fazla kez işe gidiyorduk... Mısır ve şeker pancarının çoğu makineye döndü…. Şeker fabrikası ve tavukcular artık mahalleden işçi aramıyorlar, İŞKUR'dan soruyorlar… Aracılar eskiden çift yevmiye alırdı… 90larda yevmiye işine gittiğimiz zaman toprak sahibi başımızda dururdu. Motorla işe götürürdü.

words half of the Roma and Kurd participants expressed that their employers change constantly whereas only 8.3 % of Turkish women work with changing employers. This difference can be explained by the concerns of Kurd and Roma participants about the insufficiency of their employment periods and hence, motivation to look for new jobs.

If we check the ratios about the relation to employer among residence groups we see that Roma women is significantly more likely to not know their employer compared to other women (Table 6.1.C). The reason for this is both the men of the group are in contact with the employer and also the above-mentioned multi-layered structure of the work where more than one intermediary is involved.

6.1.C Residence Groups * Relationship with the Employer(s)[110] (Case Stduy 2015)			
	Met her employer(s)	Did not meet her employer(s)	Know some employer(s)
Turk	91.7%	0.0%	8.3%
Roma	12,9 %	74.2%	12.9%
Kurd	34.6%	48.1%	17.3%

6.1.3 Working Age

Participants of the Field study of 2015 had started to work at the ages between 9 and 38 (mean 16.8 and mode 13). The reason why the age of work drops to 9 here is because some women start as unpaid laborers in their families' farm/village. I included this to the table because they especially emphasized this point to indicate how much they worked and at what an early age they started working. If we consider only the paid labour, minimum age appears as 12.

If we consider when they start working in the agriculture industry as paid labour the age range is 12 to 61 (mean 20.63 and mode 15). Even though the distribution is very wide the majority is between 13-17 (29 workers). Other than unpaid family labour women sometimes began working as accompanying their mothers in such jobs as cleaning, and some start working in agriculture after working as *bohçacı*. But also some women said they started working in agriculture after they get married. Significant number of women working in Wholesale Market became a paid agricultural worker after they migrate to city (with marriage)—while they were working in their family's land without being paid, now they are working in other people's land as paid laborer.

[110] I asked workers if they personally met, are familiar with or be acquainted with the employers.

Cross tabulation between residence groups and the starting ages of participants to work in paid agricultural tasks unfolds that 77.8 percent of the Kurdish group participants had started working before they were 15 or younger. This ratio is 48.4 percent within Roman group due to their pervious occupation of *bohçacılık* for the most part. Within Turkish group, only a woman had started to work in paid agricultural jobs before 16.

Finally one of the differences of those who work in the Wholesale Market and those who organize in the neighborhoods was that I encountered unpaid family worker story only among those who work in the Wholesale Market. While some of these women start working in their family's farms before marriage, others generally started in paid jobs. Romani participants, when I said "agricultural work"—assuming that this applies only to those that work on their own fields—warned me several times: "Make no mistake, we do not have farms, we do other people's work"[111] (Field Notes, *Karaköy*, 2015). Instead of agricultural work they preferred the phases "field works" (*kır işleri*) and "other person's/strangers work" (*elin işi*) to describe the jobs. As one of the Roma participants clarified: "we have always gone to other person's work"[112] (Field Notes, Karaköy 2015).

6.1.4 Tasks

The participants of the 2015 case study were mostly employed in hoeing, harvesting, and packaging jobs.

Hoeing was still one of the most genderized tasks in the region. Hoeing teams consists almost exclusively of women since even Roma men working in harvest acclaim that they have usually not been recruited in hoeing tasks (Field Notes, *Karaköy* 2015). Kevser claimed that employers prefer women for these tasks because of the experience requirements:

> Women are working in hoeing tasks. Men are new to this job. In hoeing, someone who does not know the work can give harm to the product. Since women are experienced on this task, women are working in hoeing tasks[113] (Kevser, Interview no. 41, Karaköy).

2015 Case Study 23.1 % of the participants was working in corn hoeing, 32.7% in lettuce hoeing, and 23.1 % in beet hoeing. When we study cross tabulation between hoeing task and residence group, we see that majority of the hoeing tasks was handled by Roma workers. One exception was lettuce works, which was the expertise of Kurdish workers.

[111] Yanlış olmasın bak, bizim tarlamız falan yok, biz başkasının işine gidiyoruz.

[112] Biz, hep elin işine gittik.

[113] Çapa işleri kadınlarda. Erkekler bu işe yeni girdi. Çapaya bilmeyen bir insan giderse zarar verebilir. O yüzden, kadınlar uzun zamandır yaptığı için çapaya tek kadınlar gidiyor.

The rest and the bulk of the agricultural tasks that women have been recruited are harvest related tasks such as picking, cutting, dismantling, loading and packaging (Table 6.1.D).

Table 6.1.D The Harvest Tasks and Frequencies (2015 Case Study)							
Potato	Peas	Spinach	Hazelnut	Corn	Beans	Lettuce	Beet
53.8%	51.9%	51.9%	51.9%	50.0%	44.2%	38.5%	25.0%

Potato harvest has appeared as the most frequent task that workers' had been recruited as 53.8 percent of the participants declared that they have been working in potato fields (Table 6.1.D). The high frequency of potato jobs among the participants is partly related to the fact that one of the places of the observation of this case study was Potato Wholesale Market. In fact, the ratio of potato harvest has decreased from 67.3 percent since 13.5 percent of the participants stated that they had stopped working in potato fields. This apparent decreasing trend is, partly due to the decrease in potato production within the region. Potato Wholesale Market Administrative Nihat Özdemir declared a radical decrease in the potato production of Adapazarı (*Bizim Sakarya* 2013, December 20). But also the aged workers in the Potato Market disclosed their preference of working more and more in the marketplace rather than fields due to physically compelling characteristic of the field tasks (Field Notes 2015).

Potato and sugar beet (hoeing and cutting jobs) are areas where both the land they are cultivated have been diminished (Işık 2007: 72) and also where the participants were working more intensively in the past. Lettuce and vegetable farming, which are increasingly more widespread in the hinterland of Adapazarı, are also reflected in the working practices of the women. In addition to that corn and hazelnut, which are two major contributions of the city to Turkey's agriculture with respect to production amounts, also plays an important role in the work life of participants.

According to the cross tabulation between residence groups and products, we see that Roma groups are mostly occupied in spinach—a winter job—and peas (araka) harvest—including migration out of the city. 67.7 % of Roma participants expressed that they work in peas and 71.0 % of them in spinach harvest.

Also when we look at the specialization patterns we see that the products for which Roma groups work exhibits a greater variety compared to others. Hoeing tasks in corn, lettuce, and sugar beet; harvesting tasks in lettuce, sugar beet, peas, potato, hazelnut, kidney beans, beans, spinach, nuts, cauliflower, artichoke, rocket, parsley, sunflower seeds; and

ornamental works are among the tasks undertaken by women of the two Roma neighborhoods studied.

Based on this data we may infer that Roma workers diversified their tasks to increase employment periods during the year. Roma women were indeed more open to work within one-time contracts, within unfamiliar crews, different intermediaries, different employers, and different terms of contracts to increase their periods of employment as far as I understood the labor processes within the neighborhoods. Yet, the openness of multi-ethnic crews to Roma women is another issue that I will elaborate on in the part titled "The Dynamics of Solidarity & Exclusion within the Labor Processes".

Another distinctive feature of Roma group is that the women was working as paid laborers in agricultural works continued to work in other daily jobs such as başak yapma, apartment cleaning, *bohçacılık*, *sülük toplama*, livestock tasks like chicken slaughtering and (plastics) recycling. We should also add to this making and selling hand artifacts (*dantel, örtü*) with the help of micro credits available to women and self-employment attempts with their husbands, such as running a coffeehouse, a butcher shop or a small market. Hence, in addition to working within more diverse tasks in agricultural jobs compared to other groups, Roma women also work in a variety of other sectors.

Kurdish women participants—with respect to working with local intermediaries in Güneşevler and Şeker neighborhoods—generally have better access to agricultural works in the city compared to Roma women living in Yeni Mahalle and Karaköy. The fact that Kurdish men works in other sectors in the city and only Kurdish women work in agricultural works, may become an advantage for Kurdish women to be included in women crews.

6.1.5 Working Status and Periods

Table 6.1.E Working Status and Periods (2015 Case Study)

	Frequency	Percentage	Cumulative Percent
Quit working in agriculture	5	9.6	9.6
Continue working in agriculture	38	73.1	82.7
Work less - care laborer - little children	2	3.8	86.5
Work less - care laborer - elderly, disabled, ill	5	9.7	96.2
Work less	2	3.8	100.0

As seen in the Table 6.1.E, 38 of the participants (73.1 percent) of 2015 Case Study have continued to work in agricultural jobs within similar terms. 5 participants declared that they quitted working in agricultural tasks, 9 were working in lesser terms mainly due to family requirements.

If we crosscheck working periods, workers of the Turkish group, on the one hand, predominantly have 9-12 months access to agricultural jobs, most of them working for 12 months in the potato wholesale market, 3-4 days a week. Younger ones were substituting market work with field tasks in spring and summer seasons whereas older workers generally stated their preferences of working in the Potato Wholesale Market.

Roma workers, on the other hand, were seeking more access to jobs as the most disgruntled group about their limited terms of employment. Many Roma women complained in the interviews about the unemployed days within their working periods and specifically hardness of finding jobs in the winter. I witnessed women resenting their neighbors when they did not ask them to come to work with them. It was actually hard to fully comprehend working periods of Roma workers because of its variability and women's relative unfamiliarity of monthly calculations. Therefore, most of the time, I estimated the working periods through crops and tasks they mentioned and decided that the majority of the group is working 6 to 9 months a year. Working 6 - 9 months a year in fact is rather common for Roma women since students and others supplementing agricultural work with other jobs usually work in agricultural tasks 3 to 6 months a year. Working 6 - 9 months is the practice of Roma women who exclusively earn their living from daily jobs and any other regular bases of household income. For example, as a field job in winter, Roma women largely work in spinach harvest, which is rather infrequent among other groups.

6.1.6 Migration for Work

Migration for agricultural tasks is one of the most distinguishing patterns between different groups in this agricultural labor market. Cross tabulation of migration for work and residence groups reveals different patterns with respect to mobility for work among residence groups (Table 6.1.F).

Table 6.1.F Migration for Work (2015 Case Study)				
	Turk	Roma	Kurd	Total
Always work within the borders of Sakarya province	12	18	6	36
Travel daily to nearby provinces for agricultural jobs	0	6	0	6
Seasonally migrate to other regions for agricultural jobs	0	7	3	10
Total	12	31	9	52

Daily migration occurs in lettuce jobs, where lettuce cutting teams working for a merchant can travel as far as Bilecik, Bursa, and Eskişehir. I have observed this pattern during 2011-2 fieldworks within Roma and Kurd groups. The reason that no daily migrating Kurds are indicated in Table 6.1.F is the small size of the sample in 2015. On the other hand seasonal migration to work in agriculture is typical in Roma group that I encountered through out my three year of fieldwork. I realized this first in 2011 in Yeni Mahalle and the 2015 case study also revealed this pattern. Few Kurdish workers that migrate seasonally in this table are from the relatively isolated Bağlar Mahallesi. Kurdish women that I contacted in Güneşler and Arabacıalanı worked either in nearby fields or migrate daily[114].

To summarize, in this part, I presented different patterns of wage labor processes for Roma, Kurd and Turk agricultural workers in the city in terms of wages, employers, the ages they start working in agriculture, migration for work, working statuses and periods. Particularly, the data revealing the migration for work pattern, working periods and relations with the employers indicate disadvantaged status of Roma in the labor market. For this comparison, I mainly used the data of Case Study (2015) but also compare and discussed some results within the light of the whole fieldwork data. In the next section, I will approach to these differences from a different angle through focusing on "interactions" between women. I will therefore focus on women agency to expose the ways in which they are using their networks to gain a better position within the agricultural labor market.

6.2 The Dynamics of Solidarity and Exclusion within the Labor Processes

Labor processes in the agricultural labor market is, on the one hand, a site to observe solidarity practices among workers including strengthening friendships, kin ties, and neighborhood social codes providing extended work networks. Women working in

[114] Nevertheless I encountered cases where household men of this group sometimes migrate for jobs in construction or service.

relatively stable crews usually have close relations with team members beyond work relations. They occasionally gather and chat, share information and advise each other for important decisions about their lives[115]. Yet many agricultural worker women in the city work within multiple crews formed by relatives, neighbors, and also strangers. Workers usually expect from their relatives and also neighbors to provide reliable information about new job opportunities.

The ties of solidarity are often selective and exclude some. In this part, I will focus on dynamics of solidarity and exclusion among agricultural workers, which often put Roma women in relatively disadvantageous positions. Through the interactions of actors in the labor market, I tried to focus on the meanings and practices and particularly the ways in which ethnicity come to assume a given set of meanings and governing practices that shaped wage labor processes.

At first, I want to reemphasize that agricultural jobs are not equally reachable for all the workers in the city. While many residents of Güneşler and members of established lettuce crews usually have the chance to work permanently, people in Romani Erenler/Yeni Mahalle and isolated settlements like Karaköy/Budaklar and Bağlar, often state that they could work more in agricultural jobs if they had the chance.

Within the crowded multi-ethnic neighborhood of Güneşler, the local women intermediaries allocate tasks between hundreds of women laborers everyday. Among the few wide-network intermediaries mentioned by workers in each neighborhood, two of them were living in Güneşler. "Everyday, women of this neighborhood goes to fields" makhtar of Güneşler told, "for years" (Field Notes, 2015). In 2015 summer, I interviewed Güler[116] (67) in Güneşler, an elderly worker who said she works for approximately 10 months in agricultural tasks each year for almost three decades. Her stepdaughter added: "Nowadays she is working less because of her health. She can work every day if she wants. This is the case for the last 30 years"[117].

Nalan (25) as the daughter of a family migrated from Van-Erçiş to Adapazarı in 1970s was also living in Güneşler. She had been a member of a stable lettuce crew working for a trader between the ages 14 to 20. She said she worked everyday except Saturdays for the

[115] In case of Turkey, there are a number of researchers elaborated on such neighborhood-based small-group solidarities and self-help networks as mechanisms enabling urban poor to develop collective capabilities and make ends meet (Soytemel 2013; Hattatoğlu 2000; White 2004).

[116] The names of interviewers are pseudo names.

[117] Interview no: 32 [Table 5.3.A The Profiles of the Participants (2015 Case Study) and Table 5.3.C Household Characteristics of the Participants (2015 Case Study)]

last 7 years and added "I can still go everyday if I want" (Field Notes 2015, August 2). Likewise, Turkish women have access to work throughout the year in the Wholesale Market, although it is 3-4 days a week. Younger workers usually combine work in the Market with farm jobs via utilizing the web of employer networks the workplace provide whereas elderly women usually prefer working in only Market tasks. On the other hand, majority of Roma women[118] have little chance to be employed in the winter seasons apart from spinach harvest, so as some of the Kurdish women. For example, within relatively isolated Kurdish Bağlar neighborhood even one of the well-known worker-intermediary[119] of the settlement complained about the insufficiency of jobs. Her granddaughter said that "we would go more if we found jobs, it is not more that 3 or 4 days a week (in the season)". Nevertheless, this family and most of the Kurdish women in the city have more means of subsistence compared to Roma participants to survive the winters with income provided by household men.

In Romani Karaköy and Yeni Mahalle/Erenler, women were trying to be involved in crews to increase their job opportunities. I witnessed women resenting to their neighbors for not calling (yelling) them while going to work. While Turkish women usually work within relatively stable crews; Roma women generally try to be included in multiple crews to increase their employment options and periods. They combine multiple strategies to increase their access to jobs like supporting neighborhood moral codes to share knowledge, going to work with complete strangers, going to work with unfamiliar intermediaries and so on. While Turkish women in Potato Wholesale Market often mention their preferences with respect to their periods of employment; many Roma women in Karaköy and Yeni Mahalle stated that they would like to work more in agricultural jobs.

I met Hüsne (55) in Potato Wholesale Market in 2011. She was a worker-intermediary for a long time as a daughter of a local farmer family. I visited her in her apartment in a central neighborhood of the city. She was also taking her three daughters to work in agriculture when they were younger. As they were going to work as a crew of four at one

[118] Here, I specifically mean Roma women in Karaköy/Budaklar and Yeni Mahalle/Erenler as parts of the 2015 Case study. Roma neighborhood in Sapanca revealed a different work pattern. There were ornament companies close to neighborhood, which have recently risen as a profitable sector of investment within the region. Professional ornament firms provide part-time and longer period employment options to women, yet, within the same structurally insecure labor processes as in other wage-labor processes of agriculture. On Roma women in multi-ethnic Güneşler neighborhood my observations are rather limited and not generalizable regarding the crowdedness of the settlement and the juxtaposition of networks providing agricultural jobs.

[119] Gülnaz (65) - Interview no: 33 [Table 5.3.A The Profiles of the Participants (2015 Case Study) and Table 5.3.C Household Characteristics of the Participants (2015 Case Study)]

phone call, employers usually preferred to hire them, she told. She had a stable working team and quitted the farm tasks apart from Potato Wholesale Market when we met in 2011. We then gather with Hüsne's co-workers (and friends) in another house within a nearby neighborhood. It was a long tea gathering with snacks, which provided me the opportunity to learn about individual work histories of women and their relations with each other. During the gathering Hüsne and others mentioned their help to latest members of the crew - a mother and daughter who recently migrated from a village in Black Sea region. The crew said they help this mother and daughter to better adapt city life through taking them to work together and intervening in their speaking, dressing habits and manners. Hüsne herself owns her apartment and already divorced her husband because of domestic violence and monetary issues. She said her husband had become lazier, worked less and to earn less income since he realized she is capable of taking care of the family by working in the fields. One day her husband stabbed her with a knife for money which was the last straw ending their marriage. The crew helped Hüsne in these days to find a temporary place to live and cope with the unpleasant divorce processes.

Hüsne mentioned that recently the crew together was able to persuade the host of the day (Munise) to take a loan from bank and buy this house. Munise had to take care of herself and her children without his husband's support, who was a civil foreman having a reputation of not getting consequent jobs from the same employer (because of his underperformance/laziness). As a following project, they concentrated on another crewmember (Huriye) whose husband had recently retired from a recycling factory. Women were single-heartedly trying the encourage Huriye to take a loan and buy a house with the help of the retirement pension. Hüsne told proudly "we are going to make her buy a house as we did to Munise" (Field Notes 2011, May).

As in this group, women workers that I have encountered throughout the fieldwork built close relationships and have helped each other in various ways. That was also the case for Kurdish workers. For example, worker-intermediary Dilara[120] (34) was accompanying the mother of one of her co-worker's in her routine visits to the hospital. Neighbors who can easily stop by each other's houses and are informed about each other's life struggles exclusively form the crew of her. They have a close and relaxed relationship, be able to share important information and help each other. Many Kurdish women in Arabacıalanı and Bağlar neighborhoods mentioned that they occasionally met women workers and

[120] Interview no: 20 [Table 5.3.A The Profiles of the Participants (2015 Case Study) and Table 5.3.C Household Characteristics of the Participants (2015 Case Study)]

intermediaries from other neighborhoods in the workplaces which led to collaboration and merging of crews. Many Kurdish workers were thus working with women intermediaries who are either outside or inside of the neighborhood. Kurdish women crews in Arabacıalanı, for instance, have been in contact with the intermediaries in Şeker Mahallesi (a crowded multi-ethnic worker neighborhood that have supplied labour force for sugar beet production to Sugar Factory - Şeker Fabrikası).

Expanding personal networks is also one of the strategies of Roma women to increase their job opportunities yet they have to struggle with two additional constraints. Many Roma women work alongside with household men, which was one of the obstacles for merging with crews that are exclusively formed by women. The second and related problem is stigma on the community, which seems too serious to not be considered within the wage-labor processes of agricultural jobs in the city.

Stigma & Exclusion

Roma workers are actually one of the hot topics of conversations throughout my project in the city. As I mentioned in the part on "Fieldwork", it even took a while for me to realize that people from Roma community were working in agriculture. The farmers, bureaucrats, gendarme officers that I initially interviewed in the city had all single-heartedly claimed that people of Roma community *do not* work at all—implying that they steal instead. After I had learned about the community's overwhelming presence in agricultural labor market of the city and had included Roma neighborhoods to my study, my interviews with other workers and farmers continued to turn around that issue of Roma workers. One time in 2011, while I was talking in the Chamber of Agriculture with the chairman and three other farmers, I mentioned my visit to a Roma neighborhood. The issue triggered a fevered argument between the men. Farmers started to argue aloud, three claimed that Roma men and women never *work*, while another hopelessly tried to convince the others stating that he personally know some and that they are *working* in agricultural jobs. Throughout the fieldwork, I have repeatedly heard such stigmatizing statements on Roma community from farmers and other workers. In 2015, I met my high school friends in the city. We were talking about my fieldwork on agricultural workers and the minute I mentioned Roma neighborhoods they responded and questioned unanimously: "But Romas never work!"[121]. I think the strength and persistence of such stigmatizing arguments on Roma workers even in the evidence of challenging knowledge necessitates a

[121] Romanlar çalışmaz ki!

specific focus on the reflections of this stigma within the agricultural wage-labor processes.

Throughout the interviews, I usually opened up the subject by mentioning my Roma interviewers to other workers, which often triggered strong responses and interesting conversations. Workers did not argue against the fact that Roma are working in agriculture; yet, they express their discomfort with the fact in various ways.

While we were talking in her house, Hüsne mentioned that some periods that she had difficulties to find workers to meet labour demands of the employers. She even knocked the doors of unfamiliar houses in the nearby neighborhoods and tried to convince women to work. Her response was remarkable to my question on how she chose eligible workers to meet the demands of employers and if she ever worked with Roma or Kurdish workers. Apparently, she does not see Roma reliable enough to work together and Kurds eligible enough for tasks in Potato hall which necessitate interaction with Turkish employers:

> Honey, I went from door to door. (Together with the other girls) we have told all the women in the neighborhood, we have tried to convince them. In the neighborhood and its surroundings. In general, those coming from Karadeniz and those coming from the (peripheral) districts. Those who came from the villages recently; since they have needs, they come to work. I am directing the ones who live nearby to the wholesale market hall; we take a walk. Work at the hall is better than work at the fields... I do not work with the Roma honey, because of thievery. They steal a lot... I send the Kurds to the fields, not to the hall. They do not speak the tongue, cannot tall to the boss, they just cannot. Kurds have a language problem... I call the most able to the hall, those who have the capacity to tall to the boss[122] (Field Notes 2011, May 20).

As in this example, ethnicity can be a central factor in many contexts in the labor market for allocating tasks between workers and consequently for allocation of the rewards associated with their tasks[123].

Racialized perception of skill and diligence are also widespread among agricultural workers crews within the city. In the summer of 2015, while we were hanging out with

---

[122] Kapı kapı gezdik kızım. Mahallede (kızlarla beraber) kadınlara anlattık, ikna etmeye çalıştık. Bizim mahalle ve civarda. Karadenizden gelenler ve ilçeden gelenlerden genelde. Köyden yeni gelenler ihtiyacı olduğu için onlar geliyor çalışmaya. Yakın oturanları hale yönlendiriyorum, yürüyerek gidiyoruz. Haldeki iş tarladan daha iyi… Romanlarla çalışmıyorum kızım, hırsızlıktan dolayı. Çok çalıyorlar… Kürtleri tarlaya gönderirim, hale göndermem. Onlar dil bilmez, patronla konuşamaz, beceremez. Kürtlerde dil sorunu var… En beceriklileri, patronla konuşabilecek kapasitede olanları hale çağırırım.

[123] Maldonado (2009) for example wrote a powerful piece on employers' racial schemes in US agricultural labor market, which turns out to be a disadvantage for Latino workers since they have exclusively been associated with manual jobs. She questioned the racial meanings employers articulate about and in relation to Latino workers and their preference of searching Latino networks for manual jobs but other white networks for managerial positions. Benson (2011) likewise noticed tobacco farmers' racialized perceptions of diligence (of Latino) and laziness (of Black) of crews, which effect their recruitment decisions independent of the individual qualifications.

Kurdish worker-intermediaries Dilara (34) and Emine (65)[124] in the backyard of Emine's house, I mentioned my plans on visiting the area in Karaköy, which is mainly/exclusively populated by Romas. They single heartedly warned me about the dangers and expressed their discomfort about working alongside with Roma workers[125]. It was mostly an issue of workplace security for them. Emine accused Roma workers for stealing their work, products and even children in the fields:

> Our team was always a mixed one, Laz, Kurd, Manav... There were also Gypsies whom I intermediated, the boss have found them. Normally, we do not go to the same fields at the same time, yet sometimes we happen to run across them. We have worked in the same fields, in different teams. We have encountered them a lot. They were taking the corn we were breaking... One day, they kidnapped a 10 year old and put him on a basket. I told the story and it came to light[126]

She was probably just reinventing an old memory highlighting her innocence and guilt of Roma workers to support her narrative. Yet, I valued the child-stealing story as important sign of the stigma. Similarly, members of the corn crew that I worked with in 2011 had also mocked me a lot when I mentioned that I was also talking with Roma women as a part of my project. They were sure (!) that I would learn a lot about *work* by asking Roma women. They clearly were not willing to be associated with Roma (Filed Notes 2011).

In fact, many agricultural workers of the city particularly pointed at the workers in Karaköy as a threat to their wages and conditions of work. It is an isolated and recently crowded Roma settlement (within Karaköy neighborhood) full of shack houses, inhabiting new comers (from Ankara) and other semi-nomadic families willing to settle and build a house. Even some Roma workers outside Karaköy were not exceptions, Romas in other parts of the city expressed negative perceptions about Karaköy. For example, I met Hamide (21) in the summer of 2012 through a common acquaintance and visit her in her home in Güneşler. She was a young single Roma woman who was living with her family-mother, father and brother. Her parents have also been workers in agricultural sector and

---

[124] Interview no: 22 [Table 5.3.A The Profiles of the Participants (2015 Case Study) and Table 5.3.C Household Characteristics of the Participants (2015 Case Study)]

[125] They stated that they have occasionally come across Roma crews in the fields but work as separate crews. That means they are doing the same job such as loading a truck with dismantled corn within the field but as independent crews. Indeed, employers occasionally hire independent crews for the same tasks through collaboration between intermediaries sharing benefits. As I mentioned before, local women intermediaries (vocally) contract with Roma intermediaries to recruit Roma workers, which often resulted in layered work organization for Roma workers.

[126] Bizim ekip hep karışık olurdu, Laz, Kürt, Manav… Aracılık yaptığım Çingeneler de oldu, patron bulmuş. Normalde onlarla aynı tarlaya beraber gitmeyiz ama tarlada denk gelirdik. Şeker mahallesinde Çingeneler var, biz onlarla cok çalıştık eskiden. Aynı tarlada çalışırdık, ayrı ayrı. Çok denk geldik öyle. Kırdığımız mısırı alıyorlardı… Bir gün Poyrazlar'da 10 yaşında bir çocugu çalmışlar, sepete koymuşlar… Ben söyledim, ortaya çıktı…

her father was still working as a kasacı (carrier) for lettuce trader. Despite her young age she was in the sector for years and occasionally intermediating between lettuce traders and workers from Karaköy that she called "girls". Yet, she was reactive about workers in Karaköy: "They are working for lower wages. They affect our business in a bad way. They are Gypsies and we are Roma" (Fieldwork, Voice Records 2012). Hamide was in fact unemployed at the time we met although it was a high season. Ironically it was because her father had started to work for a lettuce trader with crew of young Kurdish women. She had tried to work within the team for a while. However, lettuce cutting requires harmony and a dynamic division of labor within the team. Kurdish workers excluded her from conversations and constantly mocked her in the field, she claimed, that gave her no options but to quit. Her father was able to stay as *kasacı* as his tasks were more definite and have been distinguished from the crew of young Kurdish women. Her story indicates a good example revealing the complexity of solidarity and exclusion mechanisms within the local labor market. As a young Roma woman she had been literally excluded from a lettuce cutting crew, which was dominated by Kurdish young women. Nevertheless, she had some advantages in accessing jobs network due to her parents work history in the sector and residence in Güneşler compared to relatively isolated Karaköy. Thus, she was able to utilize her position in the labor market to increase her income through intermediating between young women in Karaköy and traders.

In conclusion, this part focused on the multiple dynamics of solidarity and exclusion between workers. Indeed, focusing on ethnicity in the practices within the labor market exposes important details about how identities are interactively constituted, negotiated and experienced by people everyday. Ethnic fragmentation within the labor market sets a base for discussing exclusionary practices within workers. In fact, it is not only employers[127] but also practices of workers, which have been perpetuating fragmentation within the labor market. As Bonacich (1972) pointed out advantaged paid labour always try to exclude others usually through utilizing such mechanisms as caste system and exclusion. The group whose labor market position is affected at most through exclusion mechanisms is Roma workers of the city, although there are complex ties of solidarity and exclusion processing within the wage-labor processes of all. Women workers in the city occasionally contribute to the strength of stigma on Roma community through excluding

[127] I excluded the discussion on employer preferences and discriminatory practices and just focused on workers. In fact, there are some studies elaborating on employers' preferences and discriminatory practices on Turkey's agricultural labor market. Önen (2012) for example, particularly mentioned employers' discrimination against Dom (Gypies in Eastern Turkey) seasonal agricultural workers that made them to hide their identities within workplaces.

them from crews, job networks and solidarity ties. Workers' such practices, I think, are not stemming from gratuitous ethnic prejudice or simply a concern for workplace security. It is in fact partly related to general exclusion of Roma community from the labor markets. The distinguishing characteristic of stigmatized Roma agricultural workers is that they usually work with all household members, which would give them advantage within piece-based renumeration whereas women workers' wellbeing tied to the availability of daily wage jobs in the sector.

In fact, workers do not only explore and utilize advantages within the agricultural labor market but also occasionally benefit from job other sectors and other resources of income in the households. In the last section, I will broaden this framework to elaborate on different advantages and positioning of Turkish women and minority women in the wider society, which seems to result in different future prospects between agricultural worker groups in the city.

6.3 Signs of an Handover of Agricultural Jobs in the City

This section will draw on the differences of personal work histories and future prospects of workers. Most of the Turkish participants of this study were not living within residential communities where women collectively work in agriculture. They rather have peculiar individual histories that distinguish them from their neighbors, which led them to work in agricultural jobs. Most of them were born in the nearby villages. They were undereducated just like the other agricultural workers in the city. Yet, their daughters are not likely to be agricultural workers in the future due to the availability of industrial jobs within the region which apparently have not been attainable by Roma and Kurdish women (regarding their own expressions about the youth of the communities). Turkish women's daughters were either working in other sectors or entering into social security system through marriage, which distinguish their future prospects from others. In the light of these, I interpret the age gap, individual work histories and different prospects of future as signs of a handover of jobs within the city from central to peripheral neighborhoods.

The participants of this study were certain about one thing; the agricultural jobs within the hinterland of the city have decreased. This decrease in fact was partly related to landowners' preference of mechanized feed grain (corn) production following the boom of poultry farms in the area; the industrial development within the city throughout 1990s; and following urban policies resulted in conversion of agricultural lands in the hinterland of the city to work places and residences. Yet, within the same period, agricultural labor

market has also welcomed some new comers. Many new migrant women (Kurds and those from Black Sea region) and Roma men and women become agricultural wage laborers due to the increased migration to the city in 1990s and the deadlock of Romani artisanships and *bohça* business[128].

Muhtars and elderly farmers living in the older settlements of the city often mentioned that transformation within the interviews by pointing out that there had been women in their neighborhood collectively working in the agricultural jobs before 1990s. For example, mukhtar of Erenler/Bağlar confirmed that throughout 1990s, the replacement of agricultural areas with residential buildings decreased available agricultural jobs within the neighborhood. Moreover, he noted that before this period agricultural intermediaries were visiting the neighborhood to take women laborers to work in the nearby villages. "All these agricultural workers become housekeepers now" he concluded (Field Notes 2015). Workers also pointed to a similar transformation. Nursel (43) [129] for example was one of the workers living in Hacıoğlu neighborhood close to the city center and noticed the transformation of her neighborhood:

> Our neighborhood is welloff… Workingwoman is rare. They are usually housekeepers. In old days, there were women working in the fields… What they do now? They are sitting at their houses[130].

Likewise, mukhtar of Küpçüler stated that there were women working in agricultural jobs in the past, yet, none remained as workers nowadays except a small group working in grass companies–a kind of ornament business selling grassed soil). There are in fact, still agricultural areas within the neighborhood but landowners were either invested in husbandry or *silajlık* corn as feedstuff allowing a fully mechanized harvest. Küpçüler neighborhood is in fact near to Romani Yeni Mahalle, which is close to the center compared to other migrant and Romani neighborhoods. Yet, the agricultural worker residences of Yeni Mahalle will probably be replaced by new residents in the near future since the urban transformation project for the area had already began in 2015.

---

[128] While everybody else was talking about low wages of agriculture jobs and their plans to quit the sector, a Roma women said "we have started work more in agriculture as the daily wages increased, we worked more in the last two years" *(Yevmiyeler arttıkça biz daha cok gitmeye başladık, iki senedir daha yoğun gidiyoruz)* (Interview no: 40 [Table 5.3.A The Profiles of the Participants (2015 Case Study) and Table 5.3.C Household Characteristics of the Participants (2015 Case Study)]

[129] Interview no: 48 [Table 5.3.A The Profiles of the Participants (2015 Case Study) and Table 5.3.C Household Characteristics of the Participants (2015 Case Study)]

[130] Bizim mahalle biraz rahat… Çalışan az, ev hanımı genellikle. Eskiden tarlaya gidenler vardı… Şimdi ne mi yapıyorlar? Evde oturuyorlar.

As a final remark before going further into the discussion, I want to remind central characteristics and limits of the Turkish sample of the group. Most of the Turkish participants of this study were women working in the Potato Wholesale Market in addition to field jobs. In fact, some of the elderly members were exclusively working in Potato Wholesale Market and some of them had worked in the fields when they were younger as both unpaid family laborers and paid workers. They were coming from nearby neighborhoods, to the Wholesale Market, which are close to the city center. I compare their position within the labor market with Roma and Kurdish workers living in settlements that are associated with their ethnic identities. For the purposes of statistical comparison and highlighting the differences in working patterns, I excluded some crowded multi-ethnic worker neighborhoods (such as Hızırtepe, Şeker, Güneşler) within 2015 case study. Therefore, the hints that case study revealed indicating a handover of jobs in the city are in fact limited to the workers living within central neighborhoods (Turkish groups) and peripheral settlements associated either Romani or Kurdish identities.

6.3.1 Age Gap

Within 2015 case study, one but all participants from the Turkish group were above 35 distinguishing them from the other groups. While Romani groups were more balanced since the number of women above 35 is close to those under 35 within the group. Kurdish group is composed almost exclusively of youngsters and elderly with just one woman between the ages 35-54.

I asked all the participants about their neighbors' livelihood and specifically the youngsters' situation within their families and residential communities. Turkish women often talked about youngsters' relative advantage in finding "jobs with insurance" and wellbeing of their women neighbors. For example, I met Figen[131] (60) in the Potato Wholesale Market. She was living in *Tabakhane* and working in agricultural jobs for 30 years. She noted that she is the single agricultural worker in her family among 12 siblings. Her remarks about her residential community were similar:

> We are 12 siblings. I am the only one who works. Noone else in my family work in agricultural jobs. It is also a rare occasion in our neighborhood, as far as I know there is only one woman in my neighborhood works in agriculture. People have insured jobs

[131] Interview no: 26 [Table 5.3.A The Profiles of the Participants (2015 Case Study) and Table 5.3.C Household Characteristics of the Participants (2015 Case Study)]

> nowadays. If I were any younger, like 35, even I would have gone to an insured work too…[132]

Ferzane[133] (38), likewise, was a worker-intermediary in Potato Wholesale Market. She was also living in *Tabakhane* and has been working and intermediating in agricultural sector for 20 years. She also noted that youngsters land formal jobs more easily these days:

> In our family, the only person who works in agricultural jobs other than me is my cousin. There is no one else. The field jobs were plenty in the past. Then, they diminished. Youngsters are working in insured jobs nowadays. Yet, even in old times there are a few people in our neighborhood who work in the fields. Women generally do handcrafts like lacework… I did for a period too. I sold my handcrafts to my relatives and neighbors[134].

Kıymet[135] (51) was another experienced worker that I met in Potato Wholesale Market. She described the transformation in her residential community and agricultural jobs in similar terms as decreased agricultural workers within the neighborhood and youngsters' employment in the factories:

> Only 2 or 3 women continue to work in agriculture in our neighborhood. In old times, we used to go to work in fields as 35-40 women together. There was corn. We harvest potatoes, onions and sugar beets. And also hazelnuts… Those women are living in their houses nowadays. They all got old. Youngsters are working in the factories. Only those handicapped among them are coming here to work (Potato Wholesale Market)… In old times, we did not have these opportunities. If I were younger, I would have worked in a factory[136].

Nuray[137] (62) was one of the workers who migrated to Adapazarı through marriage from a nearby province in 1972. She also reported about the non-working status of her women neighbors and the non-agricultural alternatives that have been utilized by youngsters around:

---

[132] 12 kardeşiz. Tek ben çalışıyorum. Ailemde başka tarımda çalışan yok. Mahallede de az var, bir tane var bildigim arada giden. Artık sigortalı işlere gidiyorlar. Biraz genç olsam, 35 yaşında olsam, ben bile giderdim…

[133] Interview no: 25 [Table 5.3.A The Profiles of the Participants (2015 Case Study) and Table 5.3.C Household Characteristics of the Participants (2015 Case Study)]

[134] Bizim ailede benden başka tarlada calışan bir kuzenim var. Başka kimse yok. Eskiden tarla işi daha yoğundu. İş çoktu azaldı. Gençler artık sigortalı işe giriyorlar. Ama zaten eskiden beri oturduğumuz semtlerde fazla tarlaya giden yoktu. Kadınlar evde genellikle el işi yapıyorlar, dantel yapıyorlar… Ben de yaptım bir dönem. Akrabalara çevreye sattım.

[135] Interview no: 31 [Table 5.3.A The Profiles of the Participants (2015 Case Study) and Table 5.3.C Household Characteristics of the Participants (2015 Case Study)]

[136] Mahallede tarımda çalışan 2-3 kadın kaldı. Eskiden 35-40 kişi tarlaya giderdik. Mısır vardı. patates, soğan toplamaya pancara da gittik. Fındığa da... Simdi evde oturuyorlar. Herkes yaşlandı. Gençler fabrikalarda çalışıyor. Eli ayağı tutmayanlar bize (patates hali) düşüyor… Bizim zamanımızda böyle yoktu. Yaşım genç olsa fabrikaya girerdim.

[137] Interview no: 49 [Table 5.3.A The Profiles of the Participants (2015 Case Study) and Table 5.3.C Household Characteristics of the Participants (2015 Case Study)]

> What about the ones in the neighborhood? Honestly, they sit relaxed in their balconies all day long. Either their husbands are working or they benefited from a heritage. The youngsters are in the factories… They work in shops at the city center. Youngsters are clever these days, they immediately ask for insurance. My nephew has been working in a factory for 10 years[138].

Finally, I want to mention the situation of Vuslat[139] (17) as the youngest participant of Turkish group in the case study working in the potato wholesale market. She was accompanying her mother in the potato and onion packaging jobs and occasionally working as a waitress in the summer periods. By the time we met she was continuing her education with a prospect of graduating from high school soon. Her familial history was different from the other workers in the potato cleaning since she was not born in a village and her parents were both workers in textiles when they met each other. Her career was unlikely to continue in daily jobs considering her education and availability of better jobs in the region. Her situation resembles some of Kurdish youngsters' in the city who finances their education with summer jobs in agriculture.

6.3.2 Individual *vs* Community Work Patterns

When I got close with a crew working in Potato Wholesale Market in 2011, I was hit by the uniqueness of their personal histories and motivations, which led them to seek income through daily jobs. One of them was a young woman with four children whose husband was a policeman with a good salary and benefits. Yet, he was living with another woman and did not contribute to the house expenditures. Husband of the other had a reputation of laziness and staying at home for long periods between jobs as a foreman. One married a disabled man, the other had an ex-husband doing nothing but spending money to horse racing bets. When I continued my interviews with the Turkish group in 2015, I encountered different versions of these personal stories of women who entered into the labor market at one point within their married life. They had been familiar with the agricultural tasks since most of them were daughters of landowner families and worked as unpaid family laborers in the past. Therefore, they used their skills to earn a living for the household when unexpected events occurred such as bankruptcy and debt, separation-

[138] Mahalledekiler mi? Valla oturuyorlar bütün gün balkonda. Ya eşleri çalışıyordur ya da miras kalmıştır. Gençler fabrikaya… Çarşıda mağazalarda çalışıyorlar. Şimdi gençler akıllı, sigorta istiyorlar hemen. Benim yeğenim 10 sene oldu fabrikada.

[139] Interview no: 51 [Table 5.3.A The Profiles of the Participants (2015 Case Study) and Table 5.3.C Household Characteristics of the Participants (2015 Case Study)]

divorce, unemployment, illness or sudden death of their husbands. Figen's[140] (60) husband, for example, was sick for a long time and she has been paying his social insurance through working in agricultural jobs herself. Ferhunde[141] (59) and her mother's story are similar in the sense that they both entered into labor market by marriage and Ferhunde's husband was also sick and had not worked most of the time:

> There was a familial dispute about my parents' marriage. They didi not want my mother. My father did not work. My mother worked in the fields. She got sick. She has diabetics… We left the village (in Giresun, Bulancak) after our marriage. The land was not fertile and there were many siblings. They gave my husband money for his part of the land. We used that money for his surgery… My husband worked in construction jobs in Arabia. He returned 20 years ago. Since he returned, he had never work due to a hearth disease. I have always worked. He died two and a half years ago…[142]

I believe the most extraordinary work history I listened in the Potato Wholesale Market belong to Nuray[143] (62). Her unemployed son and grandchildren recently moved in with her, which triggered her search for extra income opportunities. She thought about what she could do for a living. Then, she simply entered into labor market at age 61 by going to Potato Wholesale Market and asking for a job for the first time in her life:

> I am 61 years old. Last year, I came to the Market and ask a job for myself. I started. It is very good. I even get rid of my pains. I did not work all those years after I got married… Before the marriage, I worked so hard in my parents land. Compared to that, the work here is nothing. I started miking cows at the age of 9. Before marriage we cultivated corn, wheat. We saw rice. We hoed[144].

Nuray and two other middle-aged women were cleaning and sorting onions on the pavement while we were talking in the Hall. They all agreed that working outside is better than being a housewife. Apparently, they enjoy each other's company and co-operative workdays much more than the days they spend solitarily on household tasks.

---

[140] Interview no: 26 [Table 5.3.A The Profiles of the Participants (2015 Case Study) and Table 5.3.C Household Characteristics of the Participants (2015 Case Study)]

[141] Interview no: 28 [Table 5.3.A The Profiles of the Participants (2015 Case Study) and Table 5.3.C Household Characteristics of the Participants (2015 Case Study)]

[142] Aileler arası anlaşmazlık oldu, annemi istemediler, babam çalışmadı, annem hep tarlalara gitti, şeker hastası oldu, hasta şimdi… Evlendikten sonra köyden (Giresun, Bulancak) ayrıldık. Araziler verimli değildi, çok kardeş vardı. Beyime bir parça yer parası verdiler. Onu da ameliyatına kullandık... Arabistan'da insaatçılık yaptı. 20 yıl önce döndü. Döndükten sonra kalp rahatsızlığı vardı, hiç calışmadı. Hep ben çalıştım. 2,5 yıl önce öldü…

[143] Interview no: 49 [Table 5.3.A The Profiles of the Participants (2015 Case Study) and Table 5.3.C Household Characteristics of the Participants (2015 Case Study)]

[144] 61 yaşındaydım, geçen sene geldim hale, bana göre iş var mı dedim. Başladım. Çok da iyi oldu. Ağrılarım bile geçti. Evlendikten sonra bu kadar sene çalışmadım… Evlenmeden önce hem ne çalışmışım ailemin toprağında, bu da birşey mi? 9 yaşında inek sağmaya oturdum. Evleninceye kadar mısır ektik, buğday ektik biçtik, çeltik biçerdik, çapa yapardık.

In sum, women workers in Potato Whole Sale market have unique family histories, which led them to work in agricultural tasks distinguishing their work histories from collective work patterns of women living in neighborhoods associated with minorities. While Romani and Kurdish women usually started to work in agriculture at young ages with their neighbors, Turkish participants of the study mostly entered in the labor market after marriage. While Kurdish women usually work with their neighbors and Romani women work with their close kin and neighbors, working crews in the Hall reveals relatively more connections based on friendship ties among non-neighbor and non-relative co-workers[145]. Consequently, the space of recruitment processes and contact with employers is different for the Turkish participants of the study; it is the workplace rather than the residence. Turkish workers in the Hall have been extending their job networks through occasional visits of farmers and traders to the workplace for asking laborers. Aylin[146] (44) was one of the experienced workers in the Potato Wholesale Market. She started to work in her father's farm at the age 9 and has worked as a paid worker in agriculture for 22 years. She summarized the recruitment and wage-labor processes within the Potato Wholesale Market as such:

> Women for all neighborhoods[147] are coming to work here. Hacıoğlu, Tabakhane… Farmers come from the villages to ask for workers… Intermediaries/crew leaders get extra wages for filed jobs, not for the work here. Traders and farmers ask for workers to them when they need.

6.3.3 Future Expectations

Turkish participants, as mentioned before, were not likely to transfer their jobs to their children. Most of them are included in the social security system through household men that will hopefully provide a retirement salary and health insurance in their after-work life. Additionally, some of them were also searching ways to convince employers to pay for their own insurance for their work in the Potato Wholesale Market.

Kurdish participants were relatively more diverse in terms of future expectations. There were elderly first generation migrant women who have worked in daily jobs for most of their lives. They worked without benefits but possibly will be cared by the family at their

[145] The harmony within the crews and collective dimension of skill seems less significant for the routine tasks within the Hall when compared to some field tasks.

[146] Interview no: 50 [Table 5.3.A The Profiles of the Participants (2015 Case Study) and Table 5.3.C Household Characteristics of the Participants (2015 Case Study)]

[147] Her mahalleden gelen var buraya. Hacıoğlu, Tabakhane… Köyden çiftçiler buraya geliyor işçi aramaya. İşçibaşları buradaki iş için değil de tarladaki iş için fazla para alıyorlar. Tüccar/çiftçi gelip burada onlara soruyor işçi lazım olunca…

senior ages within the extended households. There were young women who worked within lettuce crews 12 months a year starting from very young ages. Their careers most likely end by marriage regarding livelihood of the community. And there were also other young women utilizing agricultural jobs to finance their education and eventually land better jobs.

In 2011, I met Dilek[148] (29) within the Kurdish settlement of Arabacıalanı. She had worked in agriculture in summers to finance her education and had already graduated from university at the time we met. We went to work together; she was unemployed at that time, waiting to be appointed as a teacher. Soon after, she landed a formal job (recruiting through standardized tests) and moved to İstanbul where she married a co-worker public employee. I visited her again in her parents' house in Arabacıalanı in 2015 while she was taking care of her newborn baby with the help of her mother who was 48. That day, we had a nice conversation on motherhood and expectations about future. Her mother was an agricultural worker and she contributed much to our conversation with her experience and insights. Dilara[149] (34) was also with us and she was the one asking a critical question that caused an argument between Dilek and her mother:

> Dilara: Will you send your daughter (to the fields)?
>
> Dilek: No, never. Never! I do not have the hearth to send my daughter.
>
> Dilek's Mother (offended): So, how did we do it then? Did I have the heart to send you?
>
> Dilek: No mum. You did not have the heart either. Do not you remember, at the beginning you were running and taking my turn to dismantle (the corn) so that I do not tire[150].

In that day, Dilek mentioned good memories and the feeling of strength that she acquired with agricultural jobs in many ways. At that time, Dilek's mother was continuing to work in agricultural jobs to support their younger children. Yet, Dilek's prospect for her child is remarkably different. Her story is not uncommon among Kurdish corn crews that are

---

[148] Interview no: 16 [Table 5.3.A The Profiles of the Participants (2015 Case Study) and Table 5.3.C Household Characteristics of the Participants (2015 Case Study)]

[149] Interview no: 20 [Table 5.3.A The Profiles of the Participants (2015 Case Study) and Table 5.3.C Household Characteristics of the Participants (2015 Case Study)]

150 Dilara: Sen kızını gönderir misin (tarlaya)?

Dilek: Hayır asla asla! Ben kızıma kıyamam.

Dilek'in Annesi: E biz nasıl kıydık, ben kıydım mı sana?

Dilek: E anne sen de kıyamıyordun, hatırlıyor musun ilk başlarda koşup gelip benim sıramı da kırıyordun, ben yorulmayayım diye.

formed by students. In Arabacıalanı, I heard about and met a number of young men and women as children of former Kurdish migrants that financed their education with summer jobs in agriculture and land better jobs (become doctors, accountants, or teachers) in the end.

In fact, Arabacıalanı transformed significantly after the earthquake, which returned the neighborhood into an expensive residential place preferred by middle classes relocating their houses away from the destructed city center. It was an area of agricultural lands and shack-like houses build by worker migrants in the 1990s. Now, it is one of the popular investment places including the biggest shopping mall in the city and dozens of new construction projects and expensive residences. The process led to a sharp increase in rents resulted in the gradual evacuation of renters within the Kurdish settlement. Therefore, only the families who are rooted enough to build a house was able to stay in the process. While it was a settlement where women collectively work in daily jobs in 1990s, today typical workers of agriculture are students of the community.

That day, Dilek explained her observations on the transformation within their residential community, which very much resembles the transformation of the neighborhoods of Turkish workers:

> We first worked with an intermediary called … As we have lived in a social environment that everyone has worked in agriculture, at least for a while, since the neighborhood people generally have medium incomes. Nowadays things are different. Now, everybody become modernized. They do not work in agriculture since they find it hard. But we worked. We became the last oppressed. They now work in restaurants, cafes in the city center. I did not work in such jobs intentionally to save money. Although I had the chase I did not work in these jobs because of their extra expenses[151].

Arabacıalanı is thus a peculiar case, which only reflects those former migrants who managed to get relatively established in the city. Some young women in Kurdish Bağlar neighborhood were also able to invest in their future through education with the help of regular household income coming from construction jobs of household men. Yet, most of the young women that I talked to were expecting to end their working lives by marriage. This yet does not mean that these young women were content with the life options they

151 Önce … ile gittik biz işe, zaten burada herkesin birbirini tanıdığı bir ortamda olduğumuz için, biliyoruz ki mesela onlar yıllarca işe gidiyorlar yani, burada zaten genel itibariyle mahallede herkes orta seviyeli olduğu için, zamanı gelince herkesin bi ayağı geçmiştir yani tarladan. Şimdi öyle değil. Şimdi herkes burada da modernleşmiş. Gitmiyorlar, zor geliyor yani ama biz gittik, biz son ezilenler olduk, işte gidip restoranlarda kafelerde merkezde çalışyorlar, ben sırf mesela çarşıda çalışmıyordum, çalıştığım parayı harcarım, yol parasıdır, boğamıza gider diye ben bilerek çalışma imkanım olduğu halde başka yerlere gitmiyordum, para biriktiremem diye.

have. Hacer[152] (15) was one of the young workers in Bağlar who recently started accompanying her grandmother in the field jobs during the weekends and summers. She did not express much of her own feelings and thoughts during the interview that I had later related to her grandmother's presence within the room. While we were walking around the neighborhood, she finally found the chance to express her concerns about future. Apparently, her grandmother was not agreeing to invest in girls' education (thinking that they are going to marry and stay at home anyway) and she is not happy with her options that are being drawn within the limits of the neighborhood:

> My grandmother tries to convince my father to take us from school. She questions the merits of sending us since we will be married soon anyway. Work in fields during summers. Then go marry a construction worker. I deeply resent that[153].

After that date, I remember our conversation a lot and her sharp-expression of concerns become one of the catchphrases of the fieldwork in my mind. I had mentioned before the extended households of the community and proud expressions of Kurdish men for non-working status of their wives. Yet, I could have never explained the pressure that many young women experience better.

Finally, I want to discuss Roma women's future expectations, which were in fact the major reason of writing this part. During the interviews, I had my most embarrassing moments after I asked the routine question about life expectations to Roma women: "What are your plans for the next 10 years?" Some of the middle-aged women in Karaköy were either offended or got really sad while answering this question, as I see the disappearance of joy from their faces. Their answers was generally no, they were not planning anything, but they have to work as usual. Özlem[154] (35) for example was one of the visiting workers in the neighborhood who does not have a house or even a shack but temporarily staying in workplaces. She has three children and just returned from a shepherd's job during which they lived in a barn. Thus, she said no, "we are not thinking anything, we just work"[155]. Another Roma women said, "What can we do, Roma have to work"[156].

---

152 Interview no: 34 [Table 5.3.A The Profiles of the Participants (2015 Case Study) and Table 5.3.C Household Characteristics of the Participants (2015 Case Study)]

153 Babaannem bizi okuldan aldırmak için babama baskı yapıyor. Ne olacak evlenecekler zaten diyor. Yazları tarlada çalış. Sonra da bir inşaatçıyla evlen. İnsanın zoruna gidiyor.

154 Interview no: 39 [Table 5.3.A The Profiles of the Participants (2015 Case Study) and Table 5.3.C Household Characteristics of the Participants (2015 Case Study)]

155 Hiçbirşey de düşündüğümüz yok sadece çalışıyoruz.

156 Ne yapalım? Roman hep çalışacak.

When I asked the same question to younger-single women in the group, they giggled and excited, then talked about some unrealistic expectations. A young woman that had recently quitted high school and did not have intentions to return back said she would like to be a nurse. A group of girls claimed that they want to be entrepreneurs who own their own business but have not yet thought about any other details. I could not help but feel they did not believe in themselves.

In Karaköy, the second common answer to future plans was building a house, which was in fact the primary motivation to work in agricultural jobs, for families who are staying in shacks and temporal places. The purpose of building a house in the neighborhood was motivating young couples to work together in daily jobs and save money. It however may take years to achieve that goal. Some of the young couples were cohabiting and there were also others who were still living in shacks with their multiple children. By contrast, in Yeni Mahalle, extended Roma households were more widespread and the houses were relatively spacious reflecting I think years and years of collective work behind them. Yet, urban transformation project had started and it was still unclear what they will get in exchange for their houses.

In sum, Roma workers generally were not expecting to get better jobs for themselves or their children or planning to quit agricultural jobs in the near future, which distinguish them radically from Turkish, and partially from the Kurdish participants of the study.

6.4 Conclusion

In this chapter, I presented the findings of the fieldwork revealing different patterns of agricultural work in the hinterland of Adapazarı including wages, terms of contracts, relations with employers, tasks, working periods of workers. Then I focused on the bonds between workers and exemplify some particular ways in which women collaborate and exclude others within the labor processes. Finally, I mentioned some hints that the fieldwork revealed indicating a handover of jobs from Turkish group to others within the city, particularly to Roma based on age gap between worker groups and future prospects.

All these information, in fact, is valuable to understand the ways in which agricultural workers act distinctively within the labor market. I tried to illustrate the contexts and conditions that make different strategies significant parts of women's working lives. Apparently, Roma women tend to invest more in kin and neighborhood relationships; while Kurdish women are able to extend their networks beyond neighborhoods through wider ethnic ties and relations with co-workers; whereas Turkish workers in the Potato

Wholesale Market invest relatively more in their relationships with co-workers. These strategies are in fact significant tools to analyze the multiple intermediary positions and various practices of intermediation within the city. I will build the next part on this discussion to portray and make sense of the complex intermediation practices in the local agricultural labor market within Adapazarı.

CHAPTER VII

A DISCUSSION ON INTERMEDIATION IN AGRICULTURE

In this final chapter, I will use the insights derived from the working and network using patterns of workers within multi-ethnic agricultural labor market of Adapazarı to engage in a discussion on the intermediary system in Turkey's agriculture. I will combine the case study with the findings of recent studies on the intermediary system in Turkey and the discussion on US agricultural labor contractors to elaborate on the reasonable ways to approach the intermediary system. First part will be an assessment of the literature[157] through scrutinizing some widespread language patterns and arguments in the reporting of wage-labor processes in Turkey's agriculture. I question the focus on characteristics of workers—culture, tradition, and kin—as the main dynamic of intermediary system with a concern for its victim blaming implications and possible contributions to the negative and stereotyped image of Eastern/Kurdish workers. Secondly, I will present different intermediation practices within the case of Adapazarı through elaborating on the dynamics affecting the choices of employers and workers. A categorization will be offered to analyze three different positions of intermediaries based on the fieldwork. The case reveals the significance of particular contexts of work relations and the high variation of intermediation practices within the wage-labor processes of workers in a local context. At the end, for the analysis of intermediation in Turkey's agriculture, I will offer a framework to switch the focus from characteristics/culture/tradition of workers to the structure of labor market, particular contexts of work relations and the political processes ensuring the disadvantaged position of workers.

7.1 A Note on Agency and Othering: Mainstream Discourse on Intermediaries

Intermediaries are independent labor contractors acting between workers and employers organizing work in Turkey's agricultural sector[158]. Intermediation is neither unique to

[157] By literature, I broadly refer to contemporary written accounts on agricultural workers in Turkey, which are mainly academic studies from a wide range of disciplines and also include public declarations of politicians, parliamentary questions and reports, NGO reports, trade unions' publications and newspaper articles.

[158] In Turkey, agricultural intermediaries have been called with different names such as *elçi, dayıbaşı, çavuş.* Kaleci (2007) stated that these names are stemming from regional differences as *elçi* is widespread in Çukurova and southeast, *dayıbaşı* have ben used in Aegean region and *çavuş* is the name of intermarries in Central Anatolia (160).

Turkey's agriculture nor peculiar to agricultural sectors in the world (Martin 1985; Luna 1997; Thomas 1992; Polopolus & Emerson 1991; McDaniel & Casanova 2003). In some aspects, it is similar to other systems of sub-contracting that are exempting employers from labor responsibility, which has recently been widespread in some industries and service sector. As Ortiz (2002) points out, modern commercial agriculture adopts forms of control commonly associated with industrial sites to reduce the cost of seasonal production (407). Intermediary system is largely regarded as a result of exceptional labor supply granted to agricultural employers by non-protective labor legislation (or lack of enforcement of laws) and seasonal labor demand (Luna 1997).

The primary function and role of the intermediaries is to coordinate seasonal labor supply and demand in an otherwise casual and disorderly agricultural labor market (Polopolus & Emerson 1991: 60-1; LeRoy 1998: 181). It is a cost-efficient system for allocating tasks enabling agricultural employers' short-term access to labour force that are already organized as crews. Through providing established crews working in harmony, intermediary system saves employers' time and money eliminating need for occupational training and constituting teams for temporary and unsteady demand of labor[159].

In Turkey, intermediation in agricultural wage-labor processes is a legally defined activity widespread throughout the country although the practicers mostly remain unregistered. Following the discussion on the role of state in structuring agricultural labor processes in Chapter IV, I elaborated on law makers' exceptional regulations for agricultural labor market, support of intermediation practices in agricultural wage-labor processes and recent policies which probably enhance the intermediary system after 2010 through security concerns especially in the cases of *en masse* seasonal migration of workers. The availability of established intermediaries and beforehand contracts are critical for employers who depend on seasonal labor migration and workers who are looking for jobs away from their homes. Yet, scholars usually report abuses and unfair gainings of intermediaries in the processes of seasonal labor migration. Nevertheless, I shall also note that intermediation practices are not only widespread in the cases of seasonal migration, the labor process also include intermediation when laborers work in nearby fields to their homes. One aspect of intermediation is the necessity of finding extra security mechanisms

[159] Intermediary system in Turkey, thus, enables small and middle-sized farms to seasonally access cheap and efficient labor crews as well as large farms. Accessing labor supply within similar terms in the labor market, increase survival chance of small and middle-sized farms through diminishing an advantage of the economies of scale for large enterprises, companies and traders. Individual recruitment of workers might rather have widened the advantage gap between the small and large production units. For a detailed discussion on firm size, tasks and usage of labor contractors see (Polopulus & Emerson: 1991).

for workers to guarantee their payments within such an insecurely structured wage-labor process. Employers who demand crews working effectively for short terms often prefer working with intermediaries. Although agricultural workers are largely labeled as unskilled laborers; the teamwork, harmony, and efficiency dramatically reduces the cost of labor in certain agricultural tasks (Thomas 1992; Ortiz 2002). In reality, this so called "low-skilled" manual labour requires high levels of expertise to reduce the cost of time (Ferguson 2007: 22). "The collective dimension of skill" (Thomas 1992: 97)— which has usually been ignored within the accounts depicting agricultural workers as unqualified/unskilled laborers— is one of the reasons of employers' preference of intermediary system to reduce costs.

Some employers prefer intermediaries because of their managerial functions. Polopolus & Emerson (1991) state that in the case of the United States agricultural enterprises labor contractors permit employers "to disengage for the details of filed labor managements, and to avoid hassles and problems associated with recruitment, retention, productivity, payroll, transportation, meals and housing" (61). Indeed, the case of Adapazarı illustrates the centrality of managerial practices of intermediaries while organizing the labor processes such as forming crews through considering who work most efficiently together; training inexperienced workers at zero costs by strategically locating them in established teams; relocating underperforming workers through the requests of employers.

Intermediary system, on the other hand, opens a way for workers' abuse as it is vastly reported about agricultural wage labor processes. Agricultural employers benefit from this arrangement at the expense of workers because labor contractors can maximize their income by minimizing their payments to the workers (Luna 1997). The intermediary system in fact effectively transfers the "risks of agricultural employment to the workers" and is contrary to the "sound principle of industrial relations that the various economic risks incident to employment ought to be distributed fairly or else insured against" (Luna 1997: 495). US system recognized farm labor contractors (FLCs) as employers who are responsible for labor law requirements. Yet, the cases in which FLCs are actually prosecuted for abuse and exploitation of workers are very few (Verduzco 2010: 11). Even the licenses of FLCs who are well known for their mistreatment/abuse of workers were never revoked (Verduzco 2010: 11). In this context, many labor advocates ask for both tightened requirements to become a FLC and more responsibility to agricultural enterprises to increase their liability for violations of labor law through using FLCs (Thilmany & Martin 1995).

In brief, I assign central importance to the insecurity of agricultural labor processes for workers in the absence of protective legislation and sanctions for employers, short-term demands of labor and managerial functions reducing labor costs in explaining the relevance of intermediary system in Turkey's agriculture. Before going further into discussion, I first want to present a critical overview of the current literature on labor intermediaries in Turkey.

The historical newspaper research and the literature analysis (Chapter III) revealed that such people with supposedly different ideological stances as trade union representatives, NGO reporters, scientists, government speaker persons have often commonly pointed at agricultural intermediaries as responsible actors for unfairness of the agricultural wage-labor processes in Turkey. Consequently, amongst such other actors of labor market as the state, employers, workers and local administrators, the actions of intermediaries are the ones that have particularly been noticed, criticized and questioned within academic studies. It is partly natural since the intermediaries have been active and visible actors of the labor market as bridges between employers and workers organizing the jobs throughout the country. It is also evident that some established intermediaries have been managing large networks of laborers have enriched in the process whereas some agricultural employers—especially small-sized farmers—have impoverished and lost their benefits through neoliberal restructuring. Yet, there are also reasons to be vigilant about such focus on the intermediaries in the literature with respect to how intermediaries have been singled out as culprits in a way that is exempting the other actors from responsibility[160]. I will portray the literature on intermediaries in Turkey through presenting such patterns in the discussions of wage-labor processes of agricultural workers and elaborate on its implications. There are three widespread trends that I have noticed within the writings of scholars who report on agricultural wage labor process: sentence structures that conceal employers while marking intermediaries; remarks stressing the primitivity, backwardness and deficiency of the practice of intermediation and the arguments linking the system of intermediation with a particular ethnic group of seasonal migrant workers.

Before going on the analysis I want to clarify a few points. I had more difficulty in structuring this part of the dissertation. Becker (2013 [1986]) advises scholars to share

[160] Without a doubt, scholars' pity for agricultural employers and the disapproval of gainings of the intermediaries is not coincidental. The ideological and historical roots of selective bias in highlighting enrichment of intermediaries and impoverishments of agricultural employers could be analyzed and discussed in various ways that is beyond the limits of this study.

their hardship with their readers when they have difficulty in writing. Taking his advice, I will try to follow a clearer path with the background of the analysis in this part. I have observed the patterns that I put forward as "common tendencies in the literature" not only in academic publications, books, and newspapers but also in interactive social activities such as conferences, workshops and non-governmental organization practices I attended in the last 5 years. These interactive social activities, which I cannot properly cite in the text, were arguably more eye opening for me than the written literature about these repetitive patterns; and they affected my approach on the mentioned literature. I will show some random quotations from the texts as examples. In addition to the new studies, I give examples from pioneering studies, which are quoted frequently in the literature. Yet I have to clarify that I do not carry out this analysis to criticize certain authors. I think these patterns are not coincidental, and as expressions of a repetitive hegemonic language they can be encountered anywhere albeit with changing frequencies. No doubt, a lot of studies that I quoted here for these common patterns have more balanced approach overall, with refined expressions elsewhere in their scripts. So, I want to express in advance that I do not want to question the qualities or deficiencies of individual studies but to problematize the pronounced patterns in the literature. Rather the problem is about the greater picture, which appears when we consider all these patterns together. In other words, the expressions concealing the employer and putting forward the intermediary as the principal agent and expressions emphasizing the primitivity of the intermediary institution, not on their own but when taken together with other arguments linking agency of intermediaries with the culture of Kurdish workers give hints of a "victim blaming" hegemonic language. When all these patterns are thought together, even though this may not be the intention, we can see that the literature on intermediaries focus on *workers*—tells the story of workers who are subject to (or who consents) existing work conditions because of their culture/tradition. In this sense, the problem with the literature on agricultural intermediaries is its contribution to the present negative and stereotyping perception about the east of country and about Kurds in particular. Apart from this normative problem, hememony of such victim blaming discourse in the literature points us towards the methodological fallacy of presuming "false consciousness" of workers. Below, I will try to explain how these patterns about intermediaries contributes to the victim blaming discourse holding the workers themselves responsible—through their culture—for the injustice.

7.1.1 "Resourceful Intermediaries vs Pitiful Employers"

First of all, both in newspaper articles and in scientific studies, scholars reporting on agricultural wage-labor processes tend to convey the actions of intermediaries with negative verbs such as exploit, dominate or take advantage of:

Intermediaries [elçiler] capture 10% of the daily wages of the workers (Ulukan & Ulukan 2011: 14).	Elçiler, işçinin günlük ücretinin %10'una el koymaktadır (Ulukan & Ulukan 2011: 14).
Exploitation relation is due to the working order in which workers depend on the intermediaries for everything. Some factors play an important role for intermediaries to make workers dependent (Çınar & Lordoğlu 2011: 435).	Sömürü ilişkisi işçilerin aracılara her konuda bağımlı oldukları bir çalışma düzeninden kaynaklanmaktadır. Aracıların, işçileri bağımlı hale getirmelerinde bazı faktörler önemli rol oynar. (Çınar & Lordoğlu 2011: 435)
It constitutes a piece of the old observations about the intermediaries [elçiler] that they cause poverty of workers by lowering the already low wages of the workers through the commissions they take (Çınar 2014: 144).	Elçilerin, işçilerin ücretlerinden aldıkları komisyonlar nedeniyle zaten düşük olan işçi ücretlerinin daha da düşerek işçilerin yoksullşamasına neden oldukları elçilere dair eski gözlemlerin bir parçasını oluşturmaktadır (Çınar 2014: 144)
Although the tasks that the intermediaries [elçiler] fulfill for the workers seem to facilitate their lives, all of these strengthen the dependencies of the workers to the intermediaries [elçiler]. The worker became unable to find a job or solve any problem at workplace alone, without depending on an intermediary [elçi]. The creation and degree of this dependence is among the qualifications of the intermediary [elçi]. In addition to the commissions taken from the employer and the workers, the intermediary [elçi] created in-numerous methods to generate income for himself/herself (Çınar 2014, June 16: 33).	Elçilerin işçiler için yerine getirdiği görevler, onların yaşamlarını kolaylaştırıyor gibi görünse de bunların hepsi işçilerin elçilere olan bağımlılığını güçlendirmektedir. Bir elçiye bağlı olmadan işçi iş bulamaz, çalıştığı yerde hiçbir sorununu tek başına çözemez hale gelir. Bu bağımlılığı yaratmak ve derecesi elçinin yaptığı işin vasıfları arasındadır. İşçiden ve işverenden aldığı komisyonlar dışında sayısız gelir elde etme yöntemini kendisi için yaratmıştır (Çınar 2014, June 16: 33).
Seasonal workers are in adverse conditions with respect to working conditions, working hours and wages. An important factor that aggravates their conditions is that in finding a job, in being brought to workplace and in every type of relation between them and the employer, the intermediaries plays a role (Kaleci 2007: 160).	Mevsimlik işçiler çalışma koşulları, çalışma süreleri, ve ücret bakımından kötü koşullar içinde bulunurlar. Bunların durumlarını ağırlaştıran önemli bir neden de, iş bulmalarında, iş yerlerine getirilmelerinde ve işverenlerle aralarındaki her türlü ilişkide aracıların rol almasıdır (Kaleci 2007: 160).
Intermediaries [simsarlar] gather child laborers for a wage of 6 liras (Avcı, *Zaman*, 2005, June 15).	Simsarlar yevmiyesi 6 liradan çocuk işçi topluyor. (Avcı, *Zaman*, 2005, June 15)
More workers meaning more income, paints a rising graph in the earnings of the intermediary [dayıbaşı]. As a necessity and an extension of the system, the intermediary [dayıbaşı] perpetuates its presence as an intermediary that maintains communication and coordination between the boss and the worker and cause many injustices (Dayıbaşı Terror, *Milliyet*, 2015, April 26).	Daha fazla işçinin daha fazla gelir anlamına gelmesi ise dayıbaşının kazanımında yukarı seyreden bir grafik çizmektedir. Sistemin bir gereği ve uzantısı olarak; dayıbaşı patron ve işçi arasında iletişimi ve koordinasyonu sağlayan bir aracı olma mevcudiyetini sürdürmekte ve pek çok haksızlığa sebebiyet vermektedir. (Dayıbaşı Terörü, *Milliyet*, 2015, April 26).
Even though the wages vary with respect to the location and product designs, the only thing that does not change is the commission taken by the intermediaries from the wages. Generally 10 % of the daily or task wage is taken as commission (TBMM 2015: 88).	Ücretler gidilen yerlere ve ürün desenlerine göre değişse de değişmeyen tek şey aracıların ücretlerden aldığı komisyondur. Genel olarak günlük ya da götürü ücretin yüzde 10'u komisyon olarak alınmaktadır (TBMM 2015: 88).
Cuts taken by the intermediaries [elçiler] constitute as [sic.] an important cause of the low income of the workers… Agricultural intermediaries [elçiler] had a great function in this system of exploitation that has been in the making throughout long years (Geçgin 2009: 85, 133).	İşçilerin gelirlerindeki düsüklügün önemli bir nedeni olarak da isçilerden elçilerin aldıkları kesintiler oluşturmaktadır… Tarım aracılarının (elçi) uzun yıllar içerisinde yapılaşma haline olan bu sömürü sisteminde işlevleri çok büyüktür (Geçgin 2009: 85, 133).

It is clearly seen in official reports in what ways intermediaries, who might have varying names depending on the region such as intermediary [elçi], exploite temporary workers… presence [of intermediaries] cause workers' exploitation at large scales and also prevents development of a tradition of agreement of employer with representative of the employee (Kazgan 1963: 55, 60).	Elçi gibi bölgeye göre değişen adlar taşıyan aracıların geçici işçiyi ne gibi yollarla istismar ettiği resmi raporlarda da açıkça görülmektedir… [Aracıların] … mevcudiyetleri geniş çapta işçi istismarına yol açtığı gibi işverenin işçi temsilcisi ile anlaşma geleneğinin yerleşmesine de imkân bırakmamaktadır… (Kazgan 1963: 55, 60).

Scholars reporting wage-labor processes often mention the amount of gainings of intermediaries using a language, which suggests that the gainings are much more than deserved:

Intermediaries [elçiler] rent children to farm owners or make significant gains by taking the job to be done as task based (Görücü & Akbıyık 2010: 213).	Elçiler, çocukları tarla sahiplerine kiralamakta ya da yapılacak işi götürü usulde alarak ciddi kazançlar sağlamaktadırlar (Görücü &Akbıyık 2010: 213).
The share of the intermediaries [elçiler] adds upto very high sums when all the workers are considered… when all their shares are noted they became financially rich people (Kaleci 2007: 129, 160).	Elçilerin payı tüm işçiler düşünüldüğünde oldukça yüksek miktarlara ulaşmaktadır… Aldıları payların geneli dikkate alındığında ekonomik açıdan varlıklı kişilere dönüşmektedir (Kaleci 2007: 129, 160)
Intermediaries [dayıbaşlar] who work with about 10 çavuş may control around 200–250 workers even though they have no connection to the production process. Being responsible only from the communication and receiving ten percent of the workers and çavuş in return and hence they receive at least twice as much as workers do without in any way being involved in production (Küçükkırca 2012: 7).	Yaklaşık 10 kadar çavuşla bir arada çalışan dayıbaşları, üretim süreciyle herhangi bir ilişkileri bulunmamasına rağmen 200 ile 250 arasında işçiyi kontrol edebiliyorlar. Yalnız iletişimden sorumlu olup bunun karşılığında işçilerin ve çavuşun yevmiyesinin yüzde onunu alıyorlar ve böylece üretime hiç katılmadan işçilerin en az iki katı ücret almış oluyorlar (Küçükkırca 2012: 7).
While those that profit the most in agricultural workmanship are the smallest minority of intermediaries [elçiler] and than [çavuşlar] and those that profit the least, frankly the most aggrieved, are women and children. For example even though they earn more family members of the intermediaries [elçiler] also stay in tents and share same conditions with others. It is witnessed that one of the intermediaries interviewed had two cars and even used a laptop computer and connected to internet via satellite in the tent (Geçgin 2009: 140).	Tarım işçiliginde en kazançlı taraf en küçük azınlık olan elçiler ve sonrasında çavuşlar olurken, en az kazançlı daha doğrusu en mağdur kesim ise kadınlar ve çocuklar olmuşlardır. Örneğin elçiler de çadırda kalmalarına ve daha çok kazananlar olmasına karşın aile üyeleri digerleri ile de aynı şartları paylaşmaktadır. Görüşme yapılan elçilerden birinin iki arabasının olduğu hatta çadırda dizüstü bilgisayar da kullanarak dahası uydudan internete de bağlanabildigine şahit olunmuştur. (Geçgin 2009: 140)
By making worker group dependent on them, by means of kinship and patriarchal relations and debts, intermediaries [elçiler] preserve or increase their capacity to provide workers; it is possible for them to make steady gains over workers (Çınar 2014: 146).	Elçilerin işçi grubunu … akrabalık ve ataerkil ilişkiler ve borçlanma gibi yöntemlerle kendilerine bağılmı hale getirmeleriyle işçi şağlama kapasitelerini koruyarak veya yükselterek işçi üzerinden kazançlarını sürekli hale getirmeleri mümkün olmaktadır (Çınar 2014: 146)
Despite the poverty of the workers working with an intermediary, it is known that intermediaries [dayıbaşlar] who receive share from both the workers' wages and also from landowner are welloff (Çınar 2014: 40).	Aracıya bağlı olarak çalışan işçilerin yoksulluklarına rağmen hem işçiden hem de toprak sahibinden pay alan dayıbaşıların durumlarının oldukça iyi olduğu bilinir (Çınar 2014: 40).

According to the "By-Law of Agricultural Intermediation"[161] intermediation for finding work and workers in agriculture is primarily carried out by Turkish Employment Agency (İŞKUR). However, in provinces where the agency has no local branches, or in the

[161] Turkish Employment Agency put into effect "By-Law of Agricultural Intermediation" in 2011 (Resmi Gazete: 27.05.2011/27593).

provinces where the agency has chapters but there is difficulty in communication, transportation or coordination the agency can authorize real or legal persons to act as intermediaries (TBMM 2015: 23). It is illegal to act as intermediary without the permit of the agency as noted in the by-law. Moreover, intermediaries are not allowed to charge workers for their services; all fees are to be collected from the employers. For this reason, within the studies, the practice of paying a share of workers' wage to the intermediary is usually noted as corruption due to lack of inspection. However, sometimes employers refuse to pay the commission to intermediaries. Çetinkaya (2008) mentioned strikes and struggles of organized farm labor intermediaries in Adana to get a raise for workers to get their commission from employers:

> During the research process, the amount of daily wage for the agricultural worker was 21 YTL. 2 YTL was cut from this amount as the share of the intermediary. The main source of disagreement is the demands of the organized farm labor intermediaries for adding their share, which is 10 % of the total amount, to the existing amount that is paid to the worker. Thus, they want employers to pay 23 YTL to the workers from which they will again take their 2 YTL of brokerage. By this way, workers will earn the minimum wage before tax for 30 days of work. However, since the employers refuse to pay this amount, the share of intermediaries is taken from the wage of the workers and the income of the workers is still below the minimum wage although this is illegal. The strikes that were organized by intermediaries via taking the workers that they work with away from the fields or other protests like slowdown are mostly reactions against the amount of payment, which is below the minimum wage (Çetinkaya 2008: 98).

In the "By-Law of Agricultural Intermediation", intermediaries are declared as responsible for the safe transportation of workers from their dwellings to their workplaces together with the employers[162]. In fact, the position and role of intermediaries within the process of transportation depend on the relation between workers and employers. Employers may compel workers to pay (at least half) for their own transportation. Intermediaries, in some cases, charge extra amounts from workers on the grounds of their payment of transportation expenses. Yet, even in these cases, a part of responsibility belongs to the employers who demand labor, yet, resist paying or even supervising transportation process of workers. Besides, the only reason of workers' travel is the labor demand of employers. When employers do not pay for initial transportation expenses, workers have to take debt from intermediaries, which can easily turn into an abusive relationship between parties as intermediaries withhold a share of workers' wages on behalf of the transportation and other costs.

[162] Multiple studies reported intermediaries' cut from wages of workers with regard to advances and initial transportation expenses (Çınar 2014; Akbıyık 2011).

As stated in the recent Parliamentary Commission's Report, although laws define clear responsibilities for intermediaries, they usually do not act in accordance with laws (89). One can always question the relation between underperformance of intermediaries—in providing vital facilities for workers—and employers' exemption from and reluctance to take responsibility. Moreover, it should be noted that intermediaries generally do not face any sanctions for underperformance or even explicit abuse of workers. Therefore, it seems that through declaring an informal and non-sanctioned group as primarily responsible for providing significant facilities, lawmaker in fact eliminates any liability within the wage-labor processes. These regulations particularly disempower workers who are directly contracting with employers and worker-intermediaries against their employers.

Apparently, there have been intermediaries who gained wealth without physically participating in the labor processes as critically pointed out in above reports. It is interesting to note that the ethical criterion of the necessity to physically participate in production to justify gainings is rarely applied to employers. In the literature, intermediaries are depicted as someone who makes (unjustified) profits who do not work physically or who do not participate in production, while merchants, landowners, proprietors are not questioned on the same grounds. For example in labor-wage process analyses I have not encountered any piece that questions the gap between the profits of hazelnut garden owners (usually referred as "hazelnut producers" although they do not participate in production physically and hire wage laborers or at the least appropriate the labor of women in his family) on the same ethical grounds. Contrary to the intermediaries that are depicted as active subjects exploiting, dominating, utilizing workers; the actions of employers[163] are largely narrated with passive voices. To exemplify, there are certain patterns that the actions of employers have been narrated in the literature: It is often the wages that workers get rather than the wage that employers pay; if employers cut the wages: workers are working with low wages; if they hire child workers: child labor have been used within the region; if employers do not pay wages: workers may have difficulties to get their wages; if employers are not willing to take any responsibility it is the labor law that is exempting employers from responsibility; if employers do not provide housing for workers there are no housing facilities in the areas of work; if employers do not pay for the transportation the workers are using dangerous ways to travel because of poverty:

[163] Employers sometimes called as producers (Ulukan & Ulukan: 2011) or landowners. Furthermore, Geçgin (2009) referred to landowners in Polatlı as "peasants".

Seasonal agricultural workers might in some cases experience problems in receiving their payments when they find a job independent of the intermediaries (Karaman & Yılmaz 2011: 222).	Mevsimlik tarım işçileri aracı dışı iş buldukları bazı durumlarda ücretlerini almada problem yaşayabilmektedirler (Karaman & Yılmaz 2011: 222).
Wages of the seasonal workers are very low. Yet their working hours are long (Çınar 2014: 34).	Mevsimlik işçilerin ücretleri çok düşüktür. Buna karşılık çalışma saatleri uzundur (Çınar 2014: 34).
The wages of the seasonal workers are not in same proportion with other local workers. Mostly they receive lower wages (Karaman & Yılmaz 2011: 216).	Mevsimlik işçilerin ücretleri diğer yerli çalışanlarla aynı oranda değildir. Çoğunlukla daha düşük ücret almaktadırlar (Karaman & Yılmaz 2011: 216).
Women considered as cheap labor have slightly more chance in finding a job… However even if these women work in these daily wage jobs with no job security for a month, including weekends from early morning hours until late in the evening, the wage they earn would not even be the minimum wage (Arslan 2013: 14).	Ucuz emek olarak görülen kadınlar, iş bulma konusunda erkeklere oranla biraz daha şanslıdırlar… Ne var ki hiç bir iş güvencesi olmayan bu yevmiyecilik işinde kadınlar, bir ay boyunca hafta sonları da dahil, sabahın erken saatlerinden akşamın geç saatlerine kadar çalışsa bile, kazanacağı para asgari ücreti bile bulmamaktadır (Arslan 2003: 14).
Seasonal agricultural workers that work without an intermediary: They have no payment guaranty. They work when they found a job, and do not work when they could not find one. They might work for low wages (Karaman & Yılmaz 2011: 220).	Aracısız çalışan mevsimlik tarım işçileri: İş ve para garantileri bulunmamaktadır. İş bulduklarında çalışıyorlar, iş bulamadıklarında çalışmıyorlar. Düşük ücret karşılığında çalışabiliyorlar (Karaman & Yılmaz 2011: 220).
This is an indication that youth labor is being widely used in this region (Etiler & Lordoğlu 2014: 123).	Bu durum genç işçiliğin bu bölgede yaygın olarak kullanıldığının bir göstergesi olmaktadır (Etiler & Lordoğlu 2014: 123).
It is a known fact that agricultural workers work with all of the family members who could work regardless of age in order to gain more and finish the task as soon as possible (Görücü & Akbıyık 2010: 212).	Tarım işçilerinin daha çok kazanmak ve bir an önce işi bitirmek için yaşına bakılmaksızın elinden iş gelen tüm aile bireylerinin katılımıyla çalıştıkları bilinen bir gerçektir (Görücü & Akbıyık 2010: 212).
Furthermore the presence of more girls than boys among the children working in cotton cultivation could be explained by their being preferred for agriculture sector since girls are more hard working, skilled, patient and obedient in general (Etiler & Lordoğlu 2014: 125).	Ayrıca pamuk tarımında çalışan çocukların arasında da kız çocukların erkeklere oranla daha fazla oluşu, genel olarak kız çocuklarının çalışkan, becerikli, sabırlı ve itaatkar olmalarından dolayı tarım sektörü için de tercih edilmeleriyle açıklanabilir (Etiler & Lordoğlu 2014: 125).
Employers, who are another actor of the work relations, do not have to deal with any problems of the workers during the period that they work other than paying their wages. Absence of a labor law regulating work relations in agriculture sector, exclusion from the existing work law is one of the major reasons for employers not to undertake any responsibility about workers (Çınar 2014: 34).	Çalışma ilişkilerinin bir diğer aktörü olan işverenler işçilere çalıştıkları dönemlerde ücret ödemek dışında hiçbir sorunlarıyla ilgilenmek zorunda değildir. Tarım kesiminde çalışma ilişkilerini düzenleyen iş yasasının olmaması, var olan iş hukukunun dışında kalmaları işçilerle ilgili olarak işverenlerin herhangi bir sorumluluk yüklenmemelerinde en önemli nedenlerden birisidir (Çınar 2014: 34).
It is necessary for agricultural workers to contact locals and public institutions at the places that they went to work while forming temporary settlements. Since there is no housing or camp area that belongs to them, these people tend to choose places close to water as settlement (Görücü & Akbıyık 2010: 211).	Tarım işçilerinin çalışmak üzere gittikleri yörelerde geçici iskân alanlarını oluştururken yöre halkıyla ve kamu kuruluşları ile iletişim kurmaları gerekmektedir. Kendilerine ait bir konut veya kamp alanının bulunmaması, bu insanların yerleşim için genellikle suya yakın yerleri seçmelerine neden olmaktadır (Görücü & Akbıyık 2010: 211).
These dangerous trips are caused by the fact that seasonal workers are too poor to cover travel expenses (Çınar 2014, June 16: 33).	Bu tehlikeli yolculuklar mevsimlik işçilerin yol masraflarını karşılayamayacak kadar yoksul olmasından kaynaklanmaktadır (Çınar 2014, June 16: 33).
Most of the time workers traveling with trucks as stowaway passengers could became victim of traffic accidents. Major reason for this is the cost of bus travel. It would be an important step towards the solution of this problem to carry workers not for profit by establishing temporary transportation bureaus to solve this problem by local authorities (Akbıyık 2011: 153).	Çoğu zaman kamyonlarla kaçak yolculuk eden işçiler trafik kazalarında kurban olabilmektedir. Bunun en önemli nedeni, otobüsle ulaşımın maliyetidir. Bu sorunun çözümü için, yerel yönetimler tarafından geçici dönemlerde ulaşım bürolarının kurularak, işçilerin maliyetine taşınması sorunun çözümünde önemli bir adım olacaktır (Akbıyık 2011: 153).

Laws and institutions of the state regulating labor markets are too remote to agricultural employment. Again due to the nature of the agriculture works, union activities are highly insufficient among workers in this sector (Akbıyık 2008: 236).	Devletin isgücü piyasalarını düzenleyen kural ve kurumları tarımdaki istihdama çok uzaktır. Yine tarım işlerinin niteliginden dolayı bu sektörde çalısanlar arasında sendikal faaliyetler oldukça yetersizdir (Akbıyık 2008: 236).
In general agricultural policies that lower production, harsh conditions of free market and at the same time diminishing support to producers created an unregistered, insecure, fragile order reverberated to workers working 11 hours a day in difficult life and work conditions (Öğünç, *Cumhuriyet*, 2015, August 19).	Genel olarak üretimi düşüren tarım politikaları, serbest piyasanın sert koşulları ve aynı esnada üreticiye yönelik desteklerin azalması, ağır hayat ve iş koşullarında günde 11 saat çalışan işçilere yansıyan kayıt dışı, güvensiz, kırılgan bir düzen yaratmış (Öğünç, *Cumhuriyet*, 2015, 19 Ağustos).

There is a remarkable contrast between the language patterns covering the actions of employers and intermediaries. While scholars largely depict intermediaries as active subjects who are individually responsible for their actions; employers' actions and responsibility in the wage-labor processes are blurred between the lines. While scholars often mention the structural restraints (such as pressures of international competition, ongoing deterioration of protection and benefits of farmers, the legal framework that is exempting employers from responsibility) as explanations for employers' treatment of workers; the actions of intermediaries are depicted as if they are independent from such structural transformations and economic limitations. While scholars tend to overlook the agency of employers by sequencing economic restraints asserting them as victims of neoliberal policies together with workers; intermediaries appear as sole active agents as resourceful, capable, open eyed, active individuals within the reports of wage labor processes. However, as a matter of fact, it is the employers who demand labor and hire workers occasionally resulting in migrant workers transportation and housing problems in the work areas. Hence, the issues of fair wages, wage equality, child labor, means of transportation, housing facilities for migrant workers could have been reported in different ways to emphasize employers responsibility alongside with intermediaries.

In Turkey, the bulk of agricultural employers are landowners who have long regarded as significant actors for agricultural production. My primary purpose in highlighting such selective bias of the literature in emphasizing *gainings* of intermediaries and *economic restraints* of employers is not to question the social support and sympathy for agricultural employers among scholars. One can cite a number of legitimate ways for supporting farmers, however, in my view, denying fundamental working rights for agricultural employees is not among them. Social support of agricultural production may necessitate extra protection mechanisms for agricultural employers through a re-allocation of public budget. However, exceptional treatment of agricultural labor market should not be seen as

a natural consequence of such social support of agricultural production since it is in fact unfairly burdening the workers to finance such support.

Besides, in Turkey, not all agricultural employers are landowners and farmers regarding those who hold property of land, yet, sub-contracting some process of production to traders (Geçgin 2009; Çetinkaya 2008). The cases of Polatlı, Adana and Adapazarı reveal, for example, increasing roles of non-landowner employers as subcontractors of agricultural production (Fieldwork Notes 2011, 2012, 2015; Geçgin 2009; Çetinkaya 2008). In fact, the bulk of the employers that were recruiting workers in the city were traders in the hinterland of Adapazarı.

In this sense, in discussing wage-labor processes of agricultural workers, the pattern of entitling agricultural employers as farmers, peasants, producers; sorting financial limits of employers; and omitting their responsibility with passive sentences is not just supporting agricultural producers; *it is favoring one group over another.* It is favoring employers over workers through denying the possibility of fundamental rights for the latter. It is favoring predominantly male employers as landowners, traders and entrepreneurs over a work force with high shares of impoverished groups of women and ethnic minorities who have minimum claim to land. Therefore, I think it is precisely this framework of denying employers responsibility that led to the portrayal of intermediaries as leading active blameworthy agents of the wage labor processes.

7.1.2 "An Outdated Practice"

Second pattern in the literature is using conjunctions such as *still* and *even today* with regard to the persistence of intermediaries in the agricultural labor market implying reactionary existence of the institution in spite of the historical change. The practice is often labeled as backward and/or outdated, portrayed with contrast to contemporary systems of recruitment, as a resistance to change, and being in the style of social institutions and relations of past:

> Intermediaries [elçiler] … continue to be an important actor of working relations even today[164] (Çınar 2014: 144).

> The time-expired practice of "Agricultural Intermediation" that is permitted by regulations must be terminated[165] (Görücü & Akbıyık 2010: 214).

[164] Elçiler … bugün bile çalışma ilişkilerinin önemli bir aktörü olmaya devam etmektedirler.

[165] Yönetmelikle izin verilen ve çağdışı bir yaklaşım olan "Tarım Aracılığı" uygulamasına son verilmelidir.

> Intermediary, an intermediation system that both the employer and the employee needs is not a system of today but it is a current projection of a system that may be centuries old. Intermediaries, although being an actor that relates employees and employers, are among the sources of the problems that seasonal migratory agriculture workers experience about wages, accommodation, health and life conditions[166] (TBMM 2015: 88-9).

It is stated in the report of Parliamentary Commission that *slavery-type* working conditions are prevalent in agricultural today and it is because workers' relations with intermediaries that they are subjected to *primitive* labor exploitation:

> Seasonal migratory agriculture workers usually find jobs and brought to workplace *via* job intermediaries which are called *çavuş, dayıbaşı, elçi*; intermediaries are also decisive in determining the wages to be paid. This very relation itself brings about the exposure of workers to cheap, primitive labor exploitation[167] (TBMM 2015: 195).

Ironically, five decades ago, Mübeccel Kıray (1999 [1971]) noted the emergence of labor intermediaries in two villages with completely different terms emphasizing its novelty[168]. Within a case study (1964-5) covering four villages in Çukurova, she noticed the emergence of a new position called *elçi* (intermediary) due to the increasing significance of day laborers in two villages characterized by large landownership (Kıray 1999 [1971]: 227):

> The status of intermediary [elçi] is one of the most complex statuses in the village indeed. Within the present power balance in Sakızlı and Yunusoğlu, the intermediary [elçi] is closer to villagers than large landowners and considered to be a trustworthy representative by the villagers. Everyone believes that the intermediary [elçi] is aware of the working conditions of the agricultural workers and does his best to protect the rights of the villagers... His resistance to large landowners places him… among the newly emerging leaders alongside the teacher[169] (Kıray 1999 [1971]: 228).

---

[166] Aracı, gerek işverenler gerekse işçilerin ihtiyaç duyduğu bir aracılık sistemi bugünün değil belki de yüzyıllardır süren bir sistemin günümüzdeki izdüşümüdür. İşçiler ve işverenler arasında ilişki kuran bir aktör olmasına rağmen, mevsimlik gezici tarım işçilerinin ücret, barınma, sağlık ve yaşam şartlarına ilişkin yaşadığı sorunların kaynaklarından biri de aracılardır.

[167] Mevsimlik gezici tarım işçileri çoğunlukla çavuş, dayıbaşı, elçi denilen iş aracıları aracılığı ile iş bulmakta, çalışma yerlerine götürülmekte, ödenecek ücretlerin belirlenmesinde de iş aracıları belirleyici olmaktadır. Bu ilişkinin bizatihi kendisi, işçilerin ucuz, ilkel emek sömürüsüne maruz kalmalarını beraberinde getirmektedir.

[168] The institution of intermediary and seasonal labor migration evidently precedes that date. For example Çetinkaya mentioned Hilmi Turan's (1939) observations in Adana indicating a professional job called elçibaşı with distinctive qualities, privileges, rights and responsibilities as a medium between workers and employers (as cited in Çetinkaya 2008: 56) Here, Kıray interprets intermediary position which is newly established for regulating labor within two particular villages in Çukurova. I quoted her account to illustrate the difference of her portrayal of the intermediaries five decades ago.

[169] Elçi statüsü gerçekte, köyün en karmaşık statülerinden biridir. Sakızlı ve Yunusoğlu'nda bugün varolan kuvvet dengesi içinde elçi, büyük toprak sahiplerinden çok köylülere yakındır ve köylülerce güvenilir bir temsilci olarak kabul edilmektedir. Herkes, elçinin, tarım içisinin çalışma koşullarını olağanüstü ağır olduğunun farkında olduğuna ve köylülerin haklarını korumak için elinden geleni yaptığına inanmaktadır… Büyük toprak sahiplerine karşı koyması onun … öğretmen ile birlikte yeni ortaya çıkan önderler arasında yer almasına sebep olmaktadır.

Kıray interpreted the importance of the intermediary position with references to structural transformation, evolving power and work relations within the village. She proclaimed this new position as one of the signifiers of unification and collective power of villagers against large landowners, and one of new leadership positions within the villages alongside with teacher and mukhtar. For her, the insecurity of new work relations, is the major motivation of villagers to act with intermediaries:

> Newly emerging daily laborer position represents such insecurity for villagers that it necessitated the emergence of new relations. Anonymity of the relation between daily laborer and land owner, persistence of the difficulty of earning a livelihood even though livelihood concerns does not diminish at all, in short a great feeling of insecurity united the workers, impelled them to resist old power owners and look for new ways to create new power groups. For this reason all of them are against large landowners and create opportunities to resist them. Since village is on a very low level of living and experience great difficulties in making a living, the leadership of intermediary [elçi], teacher and mukhtar emerge as a new and united force against large landowners[170] (Kıray 1999 [1971]: 229).

Kıray's approach to the position of intermediary as a novelty within village power relations is remarkably different from today's approaches implying pre-modern origins of the practice. In fact, her analysis preceded 1980s turmoil marking the increase of emphasis on inter-regional labor migration for agricultural jobs within the literature. Extension of seasonal migration routes to dozens of cities throughout Turkey made the relations of work even more insecure for workers, which probably increased their need for intermediary. Ethnicization of agricultural labor market has both intensified and become more visible as pointed out in later studies, particularly the ones revealing the catastrophic consequences of forced migration. Today, scholars' focus on seasonal labor migration between regions with a framework in which I believe cultural distinctiveness of (Southeastern, Kurdish, Arabic) workers is over-emphasized.

Labor intermediary, once noted by Kıray as a new leader position balancing the power relations to the advantage of villagers (workers) against employers; today turn out to be something largely portrayed as a traditional/tribal authority, which is an obstacle for workers wellbeing. Consequently, many scholars have offered abolishment of the intermediary system as a solution to the problems of agricultural labor market. Çınar

[170] Yeni ortaya çıkan gündelikçi emekçi pozisyonu, köylüler için öyle bir güvensizliği temsil etmektedir ki, yeni ilişkilerin ortaya çıkması gerekmiştir. Gündelikli emekçinin toprak sahibi ile ilişkisinin anonimliği, geçim endişesinde hiçbir azalma belirmediği halde geçim sağlamak güçlüğünün sürüp gitmesi, kısaca büyük bir güvensizlik duygusu, köylüleri birleştirerek eski kuvvet sahiplerine karşı direnmeye ve köyde yeni kuvvet grupları yaratmanın yollarını aramaya yöneltmektedir. Bu nedenle, hepsi büyük toprak sahiplerinin kuvvetine karşıdır ve onlara karşı direnme fırsatı yaratmaktadırlar. Şimdi köy çok düşük bir yaşama düzeyi devresinde bulunduğu ve geçimini sağlamada büyük güçlüklerle karşılaştığı için elçi, öğretmen ve muhtarın önderliği büyük toprak sahiplerine karşı yeni ve birleşmiş bir kuvvet olarak ön plana çıkmaktadır.

(2014), for example, at the end of her book, proposes legal re-regulations to eliminate intermediary institution and to ensure individual contracts between workers and employers (215). Görücü & Akbıyık (2010) argued on the necessity of replacing intermediaries with authorized public and private agencies (Görücü & Akbıyık 2010: 214). With similar concerns, in a recent Parliamentary Assembly press meeting, two deputies[171] declared, "seasonal migratory agricultural workers shall not be left to the mercy of intermediaries and the system of intermediaries must be abolished" (*Evrensel*, 2015, July 7).

I think abolishing intermediation—which is already mostly an informal job—is to fight with a symptom rather than the disease given the absence of legal mechanisms protecting workers against employers and intermediaries. As Luna (1997) states that intermediaries are "more a symptom than a basic cause of the difficulty" (494). The cause is mostly the conjunction of substandard labor supply—enabled by exceptional labor legislation—with irregular labor demand. I will not argue against abolishment proposals, yet, I want to briefly discuss the outdatedness and "primitiveness" of the intermediary system implied within such proposals.

The emphases on outdatedness of intermediary system is especially hard to understand with regard to its contemporary worldwide popularity as a cost-efficient system for allocating tasks and controlling labor, especially in agricultural labor markets. Rather than being a disappearing traditional practice, the intermediary system is consolidated through contemporary political processes. For example, IRCA (The Immigration Reform Control Act of 1986) created a notable increase in labor contractor (intermediary) usage in the United States' agriculture[172] (Luna 1997: 495). Similarly Thilmany and Martin (1995) noticed the increasing role of labor contractors in US agriculture after 1980s although employers have the option of calling Employment Service to obtain workers at no charge. Polopolus & Emerson (1991) pointed out that the persistence of the system strongly suggests the existence of economic benefits or incentives (for employers) accruing continued use of intermediaries (61).

[171] CHP İzmir Deputy Musa Çam and Bursa Deputy Orhan Sarıbal

[172] This act provided amnesty to over 2.3 million Mexicans (Charvet, Durand and Massey 2000). The passing of this gave hope and encouraged newcomers to enter the country. The IRCA, on the other hand, made the hiring of undocumented workers strictly illegal. Some commentators argue that employers increase their usage FLCs to avoid legal penalties as most of the workers hired by FLCs are undocumented (Verduzco 2010: 7; Thilmany & Martin 1995)

I will exemplify with the historical experience within the United States' agricultural labor market to clarify this point. In his book on southeast agricultural labor market in the United States, Thomas (1992) makes a comparison between Bracero's[173] and undocumented agricultural workers[174] that become increasingly preferred as harvest crews in the lettuce production. They are both sources of cheap labor yet; one of the advantages of undocumented workers is the fact that crews are organized by labor contractors (intermediaries) rather than by individual firms:

> The labor contractor, an individual entrepreneur who traded in the labor of undocumented workers, would recruit and supervise the production operations of the harvest. For a contract fee negotiated with the grower, the contractor would provide sufficient labor to harvest the crop and would, in turn, organize housing, food, and transportation for the crew. Hiring a labor contractor and a professional crew enabled smaller firms to externalize the recruitment and supervision of production to another agent. While direct labor costs were higher for the employer, the system as a whole offered an efficient and less complicated alternative to the use of braceros (Thomas 1992: 118).

Therefore, according to the employers, hiring a labor contractor saves time and provides access to efficient teamwork (Thomas 1992: 118). Apparently, skilled and stable teams of undocumented workers were more efficient and produced a more uniform quality pack compared with the uneven, heavily supervised Bracero crews (Thomas 1992: 120). The Bracero system, in fact, was mostly working in the advantage of larger companies who got more workers and could use the scale of advantage by having an extra budget for supervising and management.

Thomas (1992) consequently emphasizes the importance of "the collective dimension of skill" (97) in lettuce harvest crews (embodied in the high degree of mutual coordination and experience) that make them even preferable to machinery harvest. Therefore, the undocumented lettuce crews hired by labor contractors constitute social harvesting machines with remarkable productivity, efficiency and adaptability (98):

> Most harvest crews are characterized by social interaction beyond the workplace itself. That is, they also exist as relatively cohesive units external to the labor process. This shows up in two ways: in recruitment of new members and in the ways in which they deal with the exigencies of migration. In the first instance, many crews recruit and help train their own members.... kinship serves as an important avenue of entry into a crew and usually involves some real or fictive attachment to one or more of its members. Sons, brothers, cousins, or brothers-in-law may be brought in when a vacancy occurs (either at the level of cutter/packer or auxiliary worker). Alternatively, people who are in auxiliary positions may exert a claim to try out for a job. In the crew in which I worked, half the

[173] Contract workers from Mexico on a program named after the Spanish term bracero, meaning manuel laborer. The Bracero program was terminated in 1964.

[174] About half of (1.2 to 1.5 million) agricultural workers in the United States farms are unauthorized immigrants (Lyon 2005: 264; Martin 2002). The share of unauthorized workers is highest in seasonal fruit and vegetable crops (Martin 2002: 1).

> workers were or claimed to be related to at least one other member of the crew. In addition, overlapping ties, such as distant family relations or common village origin in Mexico, served to bind the crew socially and facilitate entry (Thomas 1992: 97).

Hence, apart from speed and harmony, employers also benefit from self-training and self-management advantages of crews hired though labor contractors.

Agricultural worker crews organized through intermediaries in Turkey are as well characterized by social interaction beyond the workplace, displaying social division of labor to make ends meet after long workdays, recruiting and training new members. Indeed, within the agricultural sector in Adapazarı, the employers who apply to İŞKUR (public institution for allocating jobs since 1946) for recruiting workers were characterized by larger and permanent labor demand and routine work schedule such as stock farming companies. For most of the field jobs in the area, on the contrary, efficient teamwork significantly reduces the labor costs especially in the cases of short-term demands of labor[175]. Employers almost exclusively prefer crews organized by independent intermediaries for these tasks. The duration of work relationship have also a significant effect on intermediary positions. For example, worker-intermediaries[176] were widespread within the jobs where employers establish a relatively permanent relation with crews, such as corn, lettuce crews, and workers in the potato wholesale market.

Therefore, intermediary system in Turkey as well can (better) be discussed in terms of employer preferences as an alternative to terms indicating its backwardness and outdatedness. Ortiz (2002) elaborates on the literature on wage-labor process and share some findings indicating the reasons of labor contractor (intermediary) preferences of agricultural employers. To sum up briefly, labor contractors provide a number of services to producers; they can access to extra labor pools, cheapen wages, reduce recruitment costs, and ensure their responsibility for organizing and supervising tasks, break the linguistic and cultural barriers with workers, can avoid labor laws and labor unions (as cited in Ortiz 2002:402). Ulukan & Ulukan (2011) likewise, explicated reasons of employer preferences of intermediaries as a strategy to control pace and quality without their supervision in the workplace (11-2).

Such perspective will also be helpful to make sense of different intermediation practices in the labor market and different strategies of workers.

---

[175] Polopolus & Emerson (1991) likewise argue that labor contracting is most feasible for short season tasks as proved by previous econometric analyses (61).

[176] It is a crew leader position with little extra gainings combining manual work and with managerial tasks.

Some of the worker groups, indeed, invest in kin relations within wage-labor processes more than others such as Roma workers in Adapazarı and seasonally migrant Kurd workers. I believe examining strategies of workers through comparative advantage and efficiency offer more to understand such differences rather than the perspectives relying on hierarchical duality of traditional and modern implying an innate contradiction between social organizations such as *akrabalık, aşiret, komşuluk, hemşehrilik* (kinship, tribe, neighborhood and compatriot-ship) and modern labor processes. In this context, the problem about the Turkish literature on intermediaries is the emphasis on the backwardness/tradition-bases of the practice and the explicit references to workers traditions/culture, which is supposed to produce the system.

The last point, I want to emphasize about this issue is the fact that it is not only the intermediaries but also the workers that are occasionally labelled as backward in the literature. There are studies that put it rather clearly. For example in his interviews with workers, Şeker (1987) concentrated specifically on the question of whether agricultural workers were able to shed their peasant mentality and develop a modern consciousness (119). He also elaborated on the limitedness of interaction between workers and locals as something reducing the chances of workers to learn modern social and political behaviors. Through his interviews focusing on worldview of workers, he argued that even if workers have the chance to realize their dreams of having agricultural land for their own, they will not be able to sustain their positions in the long term because workers have a tendency to be obedient to traditional authority figures, may work for them freely out of respect and thus lack the consciousness required for holding an enterprise. On the other hand, there are other scholars emphasizing favorable sides of seasonal migration of workers, again because of the backwardness they see in workers. Okçuoğlu (1999), for instance, argues that seasonal worker migration stems from unequal development of capitalism in Turkey's different regions. Through emphasizing the distinction between sharecroppers and free peasants, he states his positive expectations of seasonal migration since migrant workers mostly come from regions where feudal relations are prevalent. He foresees that the feudal relations will be diminished with the help of the processes of seasonal migration, since these workers will be able to observe, witness and transfer the values, social and economic experiences of the developed regions to their hometowns (Okçuoğlu 1999: 161). Similar to Okçuoğlu's East-West and feudal-modern dichotomy, Akbıyık (2008) pictures seasonal agricultural workers as a connection between traditional sector and modern sector, between village and city. For him, seasonal visits transform semi-peasant semi-worker laborers, cities and also villages. Consequently, seasonal agricultural workers

are becoming modern sector workers through the consciousness generated by the processes of migration (Akbıyık 2008: 236). The major problem I see about these type of accounts is the focus on workers characteristics/culture/consciousness in categorizing agricultural workers rather than the work relations. The categories that scholars base their analysis such as modern worker, peasant, sharecropper and so on, is defined as types of consciousness rather than through material work relations. I will analyze the examples in which intermediary system is similarly defined through workers characteristic in the next section.

7.1.3 "Cultural Bonds between Workers and Intermediaries"

Third noteworthy pattern in the literature is the emphasis on the cultural bonds between workers and intermediaries. In fact, the issue of intermediaries is one of the areas that cultural differences of workers have been pointed out within the literature. Yet, most of the time I perceive this as an *overemphasis*. The examples below report that traditional, tribal values and moral codes such as respect/obedience of agricultural workers are transferred into work relations, which eventually appear as the intermediary system (all emphases are added):

Hierarchical social structure shaped by the production relation between agha/sharecropper and tribal order added on top of this in some places, caused the multilayered social relations with a rigid hierarchy to be transferred to relations of work (Çınar 2014: 176).	…. ağa/ortakçı arasındaki üretim ilişkisinin şekillendirdiği hiyerarşik sosyal yapı, ayrıca bazı yerlerde buna eklenen aşiret düzeni, çok katmanlı ve katı bir hiyerarşiye sahip toplumsal ilişkilerin … çalışma ilişkilerine aktarılmasına neden olmuştur (Çınar 2014: 176).
Intermediary filled an important gap for seasonal agricultural workers that has a sharecropper background, who were unable to find the protection provided in feudal production relations by agha to sharecropper, in the new social structure (Çınar & Lordoğlu 2011: 435).	Feodal üretim ilişkilerinde ağanın ortakçılarına sağladığı korumayı yeni toplumsal yapılanma içinde bulamayan, ortakçılık geçmişinden gelen mevsimlik tarım işçileri için aracı önemli bir boşluğu doldurmuştur (Çınar & Lordoğlu 2011: 435).
That most of them have the Kurdish identity and moreover use the expression "Eastern" in public as an umbrella identity shows the strength of tribal ties, dominant character of religious identity, strength of group solidarity and that traditional community pattern still exists. This structure assumes permanence with ethnic economy. With trust towards intermediary [elçi, çavuş] obedience is also on the carpet. This may be shown as the most important proof that hierarchical structure is nourished by traditionalist structure and in the structuring of ethnic economy (Geçgin 2009: 140-1).	Çogunlugunun Kürt kimligine sahip olması, dahası bir üst kimlik olarak da toplum içinde "Dogulu" ifadesini de kullanmaları, asiret baglarının yüksekligi, dinsel kimligin baskın karakteri grup dayanısmasının yüksekligine ve geleneksel cemaat örüntüsünün hala var oldugunu göstermektedir. Bu yapı etnik ekonomi ile süreklilik kazanmaktadır. Elçiye, çavusa duyulan güvenle birlikte itaatkârlık da söz konusu olmaktadır. Bu durum hiyerarsik yapının gelenekselci yapıdan beslendigini ve etnik ekonominin yapılaşmasında en önemli kanıt olarak gösterilebilir (Geçgin 2009: 140-1).
Seasonal agricultural laborers were not freed from the conditionings determined by sharecropping relations within the traditional production structure that they were in, in the past; they still find the absence of large landowner *agha* having social and psychological power (Şeker 1986: 126-7).	Mevsimlik tarım işçileri, geçmişte içinde yer aldıkları geleneksel üretim yapısı içinde ortakçılık ilişkilerinin belirlediği koşullandırmalardan kurtulmuş değilerdir; toplumsal psikolojik erk sahibi büyük toprak sahibi ağanın yokluğunu hala yadırgamaktadırlar (Şeker 1986: 126-7).

All of these accounts specifically refer to work organizations of Kurdish (Eastern) workers. Şeker (1986) also reported that through seasonal migration "workers bring their family, kinship and tribal bonds to the vicinity" (109). They could not get rid of their past, conditioning them to look for protective authority (Şeker 1986: 126-7). That is probably why they brought intermediaries with them. Akbıyık (2008) likewise wrote that "it is *elçi's* and *çavuş's* who perform the duties of intermediary institution and it is traditions and customs that determine the rules of work life" (236).

As seen above, these scholars point out the close link between workers culture and intermediaries—as if it is something they carried to labor market from outside—and built their arguments on the supposed hierarchical duality between modern and traditional. They emphasize that the social hierarchy and workers trust/obedience to intermediary are fed by traditional social structure of workers. Workers are therefore situated at the traditional side—bottom level of the hierarchy—by their tribal and traditional values coded in their history.

In addition, some scholars depict intermediaries—whose position closely linked to workers culture in the examples above—as exploitative human beings who take advantage of, control and discipline laborers and who make workers bounded laborers through utilizing nothing but *culture*, "local power relations", "values of kinship, neighborhood, compatriot-ship":

Intermediaries exploit workers, make them dependent by binding them based on local power relations and relations such as kinship, neighborliness and hemşehrilik. In fact "values of kinship have a potential to make workers dependent in a more intense way than loans in some cases" (Çınar 2014: 177).	Aracılar işçileri yerel güç ilişkileri, akrabalık, komşuluk, hemşehrilik gibi ilişkiler üzerinden bağlayarak sömürür, bağımlı kılar. Hatta "akrabalığın içerdiği değerler bazı durumlarda borçlanmadan daha şiddetli şekilde işçileri bağımlı hale getirecek potansiyele sahiptir" (Çınar 2014: 177).
Since intermediaries [elçiler] live in the same place with workers, they dominate workers by effectively using local power relations (Çınar 2014:174).	Elçiler, işçilerle aynı yerde yaşadıkları için yerel güç ilişkilerini etkin bir şekilde kullanarak işçiler üzerinde egemenlik kurarlar (Çınar 2014:174).
One of the main reasons for such a dependency relationship to be built is the formation of the relation of intermediary and worker to be solely based on relations such as kinship, hemşehrilik, and neighborliness. Therefore the relations between workers and intermediaries are defined with primary relation codes such as trust, mutual dependency, loyalty and solidarity. These relations, especially when they rely on kinship, must be considered in association with the hierarchy formed based on age, gender and status within the group. This phenomenon also emerges as a cause of the dependency relation, in which the workers hand over the control over their own labor to the intermediary (Çınar & Lordoğlu 2010: 27).	Böyle bir bağımlılık ilişkisinin kurulabilmesinin ana nedenlerinden biri aracı ile işçi arasındaki ilişkinin tamamen akrabalık, hemşerilik, komşuluk gibi ilişkiler üzerinden biçimlenmesidir. Dolayısıyla işçiler ve aracıların ilişkileri güven, karşılıklı bağımlılık, sadakat, dayanışma gibi birincil ilişki kodlarıyla tanımlanır. Bu ilişkilerin, özellikle de akrabalığa dayanması halinde, yaşa, cinsiyete ve topluluk içindeki statüye dayalı olarak oluşan hiyerarşi ile birlikte düşünülmelidir. Bu olgu aynı zamanda işçilerin kendi emekleri üzerindeki denetimi aracıya devrettikleri bağımlılık ilişkisinin de bir nedeni olarak ortaya çıkmaktadır. (Çınar & Lordoğlu 2010: 27)

Intermediary [çavuş] system has a feudal structure... Intermediaries [çavuşlar, dayıbaşları] and workers have either close kinship or neighborliness relations. For example in the group that I made interviews with in Sakarya the intermediary [dayıbaşı] Erol was the brother of the wife of intermediary [çavuş] Ahmet. Erol, even though he is from Diyarbakır, lives in Sakarya's Akyazı borough with his second wife. His first wife works in one of the groups as seasonal worker. This, kinship relations that still lives on under these severe exploitation conditions, is a good example to see the strength of feudal ties. The kinship between workers and intermediaries [çavuşlar] enables worker control to work more effectively. Because the relations of workers and intermediaries generally continue also after they return to their homes from Karadeniz and whether or not they will be in the group next year depends on their performance that year, how well they get along with the intermediary [çavuş] and whether or not they cause problems in the group (Küçükkırca 2012: 7).	Çavuş sistemi feodal bir yapıya sahip… Çavuşlar, dayıbaşları ve işçiler birbirleriyle ya yakın akraba ya da komşuluk ilişkisi içindeler. Örneğin, Sakarya'da görüşmeler yaptığım grupta dayıbaşı Erol, çavuş Ahmet'in eşinin kardeşi idi. Erol, memleketi Diyarbakır olmasına rağmen ikinci eşiyle Sakarya'nın Akyazı ilçesinde yaşamakta. İlk eşi ise gruplarından birinde mevsimlik işçi olarak çalışmakta. Bu, ciddi sömürü koşullarında hâlâ süren akrabalık ilişkileri feodal bağların gücünü görmek için de iyi bir örnektir. İşçilerin ve çavuşların akraba olması, işçi denetiminin daha etkin bir şekilde işlemesini sağlamakta. Çünkü işçilerle çavuşların ilişkileri genelde Karadeniz'den evlerine döndüklerinde de devam etmekte ve gelecek yıl gruba girip girmemeleri o yıl gösterdikleri performansa, çavuşla ne kadar iyi geçindiklerine ve grupta sorun çıkarıp çıkarmamış olmalarına da bağlı (Küçükkırca 2012: 7).
The control of intermediary [elçi] towards male worker, and male worker towards his family... is due to the fact that respect in the traditional sense is still valid. Intermediaries [elçiler] can rule over workers thanks to the codes of traditional conception of respect and making use of the conditions of traditional social structure (Çınar 2014: 173).	Elçinin erkek işçiye erkek işçinin de ailesine yönelik kontrolü … geleneksel anlamda saygı anlayışının hala geçerli olmasından da kaynaklanır. Elçiler geleneksel saygı anlayışının kodları sayesinde geleneksel toplumsal yapının koşullarından yararlanarak işçiler üzerinde egemenlik kurabilirler. (Çınar 2014: 173)
... when one talks about the social structure of Southeast Anatolian region it should be remembered that tribal relations dominated this region for long years and not only whether or not they still continue to exist but also that the value judgments, ethical rules that this structure produced are still valid... it is much more easier for the intermediaries to keep workers under control directly or indirectly by using these hierarchical relations that already exist in the social structure to control workers (Çınar 2014: 174, 176).	…söz konusu Güneydoğu Anadolu Bölgesi'nin sosyal yapısı olunca aşiret ilişkilerinin bu bölgede uzun yıllar hakim olduğunu ve hala varlıklarını sürdürüp sürdürmemeleri bir yana bu yapının yarattığı değer yargılarının, ahlak kurallarının geçerli olduğunu hesaba katmak gerekir… … aracıların işçileri kontrol etmek için zaten sosyal yapı içerisinde var olan bu hiyerarşik ilişkileri kullanarak işçileri doğrudan ve dolaylı olarak kontrol altında tutmaları çok daha kolaydır (Çınar 2014: 174, 176).

In these accounts, the kinship ties between workers and intermediaries interpreted as a factor enhancing labor control and thus putting workers in a relatively disadvantageous position. The report of Parliamentary Commission on Seasonal Agricultural Work (2015) took a step further from this point and argued that the primordial ties between workers and intermediaries are *the* reason of workers willingness to pay for the intermediaries although it is illegal:

> Expectation of loyalty also stems from dependency relations seen in agricultural workers different normal working life... Intermediaries rather use primordial relations through kinships, hemşeriler, and neighbors. What are essential here are not the principles of work relations but emotions such as solidarity, dependency, and mutual trust. Thus even though it is forbidden to take commission from workers, it is the result of primordial relations that workers expressed, during the interviews made by workers themselves, commission pays are the right of worker intermediaries[177] (TBMM 2015: 86-87).

[177] Sadakat beklentisi de normal çalışma yaşamından farklı olan tarım işçilerinde görülen bağımlılık ilişkilerinden kaynaklanmaktadır… Aracılar daha çok akrabalar, hemşeriler ve komşular üzerinden birincil ilişkiler kullanırlar. Burada esas olan çalışma ilişkilerinin ilkeleri değil dayanışma, bağımlılık, karşılıklı güven

Gürsoy (2010) likewise portrayed agricultural labor market as completely dominated by kinship and tribal ties leaving zero chances to "free" workers to authorize their labor processes because of intermediaries:

> ... it is obvious that worker does not personally have the opportunity to market his/her own labor force and rather is at the discretion of agricultural intermediary. In a labor relation, where any worker without a kinship or tribal tie cannot practice the profession of "seasonal agricultural workmanship" directly and where it is imperative to be selected by an intermediary [dayıbaşı], it is difficult to claim that the worker personally has the authority to decide about to whom and under what conditions he/she will market his/her labor[178] (Gürsoy 2010: 56-7).

Her point is not fundamentally different from the previously quoted accounts in the sense the she also points at the workers' innate characteristics (their social ties, social organization of labor and so on) while explaining the problems of wage-labor processes.

Finally, I want to quote from Geçgin (2009) as he argues that intermediaries are benefiting from the "ethnic economy" and poverty of workers while the state simply closes her eyes to such informal labor processes:

> There are historical, global, social, political and spatial reasons creating seasonal workmanship. These are several dimensions may be listed such as generally social and economic structure of Southeast Anatolia's and as a result of this landless peasants to choose primarily agricultural works because of their unqualified character, field of informal economy to cover a very large area and the state to overlook this; coming together of agricultural workers by ethnic aggregation and reproducing an ethnic economy that supports a collective consciousness (in addition to this, intermediaries [elçiler] to receive their social and symbolic capital from the source provided by this ethnic economy and to carry this on); agricultural workers to built a culture of poverty for themselves and to try to profit from the social legitimacy of this[179] (Geçgin 2009: 141-2).

Apparently he, as well, elaborate almost exclusively on characteristics of workers. The state is just mentioned as a neglecting actor whereas employers are completely excluded from the discussion on the structure of seasonal agricultural work. In fact, he did not count

---

gibi duygulardır. Nitekim, işçilerden komisyon alınması yasak olmasına rağmen, işçilerin kendileri ile yapılan görüşmelerde komisyon bedelinin iş aracılarının hakkı olduklarını söylemesi birincil ilişkilerin sonucudur (Meclis Araştırması Komisyonu Raporu 2015: 86-7).

[178] …işçinin kendi emek gücünü pazarlayabilme imkanının kendisine ait olmadığı, daha ziyade tarım aracısının takdirine kaldığı açıktır. Akrabalık veya aşiret bağı taşımayan herhangi bir işçinin doğrudan "mevsimlik tarım işçiliği" mesleğini icra edemediği ve bir dayıbaşı tarafından seçilmesinin zorunlu olduğu bir emek ilişkisinde, işçinin emeğini kime hangi koşullarda pazarlayacağı hususunda takdir yetkisine kendisinin sahip olduğunu iddia etmek güçtür (Gürsoy 2010: 56-7).

[179] Mevsimlik işçiligi yaratan tarihsel, küresel, sosyal, politik ve uzamsal nedenler bulunmaktadır. Bunlar genel olarak Güneydoğu Anadolu'nun toplumsal ve ekonomik yapısı ve bunun sonucunda topraksız köylülerin kalifiyesiz niteliklerinden dolayı öncelikle tarımsal işçiliği seçmeleri; kayıt dışı ekonomik alanın son derece geniş yer kaplamış olması ve devletin buna göz yumması; tarım işçilerinin etnik kümelenme yolu ile bir arada bulunmaları ve bunun kolektif bilinci besleyen bir etnik ekonomiyi yeniden üretmeleri (bununla birlikte elçilerin sosyal ve simgesel sermayelerini bu etnik ekonominin sağladığı kaynaktan almaları ve bunu devam ettirmeleri); tarım işçilerinin kendilerine göre bir yoksulluk kültürü inşa etmeleri ve bunun toplumsal meşruluğundan yararlanmaya çalışmaları gibi pek çok boyut sıralanabilir.

a single reason other than workers characteristics (not even the labor demand) while pointing out the global, social, political and spatial reasons that created seasonal work.

I perceive these examples as manifestations of the hegemonic discourse, which partly made possible though historical processes othering Kurds, rather than simply exaggerations or prejudices of individual scholars. As seen, all these accounts elaborate on intermediaries in the agricultural labor market with respect to their cultural (primordial, traditional) ties with workers. The tradition and culture of workers also pointed as the source of unfairness within the labor processes since they give way to dominance of intermediaries. The *cultural bonds* between workers and intermediaries offered as an explanation for effective functioning of the institution of intermediary as a control mechanism over their labor. Such terms that some scholars (Küçükkırca 2012; Çınar & Lordoğlu 2011) occasionally used to define the bonds between workers and intermediaries as "feudal" and "tribal" are in fact value-loaded terms in the mainstream discourse usually implying a reactionary existence at the expense of social and structural change[180]. In this sense, *culture* of the workers, i.e., something that has been carried to the labor market by workers themselves is interpreted as the tool of control over their labor. My point is not to deny that intermediaries in general are functioning as a control mechanism over labor and some of them benefit from social hierarchies to increase their gainings. My criticism is rather on the popularity of such over-generalized cultural rules as explanations of the unfairness of labor market. Within the context of Turkey's agricultural labor market, I think what we need is to take the focus away from workers characteristics (who have already been *othered* and stigmatized enough) and direct our attention to the other actors of the labor processes, particularly to the role of the state and employers in structuring such an insecure labor market.

[180] In fact, the perception of tribal social structure as a reactionary remnant of past itself has been subject to scholarly criticism. For example, Yalçın-Heckmann (1993) defines Kurdish tribal system as one of the socio-politically formed groups commonly seen among nomadic or semi-nomadic people in the Middle East. Based on her fieldwork on Kurdish tribal system in Hakkari she argues that aşiret membership in the region is not something given but requires reinforcement by continuous remaking of kinship, friendship, and neighborly relations (182). Bruinessen (2002) likewise, argues that tribal organization has shown itself to have survival value in a number of distinctly modern situations and tribes have played more prominent social and political roles in Kurdistan of the 1990s than they did a half century earlier (20). Rather than as a remnant of traditional mentality legitimizing intra-group hierarchies, Bruinessen (2002) emphasizes the advantage of tribal organization in many urban contexts as a factor reproducing and enhancing tribal organizations (3). In fact, the same logic applies to the agricultural labor market; if it is evident that tribal hierarchies are functional in some workers' recruitment and work processes, the hierarchy pattern would also be analyzed with respect to its relative advantage to worker groups competing in the labor market. Although being an agricultural worker is largely portrayed as misery and hopelessness, managing to be hired in agricultural jobs throughout the country is not an easy job, which could also be studied as a successful survival mechanism of the poor. Such a perspective would alter the way we look at tribal hierarchies, as they would mean more than just backwardness.

There are compelling reasons to be pessimistic about this emphasis on the culture of workers in the discussions on intermediation in agriculture. Alongside with over generalization and the methodological problem of assuming an *a priori* culture structuring wage labor processes; my primary concern is the victim blaming implications of such a discourse. I perceive such an emphasis on culture as a form of victim blaming[181] since it is implied that the intermediaries are the problems and they are taking advantage of workers through their traditional bonds with the workers. It is in fact the workers who have been *othered* in the literature focusing on intermediaries with respect to their so-called bonds with intermediaries. I neither claim that there are accounts openly blaming workers for their own situation nor think that there is an agreement over these issues. It is just the established way of reporting on wage-labor processes that reveals signs of victim blaming through stressing specific points like responsibility and wealth of intermediaries, outdatedness of the intermediary practices and assumptions about the culture of the workers that are effective on the wage-labor processes. Through considering these specific emphases together, it is feasible to claim that contemporary scholarship on agricultural labor have been pointing out the workers *own* culture as responsible for their poor working contracts, appropriation of their wages and purported non-free status of their labor.

Alongside with victim blaming implications, there are other considerable handicaps of foregrounding generalized cultural codes of ethnic groups in the analysis of intermediation practices. First of all, as mentioned before, it may contribute to the reproduction of cultural stereotypes on a stigmatized group. In fact, current literature on agricultural intermediaries is not challenging the popular stereotyping of Kurds as strictly hierarchical, backward, patriarchal tribesmen. When the analyses on wage labor process include socially excluded, stigmatized and/or politically vulnerable groups, scholars need to be more careful about their preconceptions. The prevalence of stereotyped cultural codes about some groups might have conditioned scholars to look for or give relative importance to particular patterns while ignoring others. In fact, the codes referred in the quotations related to Kurdish social organization (or more generally "eastern" communities including Arabs and Kurds) are themselves over-generalizations regarding the extensiveness of the group and the geography, formed by varieties of social and political organizations. In fact, as Bruinessen (2003) pointed out "even on a superficial outlook will reveal the absence of

[181] In fact, the mainstream discourse on agricultural workers can be scrutinized for "victim blaming" tendencies in various ways. Yet, here I just focus on the discourse on intermediaries and its victim blaming implications.

a single Kurdish social organization; the differences are vast and obvious" (81). Moreover, there are also significant differences between the internal organization of tribes: "Kurdish tribes show up such a bewildering variety in size and forms of internal organization that it may seem misleading to refer to all by the same term" (Bruinessen 2002: 19). He also states that there are significant differences between the tribes with respect to in-group hierarchies:

> It is almost meaningless to speak of tribes in the abstract. The size, composition, degree of hierarchy or egalitarianism of a tribe and its relations with its neighbors are affected by changes in the economic and political environment[182] (Bruinessen 2002: 2).

Second, methods of observation may affect scholars' portrayal of labor market as if it is dominated by a bunch of powerful intermediaries. In fact, majority of the recent studies carried out in labor camps excluding other workers of agriculture. In fact, since intermediaries are more familiar and more accessible, it is possible to say that they also serve as intermediaries in academic fieldwork on agriculture. As Yıldırım puts it in explaining his methodology in his dissertation:

> The social networks provided by intermediaries made it possible to connect and interview with the farmers and seasonal workers in the least accessible rural areas of Kocaali[183] (Yıldırım 2015: 262).

This method of using intermediary networks in the fieldwork—which is inescapable for many researches on seasonally migrant workers—might have resulted in the analyses that attach a high importance to the role of intermediaries in the labor market. Despite the practical benefits of utilizing networks of intermediaries in the case studies; the workers without intermediaries, relatively network-poor intermediaries, crew leaders might have represented less than their actual share in the labor market in such research. In fact, significant discrepancies between the findings of researches using different modes of inquiry give signs of sampling bias in the literature. For example, in the case of apricot harvest, while Çınar (2014) made an argument based on the absolute domination of the intermediaries in the labor market through snowball sampling by visiting labor camps in Malatya; Akbıyık (2011) claimed that the majority of workers (67 %) are working without intermediaries through a study with random sampling (with 120 workers) within the same

[182] The size and complexity of composition of tribes, as well as the authority relations within them, appear to change in response to two crucial variables. The first of these is the form and degree of indirect rule that the relevant state or states allow the tribes (which is itself the outcome of a process of continuous negotiation between society and state); the other variable consists of the available economic and ecological resource base (Bruinessen 2002: 19).

[183] Kocaali'nin ulaşılması zor kırsal alanlarında dayıbaşlarının sağladığı ilişki ağları sayesinde çiftçiler ve mevsimlik işçilerle bağlantı kurmak ve görüşmek mümkün olabilmiştir.

region. Moreover, the researches conducted in the hometowns of workers usually indicate lesser significance of intermediaries compared to case studies carried out in the regions workers recruited. For instance, in a recent study (Şimşek 2011), a systematical sample is selected (through information gathered from local authorities the numbers and locations of seasonally migrant agricultural worker families are estimated) within the neighborhoods of Urfa. According to this study, the ratio of seasonally migrant workers who are recruited through intermediaries is 54.9 % (Şimşek 2011: 51).

Third, neither *a priori* assumptions about the culture of the workers nor the acclaimed cultural bonds between workers and intermediaries apprehend the variations of the intermediation practices among similar groups of workers, and even among the same workers under different tasks. Relying more on generalized cultural values/codes in the analysis of intermediation practices offers less for understanding the variations within the groups and tasks and changes within time regarding agricultural wage-labor processes. For example, there are remarkable differences even within the wage-labor processes of seasonally migrant Kurdish workers; between youngster crews and family crews; between established workers and newcomers (Ulukan & Ulukan 2011). Moreover, the wage-labor processes tend to differ through employers labor renumeration, i.e., the intermediation patterns prevalent in cotton harvest is not the same for apricot harvest (Akbıyık 2011; Çınar 2014). Çetinkaya (2008) for example argued for a decrease with regard to gainings and authority of intermediaries in Çukurova ("end of the golden age of intermediaries") due to the decrease and mechanization of cotton cultivation:

> The cession of the cotton-based agricultural structures and the intensification of new production patterns like citrus and glass housing in Adana, influence the work organizations and, as a result, the relationships of intermediaries with both employers and workers (Çetinkaya 2008: 113)

He argues that citrus production and glass housing is much more attractive for the agricultural workers because wages are given on a daily base (different from piece-based numeration in cotton harvest). Citrus collecting needs much more strength and to an extent qualification; therefore child labor between the ages of 6-14 has been limited with respect to cotton production, which in turn limited the labor force capacities of intermediaries (114).

Within hazelnut harvest crews, Yıldırım (2015) noticed that the ones working for larger landowners tend to skip intermediation since they are able to work for the same employer throughout the whole season (Yıldırım 2015: 306-7). Moreover, intermediation practices are also distinguishable between some local and seasonally migrant groups, when workers

are recruited by nearby employers or migrate to distant towns to work. For example, in Adapazarı, the wage-labor processes of Kurdish agricultural groups that are settled in the city are significantly different from seasonally migrant Kurdish workers coming to the city in the harvest seasons. In addition, cultural explanations of intermediation are not reliable for understanding the extensiveness of intermediation practices within the agricultural labor market today throughout the country regardless of workers cultural codes and traditions.

Çınar (2014) mentioned worker-crew leaders that had dismissed their intermediaries and have been contracting with the employers directly; Ulukan & Ulukan (2011) also recorded worker-intermediaries within hazelnut harvest as leaders of small crews contracting directly with the employers:

> One of the findings in our research was differentiation among intermediaries. New intermediaries, which we may call "worker/intermediary" *(işçi/elçi),* have been encountered other than the intermediaries as we know it, in other words those who bring seasonal workers en masse, take care of their every need, lend money if necessary. These intermediaries [elçiler] by using their own informal webs collect and bring to the region to work laborers, mostly from relatives and acquaintances in lesser numbers compared to other intermediaries. The reason we call these intermediaries [elçiler] "worker/intermediary" is because while in different times of the year such as during hazelnut harvest they emerge with their intermediary [elçi] identity, after the hazelnut harvest intermediary identity may disappear and sustain their livelihoods as cotton worker[184] (Ulukan & Ulukan 2011: 22).

Fourth, such an exclusive focus on negative sides and abuses of worker-intermediary relationships may cause one to overlook preferences and strategies of workers. Such a framework makes it hard to notice successful strategies of workers within labor market to acquire consequent jobs and get paid securely in very unfamiliar environments without legal protection. In fact, some studies point out that workers perceive intermediaries as wage guarantees:

> Seasonal agricultural workers can experience problems to receive their payments when they find a job an intermediary. The ones who are recruited through intermediaries generally do not have this problem. Because workers can ask their payment from

[184] Araştırmamızdaki bulgulardan biri de aracılarda görülen farklılaşma idi. Bildiğimiz anlamda aracılar diğer bir deyişle kitlesel olarak mevsimlik işçi getiren onların her ihtiyaçları ile ilgilenen gerekirse borç veren elçiler dışında "işçi/elçi" diyebileceğimiz yeni aracılarla karşılaşılmıştır. Bu elçiler kendi enformel ağlarını kullanarak diğer elçilere oranla sayıca daha az, genellikle akraba ve tanıdık çevresinden işçiler toplamakta ve bölgeye çalıştırmak üzere getirmektedir. Bu elçilere "işçi/elçi" olarak tanımlamamızın nedeni, yılın farklı zamanlarında örneğin fındık hasadı döneminde elçi kimliği ile öne çıkarken fındık hasadı bittiğinde elçi kimliği ortadan kalkabilmekte ve pamuk işçisi olarak geçimini sürdürebilmelerinden ötürüdür.

> intermediaries in these cases where their intermdiaries are intermediaries, not employers[185] (Karaman & Yılmaz 2011: 223).

Given the circumstances of the labor market, workers can choose to work with intermediaries—at least once—for a number of reasons such as ensuring payments, gaining comparative advantage, extending job opportunities, to learn a new task and so on. Moreover, ethnic, neighborhood-based, village-based permanent ties between workers and their intermediaries could have also been read as an advantage for workers. In fact, researchers so far reported many cases of worker abuse where workers and intermediaries are not tied through permanent relations beyond the labor processes (e.g. Çetinkaya 2008; Geçgin 2009; Önen 2012; Ulukan & Ulukan 2011). Geçgin (2009) and Çetinkaya (2008) described the enlargement process of worker networks of established intermediaries through spread of reputation among workers (Geçgin 2009: 134). On the other hand, Önen (2012) noticed negative consequences of non-existent social ties between workers and intermediaries on working conditions. Through a comparison between working conditions of Roma and Dom workers, she pointed out the negative effects of Kurdish intermediaries on working conditions of Dom workers:

> Intermediaries of Dom workers are Kurds whereas Roma workers' intermediaries are also Roma. Therefore, we can say that Dom workers have a more layered intermediary system. The intermediaries of Roma community is called "Dragoman" who are selected within the community… *Dragoman* intermediaries defend rights of their Roma community even if they work for landowners. On the other hand, we cannot say the same for Kurdish intermediaries. A Dom women stated that she had worked in seasonal agricultural jobs for 20-25 years with her family, yet, they could not get their wages in the last term and the intermediary was also disappeared… (Önen 2012: 286)

Ulukan & Ulukan (2011) had also noticed the layered intermediary system in the cases of Georgian workers where intermediaries do not have social/ethnic ties with workers. One of their interviews they carried out with an intermediary who is working with Gerogian workers was very informative about the structure and functioning of the layered intermediary system:

> Intermediation is very important in hazelnut job but this should be done well. There are maybe 7-8 intermediaries like me here that bring Georgian workers but doing it professionally we are at most 2-3 people. The most important thing in this job is reaching right people and communication. My capital is hidden in this phone. Garden owners call me 1-2 months before hazelnut harvest and tell how many workers they need, and I start phoning. There is a person that I am in contact with in Georgia and is a key person for me. We may say he is sort of my intermediary *[dayıbaşı]*. I call him, and he arranges a group

[185] Mevsimlik tarım işçileri aracı dışı iş buldukları bazı durumlarda ücretlerini almada problem yaşayabilmektedirler. Aracı marifetiyle işe yönlendirilenlerin, genelde, bu tür bir sıkıntısı olmamaktadır. Zira işçi parasını aracıdan alabilmektedir. Çünkü onun muhatabı arazi sahibi değil, aracıdır.

> and then I get them from Sarp border with my minibus and bring here to hazelnut harvest[186] (Ulukan & Ulukan 2011: 12).

A similar and layered organization is also the case for the work organizations of some migratory agricultural workers, which include both intermediary and crew leader as different persons. Ulukan & Ulukan (2011) summarized the recruitment processes of hazelnut harvest workers coming from Southeast:

> Intermediaries [elçiler] visiting the region 1-2 months in advance of harvest time during June July, talk to producers and receive their demands for the term. Once the demands are specified they again go back to Southeastern/Eastern cities where they live and from where they will bring workers and prepare worker teams according to the demand they received. A team is made up of 10-15 people generally. While some intermediaries [elçiler] arrange these teams personally, many of them call intermediaries [ekipbaşları (dayıbaşı)] that they are in contact and worked before and made them form the teams[187] (13).

Fifth, considering culture as given, as an essential characteristic of workers *a priori* to wage labor processes would blind us to the significance of labor market processes in shaping, restructuring and reproducing these so-called social bonds. Social ties, codes, traditions have not been stable, rather subject to change, negotiation through actual human interactions every day. Consequently, it has been always rewarding to analyze which codes, ties, and traditions become prevalent in particular contexts. Yet, considering *culture* as given, essential characteristics of workers work against recognizing the agency of the workers as real actors struggling with their barriers. Agricultural workers are aware of and have the mental capacity pursue their interests by utilizing their social ties as much as the other actors of the labor market.

Because of these handicaps, this study offers to avoid preconceived cultural generalizations in the analysis of wage-labor process of agricultural workers as much as possible. In fact, questioning workers values, social codes regardless of their behavior in the labor processes (e.g. as analyses concluding on the significant role of tribal values in

---

[186] Aracılık fındık işinde çok önemli ama bu işi iyi yapmak lazım. Burada benim gibi Gürcü işçi getiren belki 7-8 aracı vardır ama profesyonelce yapan en fazla 2-3 kisiyiz. Bu işte en önemli şey doğru kişilere ulaşmak ve iletişim. Benim sermayem bu telefonun içinde saklı. Fındık toplama zamanından 1-2 ay önce bahçe sahipleri beni arar ve ne kadar işçiye ihtiyacı olduğunu söyler, ben de telefonlarıma başlarım. Benim Gürcistan'da iletişimde olduğum bir kişi var benim için anahtar kişi. Bir bakıma benim dayıbaşım diyebiliriz. Onu arıyorum o da bir ekip ayarlıyor sonra minibüsümle gidip onları Sarp sınırından alıp buraya fındık toplamaya getiriyorum.

[187] Elçiler hasat zamanının 1-2 ay öncesinde Haziran Temmuz aylarında bölgeyi ziyaret ederek, üreticilerle görüşüp o dönemin işçi taleplerini almaktadır. Talepler belli olduktan sonra yeniden ikamet ettikleri ve işçi getirecekleri Güneydoğu/Doğu illerine geri dönüp elde ettikleri talebe göre işçi ekiplerini hazırlamaktadır. Bir ekip genelde 10-15 kişiden oluşuyor. Bazı elçiler bu ekiplerin oluşturulmasını bizzat kendileri yaparken bir çoğu daha önceden çalıştıkları, irtibatta oldukları ekipbaşlarını (dayıbaşı) arayarak ekiplerin oluşturulmasını sağlatır.

the labor processes through observation of blood feuds among workers) is not actually that relevant for the analysis of wage-labor processes.

Finally, I wanted to study the case of Adapazarı to further elaborate on the handicaps of cultural generalizations in the analysis of intermediation practices. The case of Adapazarı revealed that Romani women usually work under command of men from their kin as crew leaders and intermediaries whereas the other women in the city mostly work with women crew leaders and intermediaries. Moreover, women from Romani neighborhoods work within relatively more hierarchical work organization compared to other groups. Nevertheless, for the analysis of differences between wage-labor processes of women, I chose to focus on the contextual dynamics of exclusion rather than engaging in an extensive questioning on Romani culture legitimizing patriarchal hierarchies. In the case of Adapazarı, Romani groups and settlements have been stigmatized and relatively isolated, they have relatively resource-poor social networks, Romani men are also largely excluded from other segments of the labor market, and there is also some evidence on Romani women's exclusion from multi-ethnic crews of women. The resolution of the traditional craftsmanship and limitedness of job opportunities for Romani men in some neighborhoods led them increasingly to work in the agricultural tasks alongside with women. The absence of regular income of household men distinguishes the Roma households from the households of other women agricultural workers in the city. On the other hand, Kurdish women in the city have relatively better access to the women crews and have relatively resource-rich networks providing both ties with Kurdish traders (as agricultural employers) and ties granting labor market participation of household men. In contrast to Romani neighborhoods, many Kurdish women in the city work within small self-organized non-hierarchical crews with women crew leaders. Ironically, some of these Kurdish women are from families of former seasonally migrant agricultural workers, whose work organization and culture have often been labelled as hierarchical and/or feudal by the scholars reporting on wage-labor processes.

In sum, contemporary scholars' emphasis on the preconceived cultural codes of workers would be misleading in terms of elaborating on the differences between the patterns of intermediation between groups of workers in the agricultural labor market. Particular contexts of the labor processes, in this sense, are both significant and necessary to understand the dynamics of intermediation. We need to shift the current emphasis from workers to the particular contexts of work relation and the political process ensuring the continuity of insecure labor market for workers in Turkey. This concern partly stems from the victim blaming implications of fore grounding preconceived cultural categories in the

analysis of agricultural wage-labor processes that would have contributed to ongoing objectification of workers in the mainstream discourse. In the next part, I will continue the discussion by presenting intermediation patterns within the agricultural labor market of Adapazarı to exemplify the multiple dynamics and variability of intermediation practices within a local context.

7.2 Intermediation Practices in Adapazarı

Within the city, agricultural jobs are organized through a couple of independent networks in the neighborhoods where workers are settled. The buses and minibuses come to neighborhoods for transportation of workers to fields. Intermediaries are the ones who allocate workers to different tasks, forming different kinds of crews for different tasks through considering all sorts of variables like their experience, skill, age, relations with each other, employer complaints and preferences and so on. They often add new young members to the most experienced and fast crews to be able to train them without a complaint from employer. Most of the intermediaries have also been manual workers as crew leaders. Intermediaries in the neighborhoods of the city are usually women, except Roma, which can be either women or men. Employers, on the other hand are either landowners or traders/merchants selling the crop.

As I mentioned in Chapter VI, agricultural workers constantly try to expand their job networks to be employed in multiple jobs, which occasionally require building ties with established local women intermediaries in the city with resource-rich networks. Yet, this is only part of the story as intermediation practices are usually more complex and are embedded in their personal labor processes.

In this part, I will introduce the patterns of intermediation with the wage-labor process in Adapazarı through statistical data based on Case Study 2015. Then, a categorization will be offered to analyze different patterns that are based on my research observations throughout the fieldwork. I will analyze intermediary positions in the city within three categories to clarify the multiple dynamics behind the position, authority, responsibilities and gainings of intermediaries.

Roma and Kurd workers in the city mostly work with multiple intermediaries to increase their periods of employment. The case study (2015) revealed that all Kurdish participants and 74.2 percent of Roma participants mentioned their ties with multiple intermediaries for recruitment (Table 6.2.A Intermediaries). In fact, regarding the layered pattern of wage-labor processes, the real ratio is even higher within Roma group. As Roma

participants mostly work as whole families or with their close kin, a familiar intermediary can hold the primary intermediary position as they only work within his/her crew or with his/her command. Yet, this does not necessarily mean that this primary intermediary directly contracts with employers each time. More often than not, they are collaborating with other intermediaries within or outside the neighborhood to organize jobs.

Turkish participants have closer ties with employers which enable them to skip intermediation processes - 66.7 percent of the Turkish participants of case study were either working with an intermediary or without any.

Table 7.2.A Intermediaries (Case Study - 2015)			
	Work without intermediary	Work with an intermediary	Work with multiple intermediaries
Turk % within Residence Groups	16.7%	50.0%	33.3%
Roma % within Residence Groups	0.0%	25.8%	74.2%
Kurd % within Residence Groups	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%
Total	3.8%	26.9%	69. 2%

According to 2015 case study, 19 (35.6 %) workers work with female intermediaries; 21 (40.4 %) with male intermediaries; and 8 (15.4 %) women work with both male and female intermediaries. As can be seen from Table 6.2.B, the comparison of residence groups and gender of intermediary gives a result that distinguishes Roman group from others. According to this, none of the workers living in central or Kurdish neighborhoods said they work solely for male intermediaries, whereas this ratio is 67.7 % among Romas.

Table 7.2.B Residence Groups * Sex of Intermediaries (Case Study - 2015)				
	Not applicable	Female	Male	Both male and female
Turk % within Residence Groups	16.7%	83.3%	0.0%	0.0%
Roma % within Residence Groups	3.2%	9.7%	67.7%	19.4%
Kurd % within Residence Groups	0.0%	77.8%	0.0%	15.4%
Total	5.8%	38.5%	40.4%	15.4%

Most of 2015 case study interviewees (65.4 %) expressed that they work for more than one intermediary. And 71.1 % of participants indicate neighborhood and neighborliness as

the primary source of acquaintance with intermediaries. In addition to this, a significant portion (74.1%) of women from the Roma group expressed that the agricultural intermediary is among family or a relative. The rate of working with an intermediary that is a relative or from family (household) was a very rare case between Kurdish and Turkish participants.

Some workers expressed that they met intermediaries at workplace. About half of the women from Kurdish and Turkish group expressed that they expend their work network by means of these intermediaries that they met at workplace. Women working at Wholesale Market work both with intermediaries at the Wholesale Market and also with farmer and trader employers, who came to Wholesale Market to ask for workers. For example Ferzane[188] (38) is a worker intermediary working in the Wholesale Market for 18 years. She receives double wage not for her work in the Wholesale Market but when she brings workers to fields. The reason that she can bring worker to fields is that she indeed works in the Wholesale Market. For field tasks she contacts with employers in the Wholesale Market. Finding the workers, distributing tasks, being the foreman, teaching the work to novices and distributing the wages are her responsibilities. She ensures transportation to the field by the shuttles provided by employers. Sometimes she collects workers for other intermediaries to work in the fields. For such cases she said: "we agree with the employer and share the extra among two intermediaries [amelebaşı]."

Kurdish participants however, said they met with other crews of women in the fields and made new work contacts through this way. For example Hacer[189] (14) is a Kurdish student living in Bağlar neighborhood and works in the fields with her grandmother during summers:

> Intermediaries change. All of them are women. We go with my grandmother. We go with intermediaries from Güneşler, from Şeker neighborhood... We met in fields, exchange numbers. That is the way it is[190].

Dilara[191] (34) was also a worker intermediary living in Arabacıalanı and she working in agriculture since she was 15. Nowadays she works in corn for only a trader employer and

[188] Interview no: 25 [Table 5.3.A The Profiles of the Participants (2015 Case Study) and Table 5.3.C Household Characteristics of the Participants (2015 Case Study)]

[189] Interview no: 34 [Table 5.3.A The Profiles of the Participants (2015 Case Study) and Table 5.3.C Household Characteristics of the Participants (2015 Case Study)]

[190] İşçibaşları değişiyor, hepsi kadın. Babaannemle gidiyoruz. Güneşler'den, Şeker mahalleden işçibaşlarıyla gidiyoruz…Tarlalarda tanıştık, tel alıp verdik, öyle.

[191] Interview no: 20 [Table 5.3.A The Profiles of the Participants (2015 Case Study) and Table 5.3.C Household Characteristics of the Participants (2015 Case Study)]

also work in another insured part-time job. But she told that in the past she went to several fields with different teams and intermediaries. When I asked how she met with intermediaries she said: "sometimes we met in the workplaces and arrange other jobs. Our previous intermediary was a woman from Şeker neighborhood; she was not working much".

Roma women rarely personally met a new intermediary and engage in new work relations by themselves. Only one of the case study participants said she was involved in a work in this way. Most of the time they go to workplace with their own teams and intermediaries. They usually work with their close kin, rural acquaintances and neighbors. A worker from Romani settlement in Karaköy, Sedef[192] (37) summarized their annual work with intermediation practices as such:

> For example I go to corn with my brother... We go to lettuce during winter from Ablalı village... with my sister. We go to Bilecik, Yenişehir and stay in tents. We also go to Bursa-Pamukova region... this year we went to Afyon for fresh corn, intermediary placed 40 of us in a single hotel room; we could not stay and returned. Tent life is the best[193].

As seen, she both utilized the social networks of her close relatives and kin and tried to expand their options by going to work with an unfamiliar intermediary who is probably found by men in their community. The deal turned out to be a failure due to accommodation problem and they ended their relationship with that intermediary. Perihan[194] (49) was also a Romani women working with multiple intermediaries extending her job network through her neighbors and relatives:

> There are different intermediaries. For example I started potato this year. A woman from Hanlıköy take me to spinach, there had been some going from here and needed workers, I also went, I mean not an acquaintance, we are not familiar[195].

There are also workers who claimed to work for a single intermediary who is actually the crew leader. For them we can say one of the following is valid: she works for an intermediary that provides large and diverse jobs; or a member of the family is an

[192] Interview no: 47 [Table 5.3.A The Profiles of the Participants (2015 Case Study) and Table 5.3.C Household Characteristics of the Participants (2015 Case Study)]

[193] Mesela mısıra abime gidiyorum... Marula kışın gidiyoruz Ablalı köyünden … ablayla. Bilecik'e, Yenişehir'e gidip çadırda kalırız. Bursa- Pamukova tarafına da gidiyoruz... Bu sene Afyon'a taze mısıra gittik, aracı bizi otelde bir odaya 40 kişi koydu, duramadık döndük. Çadır hayatı en iyisi.

[194] Interview no: 52 [Table 5.3.A The Profiles of the Participants (2015 Case Study) and Table 5.3.C Household Characteristics of the Participants (2015 Case Study)]

[195] Ayrı ayrı aracılar oluyor. Mesela patatese bu sene başladım. Ispanağa Hanlıköyünden bir kadın götürürdü, bizim buradan gidenler varmış işçi lazım olmuş, ben de gittim, tanıdık değil yani tanımıyoruz.

intermediary and that intermediary keeps his team fixed by constantly arranging jobs from other intermediaries.

Categorization

As mentioned before, intermediation practices and positions are highly variable in the city. In this part, I will try to present this variability within categories to portray the juxtapositions of areas of work for multiple intermediaries within the city: local women intermediaries; intermediary men in Roma community; women worker-intermediaries.

7.2.1 Local Women Intermediaries

According to the farmers of the area, the first and the most important intermediary group is that of local women intermediaries. They were the ones working like individual firms of recruitment and management within the city who have wide networks. In 2011, elderly farmers in *Ziraat Odası* mentioned three significant women intermediaries in the city. One was deceased before that time. I had the chance to meet the other two. In time, through following the commonly repeated names within the worker interviews, I was able to enlarge the list a little bit.

Nurgül (46) was one of them. She is one of the few local women intermediaries, known for a long time. I visited her in her home in 2011. She is doing intermediation for 28 years in the region. She is an entrepreneur that connects the women in the neighborhood with employers, and who states the number of workers she once guided in terms of thousands. She describes agricultural work as a "work that is being done by those who migrate from village, Romans, coming from East, from Karadeniz, coming for college pocket money... can be done by anyone whose husband died, who is divorced, willing to cover the expenses of kids in school" (Field Notes 2011). She managed to transform her social capital—being the daughter of a farmer, being native of the region—to a decent income within years by making agricultural intermediation. She has taken over agricultural intermediation from her paternal aunt. She is the daughter of a land owning farmer ("we had 150 acres of land, also animal trade; my father went bankrupt). She began intermediation at the age of 14. She never go to work but the labor force she can direct is so large that at times factories call her for seasonal jobs—she chose the jobs. In her words "she does not send her workers to just any work". In the past she has send workers to beet hoe, to potato harvest outside the city (to Afyon and Bolu) but now these jobs decreased and ceased. Nowadays she sends workers to a dried vegetable factory in Pamukova. She told me that because the workers she send to pickle factory too much worn out, and she

cares about them, she did not send them again. Sometimes farmer and the worker team that worked together and are satisfied from each other wants to lose the intermediary for the next year. But it is not easy to do this to an intermediary with strong local ties such as Nurgül. Although she describes herself as a kind worker leader, the stories of what she did to those workers, farmers that bypass her are wellspread in the neighborhood. According to rumors she raids the house of the farmers if necessary, kick doors, shout and scream. Nurgül is feared. But this reputation is a reputation that supports her career success. Nurgül coordinates all jobs, forms teams as the intermediary but according to her one of the reason that all those workers trust her is that they believe she will definitely get the money from the farmer. She said "no one fails to collect their money from me" with a clear self-reliance (Field Notes, 2011, May 19).

Nurgül's case was informative about some important characteristics of local women intermediaries. First, I call them "local" because of their close connections with the farmer community in the region, which is different than those of Kurdish and Romani intermediaries. Second, these women were not going to work that much and rely on the gainings of intermediation since they can coordinate large networks of employers with multiple crews. Apparently, these women are located within the crowded multi-ethnic worker neighborhoods such as Şeker Mahalle and Güneşler. Third, as Nurgül told they left the golden age behind them due to the decrease in cultivation of labor-requiring crops in the hinterland of Adapazarı and increase in trader employers who are more able to hold stable crews of their own.

7.2.2 Intermediary/Crew Leader/Driver/Boss Men

Second category was men intermediaries which only seen within the labor process of worker in the Roma neighborhoods in the city. This is also a variable category in itself since they do not have much in common other than being men and Roma. There are all kinds of intermediary positions held by men within the community ranking from bosses (as they call them) at top to worker-intermediaries (crew leaders) at the bottom.

Mahir for example has been a labor intemediary who lives in Romani *Yeni Mahalle*. He was a Roma man in his forties. He has a team of 20 most of which are relatives including his wife and daughters. He does not have a connection with local farmers, he works for a trader that buys the product on the field and brings to İstanbul wholesale market. His

responsibility is mostly leading the crew and transportation[196], rents a minibus to take workers to field. They work almost the entire year in Sakarya and nearby regions. After the job of his connection is done, he goes to work with other intermediaries with his wife and daughters.

In Roma neighborhoods, which are relatively isolated from agricultural job webs in the city, people mostly work for traders coming outside the city. These traders, according to what workers tell, are not local; they came to the neighborhood from İstanbul and Ankara. When they arrive to the neighborhood those they contact are the known male intermediaries of the neighborhood. These intermediaries are known as *patron* (boss) in the neighborhood. They are the one who know the actual boss. That is in products worked for a trader there might be up to 3 levels between worker and employers in some Roma groups. As mentioned, Roma women work within relatively more layers between themselves and employers. This is generally a much more multi-layered labor relation that they are immersed, including producer, trader and crew leader. Workers were generally reactive to these intermediaries that they called *patron* and not to their own crew leaders (worker-intermediaries) or transporters. For example, Özlem[197] (35), a worker from Karaköy stated that "there are many *patron's* here; we do not know the actual employer; patrons talk to him/her in secret...." But I should also note that since generally a worker is engaged in several different wage-labor processes during the year these *patrons* has a share from not all the works of a worker done within the year but only from those they arranged.

7.2.3 Women Worker Intermediaries

This is a broader category including an important number of workers within the agricultural labor market in the city. Some workers hold this position occasionally, while others permanently. Worker intermediaries are usually also crew leaders that are seen in all kinds of crews. Among 52 women workers I interviewed during my 2015 case study, 9 were also serving as intermediaries, 7 of them on a permanent basis and remaining 2 occasionally. Dilara (34) was one of them. She is a crew leader and intermediary working with a stable trader employer who is a corn trader. She is forming her crew from neighbors, a crew of 6 or 12 according to task. They do not have any connection with the

[196] As far as I understand it were only Roma workers in the city who were occasionally affording their transportation by themselves. Roma men who own a minibus or a pickup truck often make deals with other intermediaries and serve as driver to the work crews.

[197] Interview no: 39 [Table 5.3.A The Profiles of the Participants (2015 Case Study) and Table 5.3.C Household Characteristics of the Participants (2015 Case Study)]

farmer, except for occasionally talking to him when they encounter him on the field. Their work relation is with a Kurdish merchant who buys the crop at the field and takes it to İstanbul wholesale market. Bilge does not work any less then other workers and she does not get any share from other workers' daily wages; she is sometimes paid an extra by the boss. I did not notice anything special about her work, other than on one occasion where she, in a friendly tone but firmly, warned her crew for extending a break. In this example, the crew is more or less stable formed by neighbors. Not Bilge, but the boss whom visits the neighborhood from time to time is their warrant in collecting their wages, on the basis of their trust based on years long work relation and on the assumption that he will shy away from mistreating them to avoid confrontation with third parties (Field Notes 2011, 2015). When we use cross tabulation we see that the ratio of women crew leaders/intermediaries is very low among Roma women. Among the 31 Roma participants only one expressed that she constantly works as crew leader/intermediary. 16.7% of Turkish participants and 44.4% of Kurdish participants, however, was composed of worker intermediaries who also work as crew leaders.

Finally, I want to point out the relation between the characteristics of jobs and the wage-labor process that are exclusively organized by worker-intermediaries. In particular work processes worker-intermediary position as the sole layer between workers and employers are widespread such as lettuce and corn crews who regularly work for a trader employer and the jobs in Potato Wholesale Market that Turkish participants of the study work.

I met Nalan (now 25) in 2011. She was a typical lettuce crewmember as a daughter of a Kurdish migrant family that had settled in the city in 1970s. She worked full time between the ages 14-20 as part of a stable crew working for a trader employer. They have met their patron, who was a lettuce merchant in wholesale market, by means of a friend from İstanbul; they had no prior acquaintance. He is also Kurdish. Like the other Kurdish women who directly work for the merchant without an intermediary she also said they have a close relation with the boss, and called him *ağabey* (Field Notes 2011, August 2). The corn team that I joined in 2011 also worked for the same boss every summer. Workers were able to go to other works during their off days. Crew leader/intermediary always guarantees a team of at least 6 workers. On the day we go to work the merchant boss took the workers from the neighborhood and brought to the field by his own minibus. The relation of workers with the boss was friendly and the again called him *ağabey*. Near the farm we will first work, as soon as we get off the car, crew leader/intermediary unceremoniously searched through the clothes in the luggage of the boss; took out and gave me clean trousers and a shirt to wear, which became unrecognizable later, so that

mine will not get dirty. And indeed, just as in the lettuce crew, she had no acquaintance with the boss, who was also Kurdish, before being involved in a work relation.

Ağabey means elder brother in Turkish. White (2004) pointed out similar cases within textile ateliers in İstanbul in which the labor relationships were euphemized as social (fictive kin) relationships (125). Like the atelier owners in İstanbul, traders and employers have access to the social networks of Kurdish agricultural workers and expand their social web through them. Textile atelier owners have access to women worker networks through their wives social relations, whereas Kurdish traders utilize ethnic ties to enter the neighborhoods and social network of workers. As I heard from the workers, traders usually initiate their relationship with a visit to a coffee house in the neighborhood to earn men's trust first. Then, they expand their network through women as an *ağabey*, a reliable Kurdish man who is recognized by men of the community. A crew leader within the neighborhood, consequently, becomes sufficient for these employers to guarantee a stable and efficient work force. Workers on the other hand guarantee more secure contracts due to crew leader's steady relations with the employer and the involvement ands tracking of neighborhood men as the third party.

To sum up, there are three main categories of intermediaries actively allocating agricultural tasks within the city. They collaborate with each other occasionally. Work histories of individual workers often expose relations with multiple intermediaries, even with different types of intermediaries. These intermediaries not only allocate tasks to individuals but also carry out a number of functions for employers such as forming crews, training inexperienced workers by strategically locating them, relocating underperforming workers through the requests of employers. Additionally, most of the Roma intermediaries and all of the worker intermediaries actively participate and supervise labor processes. They work for both parties, which distinguish their position from a mere managerial agent of employers. They are usually the ones who bargain with the employers on the working terms (transportation, wages, payment time, size of crews and so on) and guarantee the payments of workers. Within the city, individual workers have chance to switch between intermediaries and in fact, the workers with insufficient access to jobs tend to try every opportunity by working with multi-layered contracts, multiple intermediaries.

7.3 Concluding Remarks

We can assert that the common function of intermediaries are regulating/limiting the encounters between employers and workers that is something prone to struggle. Yet the practices of intermediation in the agricultural labor market of Turkey, in fact, is highly

variable in terms of differences between intermediary positions' responsibilities, financial gains, relationships with workers, authority positions (Çetinkaya 2008, Ulukan & Ulukan 2011; Çınar 2014).

Recent studies have reported that about half of the workers directly contract with employers even in the case of migrant workers who initially had less access to employer networks and the states regulations enhancing intermediary system for migratory workers—as discussed in Chapter IV. Although, migration for work would reasonably increase the feasibility of working with established and more powerful intermediaries in stranger areas, such variability in the intermediary statuses of migrant workers is not deniable. The worker-intermediaries as crew leaders with little extra benefits constitute the largest category of intermediaries in Adapazarı case study. Throughout the fieldwork, I came across to intermediaries whose position is closer to the stereotyped rich and authoritarian version only where workers have less access to employer networks rather than labor organization of any particular ethnic group of workers. In the first part of this chapter, I questioned the literature and discursive patterns within the discussions of wage-labor processes in the agricultural labor market. My main motivation for analyzing the discourse, like Pascale (2013) expressed for her own study, is the belief in the fact that "scholars can advance an agenda of social justice by working at the constitutive frontiers of language to imagine new socialites and new subjectivities" (22). I tired to analyze the ways in which we are talking about intermediaries today with a concern for reproduction of ethnic prejudices about Eastern/Kurdish workers. I engaged in this discussion to I offer an alternative path to understand intermediation in Turkey's agriculture through questioning its functioning in particular contexts by taking into account the variations, preferences of employers, workers, and the political processes. Such comprehensive analysis of intermediary system, I suppose, above all critical for scrutinizing the well-established opposition between (modernizing) state and (traditional) intermediary in the mainstream discourse through emphasizing the state support of the intermediary system in the agricultural labor market.

Literature analysis and press research (Chapter III) had revealed that newspaper reports, politician declarations, academic studies, NGO reports and trade union declarations share a common ground in emphasizing both poor working conditions and distinctiveness and/or exceptionality of agricultural jobs. In some cases—as I tried to illustrate on the intermediation issue—this distinctiveness of jobs are decided through the characteristics of workers, implying that the exceptionality of the labor market actually stems from workers themselves. These exceptionalist rationale(s) manifest itself within the discourse

on intermediaries, which largely pointed out as exploiter agents thanks to their social ties with the workers. As intermediaries are depicted as representatives of backwardness and as remnants of a tradition their survival is perceived as something related to "culture" of the workers as a baggage they are carrying and must be get rid of in the way of emancipation—as a step for becoming truly a "worker" by eliminating authority of third person on their labor. Intermediaries are thus the ones to blame as they have enriched in the process, exploited the workers by bringing chains of pre-modern ties to the workplace in mainstream perception of seasonally migrant agricultural workers.

Such a focus on workers' *culture* in the analysis wage-labor processes creates a victim blaming environment since *workers own characteristics* is fore grounded as the main area to look for mechanisms of exploitation—rather than the structure of labor market and the particular contexts of wage-labor processes. In fact, most of the agricultural workers (of private farms) work without legally defined rights and employer responsibility in Turkey. They are working without compensation rights, excluded from unemployment benefits, minimum wage laws, and right to organize and collectively bargain. Furthermore, Kurdish migratory workers face discrimination and continuous ID checks by security forces in the migrated areas and labor camps. Given the circumstances, workers have multiple reasons to prefer working with intermediaries other than primordial ties such as reliability, securing the payments, increase terms of employment, to increase job opportunities, to begin working in new tasks, the need for assistance (to reach health care, to mediate interaction with security forces in the working region) in the cases including migration. In the current situation, what seems to be fueling the abusive side of intermediary system is workers' need for guarantees of payment and security. The way to minimize this need and the abuse is to equip workers with rights to defend themselves against employers and intermediaries and ensure that these rights are realized.

VIII CONCLUSION

This thesis documents the wage-labor processes of agricultural workers in the agricultural labor market of Adapazarı with a specific focus on workers' strategic use of their social networks. I have discussed the wage-labor processes of three groups of workers—Turks, Kurds, and Romas—regarding different working patterns and strategies of workers with regard to their contextual situations in the labor market. I have elaborated on the specific contexts of work relations and working patterns, which result in the different strategies on the part of women to secure and improve their wage-labor processes. I have thus focused on individual stories and struggles of workers in the feminized agricultural labor market of Adapazarı to illustrate the dynamics and variations of the intermediation practices within the wage-labor processes. The thesis emphasizes daily struggles of workers and their strategic use and extension of intermediation networks as an alternative to the dominant/prevalent victimization discourse depicting workers as victims who have no choice but work with abusive intermediaries because of their primordial/tribal/communal ties.

I design this research as a criticism to conventional reports on wage-labor processes in Turkey's agriculture, which highlight the actions of intermediaries in such a way that conceals the role of employers and the state in the structuring of agricultural labor market. Throughout the fieldwork, I noticed a gap between the aspirations of workers and the emphases of contemporary news articles and mainstream literature. While workers mostly express their concerns about retirement/old age income and define wage-labor process as a struggle with employers; mainstream literature foregrounds the gainings of intermediaries as the main problem of wage-labor processes in agricultural labor market. The analysis is complemented by a discussion on the role of the state in relation to insecurity in wage-labor processes and an emphasis on employers' responsibility in the vastly reported abuses and hazardous working conditions alongside with intermediaries. Apart from concealing the state and employer responsibility, I have also criticized the contemporary accounts on the grounds that Eastern/Kurdish workers are *othered* on the basis of their alleged primordial dependence on intermediaries. The fieldwork data as to the wage-labor processes in the ethically mixed labor market of Adapazarı provides insights for scrutinizing the popular portrayal of intermediaries as traditional figures exploiting workers thanks to their primordial/cultural/communal ties. The in-depth

analysis of wage-labor processes in Adapazarı reveals a rich data to elaborate on the dynamics of intermediation practices through focusing on specific contexts of work relations and different positioning of workers in the wider society.

I have treated exploitative intermediaries as symptoms rather than the cause of the insecure structure of labor processes, which is ensured by political processes and legal exemptions that transfer the risks of the sector on the shoulders of workers. Within the literature on intermediation, I am specifically critical of the popular emphasis placed on the culture of Eastern and/or Kurdish workers. In addition to overgeneralization and the methodological problems of assuming false consciousness of workers and an *a priori* defined culture of workers structuring wage-labor processes; my primary concern has been the victim blaming implications of such a discourse. As exemplified from the literature, the hints of the ''victim blaming'' language appear in the combination of three widespread notions in the analyses of wage-labor process; first, the expressions concealing the employer and putting forward the intermediary as the principal agent in the wage-labor processes; second, expressions emphasizing the primitivity/backwardness of the intermediary system; and third the analyses linking agency of intermediaries with the culture of Eastern/Kurdish workers. When all these patterns are considered together, even though this may not be the intention of scholars, we can see that a significant part of the literature on intermediaries focus on workers rather than the structure of the labor market or other actors and tell the story of workers who are subject to (or who consent) existing work conditions because of authoritarian relations embedded in their culture/tradition. In this sense, the problem with the literature about intermediaries is twofold: its contribution to the prevalent negative, stereotyping perception about the Eastern/Kurdish workers on the one hand and its concealment of the structural insecurity of the labor market which is ensured through political processes on the other.

Two methodological concerns—emphasizing the agency of women workers and approaching the issue of intermediation within more transactional terms—played a central role in the initial structuring of this research. These two concerns are in fact responses to the mainstream discourse on agricultural workers in Turkey which points to both victimhood and cultural differences of workers. The research thus combines discourse analysis with the case study.

The sample, selected among urban-dweller women working in agricultural jobs, is a marginal part of Turkey's agricultural workers. The sample of this research nevertheless shares common a condition with the rest of the agricultural workers in Turkey, namely,

working within structurally insecure wage-labor processes of agriculture. This sample also reflects the importance of women laborers in Turkish agriculture, who have historically little claims on land, as well as the effects of patriarchy and occupational segregation in the urban labor market that limit many poor women's career to precarious agricultural jobs. Furthermore, the rapid industrialization and growth of the Adapazarı throughout the 1990s and ethnically segregated settlements of the city provided a field to observe occupational segregation and discrimination dynamics confining women and some disadvantaged minority groups to precarious agricultural jobs. There are also evidences indicating clustering of disadvantaged minorities and women in precarious jobs at the country level, thus, I have interpreted this process as a crisis of citizenship since significant social rights have been attached to formal labor market status in Turkey.

The research is designed as an in-depth analysis of wage-labor processes of a group of workers, who are generally overlooked in the literature due to the use of the advantageous "local worker" category. Scholars usually portray local workers as landowning rural families who are better off compared to landless migratory workers from the impoverished Southeast. The sample represents the internal divisions, layers and heterogeneity of these so-called local workers. The wage-labor processes are presented in their heterogeneity through illustrating different patterns of work, intermediation practices and different prospects of future between the groups. It is illustrated in this case study that problems usually coded with seasonal migration (that is, low wages, insecure contracts, exclusion, isolation and dangerous ways of transportation) have also been evident in the wage-labor processes of local workers who work in nearby fields, as is the case of Adapazarı. I do not mean to deny or undervalue the catastrophic conditions of seasonal migratory workers, but it is important to emphasize the common problems of agricultural workers as they all work within a structurally insecure labor market, which place them in disadvantaged positions against the employers.

The discursive transformation on agricultural workers is discussed in Chapter III in the context of 1980s turmoil regarding the effects of military coup, restructuring of the economy, high levels of urbanization, increasing deregulation of agricultural market and the major socio-political processes that led to the ethnicization of the agricultural jobs. The press research on daily *Milliyet* revealed a process of replacement of the language of rights and developmentalism with victimization and *othering* as the main framework in the presentation of agricultural workers after 1980s. The continuities and ruptures within the discourse in fact give an idea about the main framework in which the problems of agricultural wage-labor processes are discussed today.

News reports before 1980s were rather infrequent and seemingly indiscriminate between groups of workers. Yet, some groups were ignored. They were mostly workers' struggles and negotiations for rights. One of the few continuing themes is the absence of employers in the picture with the exception of 1970s, when the scarcity of labor and the massive strikes in the Aegean region have challenged the landowner employers. Apart from absence of employers, contemporary portrayals share such prominent themes as visualization of misery, expressions of pity and strangeness and an ambiguity towards the responsible subjects.

Migration routes and ethnic tensions have indicated a process of ethnicization given the specific portrayals of workers in the press, and ongoing articulation of ethnical meanings about and in relation to workers. On the one hand, in many contemporary accounts, workers are typically depicted as passive objects through the discourses of victimization which emphasize misery, exploitation, absolute poverty and hopelessness. Yet, simultaneously, a certain kind of subjectivity is attributed to them as anonymous representatives of a particular culture portrayed as backwards and blameworthy. These statements of victimization and othering share a common dehumanizing aspect as neither calls attention to actual social lives and/or individual subjectivities of the workers they are looking at. However, there is a tension between these two lines of statements. I perceive this tension and the specific ways in which it is handled as a central characteristic of textual accounts on agricultural work in Turkey. Apparently, the most popular way of handling this tension is putting the blame on the intermediary. The monolithic portrayal of intermediary as a remnant of the past and a representative of authoritarian culture hints the ways in which workers are being *othered* in the contemporary accounts.

The literature analysis and the press research have proved informative about the discursive construction of difference and the formation of locality and community through the process of ethnicization of Turkey's agricultural labor market. Community, as Gupta and Ferguson (1997) point out, is never simply the recognition of cultural similarity or social contiguity but a categorical identity that is premised on various forms of exclusion and construction of otherness (13). It is through these processes of exclusion and othering that both collective and individual subjects are formed (Gupta & Ferguson 1997: 13). The processes of ethnicization of the agricultural labor market, in that sense, are not just about the numbers illustrating the increasing cluster of ethnic minorities in the sector. The processes rather inform us about the ways in which labor market itself becomes the very site of construction of differences and identities. In the case of Mexican farm workers in North Carolina, Benson (2008) states that when people look at a migrant farm worker

staying in the camp, they see someone who does not belong to the fabric of "who is here with us", someone who is excluded from what counts as community. This essentialist discourse of culture is central to portrayal of migrants as others, which in turn make them susceptible to various kinds of blame (Benson 2008: 621-2). This very interaction with migrant workers is, on the other hand, also constitutive of the community since Kurdishness of the labor camps are established in a way that also asserts the "Turkishness" and "locality" of the community outside (Duruiz 2011). Labor camps, in that sense, are functional in setting the boundaries of "normal" in social life through labeling the workers as an exception. Benson (2008) offers the concept "faciality" as an alternative to the widespread notion of invisibility of farm workers in US agriculture through pointing out the specific kind of perception of them as anonymous members of a particular group "outside" of the community. He questions the connection between this mode of active perception of workers within a set of beliefs about cultural superiority and the perpetuation and justification of structural violence on tobacco farms (Benson 2008: 620). Likewise, in Turkey, it was the increasing visibility of workers in the last decades in a certain way that helped the establishment of agricultural worker as a monolithic category that has been connected with specific cultural traits.

Third chapter was an attempt to illustrate the significant role of the state in the structure of the agricultural wage-labor processes through providing employers access to a substandard labor force, which is ensured with exceptional legislation. Turkish state has been present in and shape the agricultural labor market in many ways; not only through dual legislation and exceptional treatment of agricultural labor market, but also through police/gendarme actions as well as funding projects which directly intervene in the lives of workers and have repercussions of structural violence towards minorities. I have thus scrutinized the equal citizenship ideal of the Republic through the disadvantaged citizens having trouble in realization of their rights. The participants of this study, women agricultural workers, have historically weaker claims on land, little access to formal jobs, trade unions and institutional networks, which have been necessary tools to access social rights in Turkey. Labor legislation and also the recent regulations under SSGSS law have conferred a disadvantaged status upon atypical jobs. I offer a framework to think about the persistence of legal exceptionalism—the exceptional treatment and unproductive legislation for the agricultural labor market—together with high shares of impoverished minority groups and women in the sector, who have little access to political and institutional process and networks to ensure their social rights. The insecurity of

agricultural wage-labor processes for workers is deeply related to such political processes reproducing the double standard of labor legislation.

Fieldwork and the Discussion on Intermediation

The fieldwork reveals different patterns of agricultural work in the hinterland of Adapazarı including wages, terms of contracts, relations with employers, tasks, working periods of workers.

Three main conclusions I have derived from the case are:

1-There is an uneven access to other sectors and income yielding activities between groups of workers in the city. Adapazarı case provides signs for a handover of jobs from women living in central neighborhoods to peripheral settlements where mainly new migrants and minorities are settled. Turkish participants settled in the central neighborhoods of the city work individually, which differentiate them from their close family-neighborhood community and are not likely to transfer their job to their children who apparently utilize the better options available to work in the enlarging service sector and in the industries around the city. In contrast, community working patterns and age balance observed within Roma group and a part of Kurdish group living in the peripheral neighborhoods of the city indicate a future prospect that these groups of workers are likely to stay in the sector as agricultural workers. The process indicates to the continuity of exclusion from social rights for the majority of ethnic minority workers studied, especially Roma workers.

2-There is uneven access to agricultural jobs among groups of workers in the city. Workers living in the small peripheral settlements that are associated with ethnic groups, such as Kurdish Bağlar and Romani Karaköy neighborhoods, stated their problems stem from inadequate social networks and limited access to agricultural jobs. They want to work more in agricultural tasks. Kurdish group in the city nevertheless have more chances to benefit from a steady income provided by household men due to the availability of construction jobs. Kurdish workers also benefit from direct contact with Kurdish trader-employers who are significant worker recruiters in the region and relatively more included by established Turkish women crews in the city. Romani women on the other hand generally work with their husbands and close relatives, suffer from both exclusion (regarding signs of stigma) and limitedness of resource-rich networks to increase their employment opportunities and secure their payments.

3-Exclusion-stigma and inadequacy of networks have created a more layered work organization including multiple intermediaries between workers and employers in the case of Romani group. While Kurdish and Turkish workers in the city generally work in non-hierarchical crews that are formed exclusively by women, Romani workers tend to work within more hierarchical structures including multiple persons between them and employers. By the same stroke, they pay commissions to multiple persons. Roma workers have relatively less contact with and information about their employers; they are recruited largely by traders rather than farmer employers; they tend to work with unfamiliar intermediaries and employers to increase their employment opportunities they have a stronger tendency to seasonally migrate for agricultural jobs and to work in more variable tasks to increase their employment terms.

The fieldwork in Adapazarı thus reveals a path to understand the ways in which agricultural workers act distinctively within the local labor market. I have tried to illustrate the contexts and conditions that make different strategies significant parts of women's working lives. In Adapazarı, Roma workers tend to invest more in kin and neighborhood relationships; while Kurdish women are able to extend their networks beyond neighborhoods through wider ethnic ties with Kurdish trader-employers and relations with co-workers. Finally, Turkish workers in the Potato Wholesale Market invest relatively more in their relationships with co-workers. These strategies offer significant tools to analyze the multiple intermediary positions and various practices of intermediation within the city.

This in-depth analysis of the fragmented and multi-ethnic agricultural labor market of Adapazarı provides insights to understand the insecurity of wage-labor processes for workers and multiple dynamics of intermediation. A relation between exclusion and the tendency to work with stronger intermediary positions within the labor market is one of the findings of the case study. The more excluded the group the more they need intermediation both to secure their payment and increase job opportunities. The case also shows the centrality of managerial practices of intermediaries: organizing the labor processes such as forming crews through considering who work most efficiently together, training inexperienced workers at zero costs by strategically locating them in established teams, relocating underperforming workers through the requests of employers. Although agricultural workers are mostly labeled as unskilled laborers, teamwork, harmony, and efficiency dramatically reduce the cost of labor in certain agricultural tasks (Thomas 1992; Ortiz 2002). In reality, this so called "low-skilled" manual labor requires high levels of expertise to reduce the cost of time (Ferguson 2007: p. 22). "The collective dimension

of skill" (Thomas 1992: 97), which has usually been ignored by accounts which depict agricultural workers as unqualified/unskilled laborers—is one of the reasons of employers' preference for intermediary system to reduce costs.

In the city, other than few local women intermediaries with large networks and a few established intermediary men in the Romani community, intermediation appears to be a position that a worker can hold temporarily or permanently. The worker-intermediary/crew leader position that is widespread amongst women crews is also a precarious worker position with managerial functions and little extra gains. Legal exceptionalism relieving employers of responsibility puts them, alongside with workers, in a weaker position in the wage-labor process to ensure fair payments and conditions. I have used these insights from fieldwork, which reveal multiple dynamics and variations within intermediary positions, to scrutinize the authoritarian intermediary stereotype and the widespread notion of relating the authority of intermediaries to Eastern/Kurdish workers' culture in the mainstream literature.

In the last chapter, I have combined the data revealed by the case study, the contemporary researches on agricultural wage-labor processes in Turkey and the United States example of farm labor contractors to contribute to the discussion on intermediation in Turkey's agriculture. I have called attention to the similar contemporary example of farm labor contractors in response to arguments declaring out-datedness and cultural bases of the intermediary system. In this discussion, I have also utilized the data provided by discourse analysis in Chapter III indicating the absence of employers and togetherness of *victimization* and *othering* in the contemporary portrayals of agricultural workers; and the analysis in Chapter III illustrating the state's presence and active role in the current structure of the labor market.

My aim is to switch the focus of the literature from workers' characteristics (tradition/culture) to the structural insecurities of labor market through pointing out the importance of legal exceptionalism, the state support of intermediary system and the employers' benefits from and preference of intermediary system. This perspective is critical for scrutinizing the well-established opposition between (modernizing) state and (traditional) intermediary in the mainstream discourse through emphasizing state support for the intermediary system in the agricultural labor market. Moreover, contrary to the popular idea of victim workers who are compelled to pay for intermediaries because of their primordial ties; workers seem to have multiple and sound reasons for choosing to work with intermediaries given the short term labor demand of employers and structural

insecurities of agricultural labor market of Turkey, which put them in a vulnerable position in their relations with employers. Furthermore, migratory workers face discrimination and continuous ID checks by security forces in the migrated areas and labor camps. Given the circumstances, agricultural workers have sound reasons to prefer working with intermediaries other than cultural codes. These reasons include reliability, securing the payments, to increase job opportunities and terms of employment, the need for assistance (to reach health care, to mediate interaction with security forces in the working region) especially in the cases of seasonal migration.

A number of recent research points out variability of intermediary positions—in terms of gains, responsibilities and authority positions—within Turkey's agricultural labor market, which is also parallel to the findings of the fieldwork in Adapazarı. According to recent studies, approximately half of the workers use intermediaries to contract with employers in Turkey. Not only Turkey, but also the United States indicators have pointed at an increase of labor contractor usage of agricultural enterprises in the last few decades. The intermediary system or labor contractors are globally associated by workers' abuse and low wages. Nevertheless, abusive intermediaries/labor contractors are symptoms rather than the cause of the difficulty, which is created in the first place by political processes and legal exemptions transferring the risks of the sector on the shoulders of workers.

In the current situation, what seems to be fueling the abusive side of intermediary system in Turkey is workers' urgent need for guarantees of payment and security and an access to social rights associated to their work. The way to minimize the abuse—to limit intermediary position to managerial functions without their current significance as payment and social assistance guarantees—is to empower workers through equipping them with rights to defend themselves against employers and intermediaries and ensure that these rights are realized.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Abu-Lughod, L. (2008). *Writing Women's Worlds: Bedoin Stories*. University of California Press. Berkeley, California.

Abu-Lughod, L. (1999). *Veiled sentiments: Honor and Poetry in a Bedouin Society*. University of California Press. Berkeley, California.

Agamben, G. (1998). *Homo Sacer. Sovereign Power and Bare Life*. Stanford Universitry Press. California.

Agamben, G. (2000). *Selections. Means Without End: Notes on Politics*. Vincenzo Binetti and Cesare Casarino, trans. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Akbıyık, N. (2008). Türkiye'de Tarım Kesiminde İşgücü Piyasalarının Yapısı. *Elektronik Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 24(24).

Akbıyık, N. (2011). Malatya'da Çalışan Mevsimlik Tarım İşçilerinin Sosyal ve Ekonomik Sorunlarının İncelenmesi. *Elektronik Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 36(36).

Akgül, B. (2010). *Türkiye çingenelerinin politikleşmesi ve örgütlenme deneyimleri*. Retrieved from http://dspace.marmara.edu.tr/handle/11424/1613 (2015, October 10)

Alkan, S., & Toksoy, D. (2009). Orman Köylerinde Kadın ve Kırsal Kalkınma (Trabzon İli Örneği). *II. Ormancılıkta Sosyo-konomik Sorunlar Kongresi*, 99-107.

Arslan, D. A. (2003). Bir Köy Sosyolojisi Çalışması: Kavaközü Köyü'nün Sosyo-Ekonomik Yapısı ve Sorunları. *Eskişehir Osmangazi Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 4(1).

Avcı, i. (2005, June 15) Simsarlar yevmiyesi 6 liradan çocuk işçi topluyor. *Zaman*. Retrieved from http://www.zaman.com.tr

Bakır, O. (2015). Tarımsal İstihdama Dair Temel Veriler ve Güncel Eğilimler. *Mesleki Sağlık ve Güvenlik Dergisi* (MSG), 11(39)

Barth, F. (ed.) (1998). *Ethnic Groups and Boundaries: The Social Organization of Culture Difference*. Waveland Press.

Bayraktar, B. (1997). Adapazarı'nda Göçler, In *Dünden Bugüne Adapzarı Sempozyumu*. (Haz.) Bilal Eryılmaz & Eyüp Sabri Kala. Sakarya Üniversitesi Basımevi.

Becker, Howard S. (2013 [1986]). *Sosyal Bilimcilerin Yazma Çilesi Yazımın Sosyal Organizasyonu Kuramı*, Şerife Geniş (çev.). Heretik: Ankara

Benson, P. (2008). El Campo: Faciality and Structural Violence in Farm Labor Camps. *Cultural Anthropology*, 23(4), 589-629.

Benson, P. (2011). *Tobacco Capitalism: Growers, Migrant Workers, and the Changing Face of a Global Industry*. Princeton University Press.

Berber, M. & Yılmaz Eser B. (2008) Türkiye'de Kadın İstihdamı: Ülke ve Bölge Düzeyinde Sektörel Analiz, "İş, Güç" *The Journal of Industrial Relations and Human Resources*, Vol: 10 No: 2, April 2008.

Beşpınar, F. U. (2010). Questioning Agency and Empowerment: Women's Work-related Strategies and Social Class in Urban Turkey. *In Women's Studies International Forum*, Vol. 33, No. 6, 523-532

Bonacich, E. (1972). A Theory of Ethnic Antagonism: The Split Labor Market. *American Sociological Review*, 547-559.

Boratav, Korkut. (2004). *Tarımsal Yapılar ve Kapitalizm*. Ankara: İmge Kitabevi Yayınları

Bourdieu, P., & Wacquant, L. J. (1992). *An Invitation to Reflexive Sociology*. University of Chicago Press.

Bromley, R. (1978). *The Urban Informal Sector: Why is it Worth Discussing? World Development*, 6(9), 1033-1039.

Bruinessen, M. V. (2002). Kurds, States and Tribes. In Faleh A. Jabar and Hosham Dawod (eds.), *Tribes and Power: Nationalism and Ethnicity in the Middle East*. London: Saqi

Bruinessen, M. V. (2003). *Ağa, Şeyh, Devlet*. İletişim Yayınları, İstanbul.

Buğra, A. and Keyder, Ç. (2005). *Poverty and Social Policy in Contemporary Turkey*. Boğaziçi University Social Policy Forum. Istanbul

Buğra, A., & Keyder, Ç. (2003). New Poverty and the Changing Welfare Regime of Turkey, *Report Prepared for the UNDP*. Ajans Turk AS. Ankara

Bury, J. B., & Bury, J. B. (1987). The idea of Progress: An Inquiry into Its Origin and Growth. Courier Corporation.

Çağlayan, H., Özar, Ş., & Doğan, A. T. (2011). *Ne değişti? Kürt Kadınların Zorunlu Göç deneyimleri.* Ayizi Yayınevi

Çakır, Ö. (2008). Türkiye'de Kadının Çalışma Yaşamından Dışlanması. *Erciyes Üniversitesi İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Fakültesi Dergisi*, (31), 25-47.

Candan E., Özalp Günal S., (2013) Tarimda Kadin Emeği, *Tarım Ekonomisi Dergisi*, 19(1): 93-101

Castles, S. (2000). "Underclass or Exclusion: Social Citizenship for Ethnic Minorities" in Vasta, E. (ed.) *Citizenship, Community and Democracy*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan

Çetinkaya, Özgür. (2008). *Farm Labor Intermediaries in Seasonal Agricultural Work in Adana-Çukurova*. Masters Thesis, METU

Çınar, S. (2014, June 16) *Türkiye'de Mevsimlik Tarım İşçilerine Dair Kısa bir Değerlendirme*. Retrieved from http: //www.tr.boell.org

Çınar, S. (2014) *Öteki Proleterya Deproletarizasyon ve Mevsimlik Tarım İşçileri*. Notabene Yayınları: Ankara

Çınar, S., & Lordoğlu, K. (2010). Mevsimlik Tarım İşçiliğinde Tekil Bir Analiz: Karasu Fındık Toplama. *TTB Mesleki Sağlık ve Güvenlik Dergisi*, 38, 23-33.

Clay, C. (1998). Labour Migration and Economic Conditions in Nineteenth-Century Anatolia. *Middle Eastern Studies*, 34(4), 1-32.

Demir, M. (2015). Mevsimlik Tarım İşçilerinin Sosyal Güvenlik Haklarına İlişkin Değerlendirmeler ve Öneriler. *Çalışma ve Toplum*, 44(1).

Diler, M. (2008). *The Survivors: Roma University Students in Turkey* Doctoral dissertation, METU.

Dixon, R. (1983). Land, labour, and the sex composition of the agricultural labour force: an international comparison. *Development and Change*, 14(3), 347-372.

Dündar, F. (2001). *İttihat ve Terakki'nin Müslümanları İskân Politikası, 1913-1918.* İletişim Yayınları

Dündar, F. (2008). *Modern Türkiye'nin şifresi: İttihat ve Terakki'nin Etnisite Mühendisliği*, 1913-1918. İletişim.

Durand, J., M., D. S., & Charvet, F. (2000). The Changing Geography of Mexican Immigration to the United States: 1910-1996. *Social Science Quarterly*, 1-15.

Duruiz, D. (2009) Söke Ovası'nda Kimlik Müzakareleri, "Batılı" Çiftçiler, "Doğulu" İşçiler. *Birikim* (247)

Duruiz, D. (2011). *Seasonal Agricultural Workers in Manisa: Materialization of Labor, Bodies and Places Through Everyday Encounters*. Masters Thesis, Boğaziçi Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü.

Düzenli, T. (2006). *Adapazarı ve Civarında Çerkes Muhacirlerinin İskanı ve Uyum Problemleri*, Yüksek Lisans Tezi. Sakarya Üniversitesi

Ecevit, M. (1994). Tarımda Kadının Toplumsal Konumu: Bazı Kavramsal İlişkiler. *Amme İdaresi Dergisi*, 27(2), 89-96.

Edecin, N. (2007) *Sakarya'da Nüfus Hareketleri*, Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Sakarya Nüversitesi

EDROM/ERRC/HYD. (2008). *Biz Buradayız! Türkiye'de Romanlar, Ayrımcı Uygulamalar ve Hak Mücadelesi.* İstanbul.

Eken, M. (1997). Dünden Bugüne Adapzarı Sempozyumu. Yayına Hazırlayan Bilal Eryılmaz & Eyüp Sabri Kala. Sakarya Universitesi Basımevi.

Emirbayer, M. (1997). Manifesto for a Relational Sociology 1. *American Journal of Sociology*, 103(2), 281-317.

Emirbayer, M., & Mische, A. (1998). What is Agency? 1. *American Journal of Sociology*, 103(4), 962-1023.

Erdoğan, G. (2010) Mevsimlik Gezici Tarım İşçilerinin Çalışma ve Sosyal Hayatlarının İyileştirlmesi Projesi (METİP) *İş Sağlığı ve Güvenliği Dergisi* Yıl: 10 sayı: 48

Erkul, İ. (1967). *Türkiye'de Ziraat İşçileri ve Bunlara İlişkin Çalışma Hukuku*, Eskişehir İktisadi ve Ticari İlimler Akademisi Yayınları

Fassin, D. (2005). Compassion and repression: the moral economy of immigration policies in France. *Cultural Anthropology*, 20(3), 362-387.

Ferguson, N. (2007). [*E]motions, Moments, and Transnational Connections: The Lived Experiences of Two Labour Migrants in Canada's Seasonal Agricultural Workers' Program.* Doctoral dissertation, Concordia University.

Friedland, W. H. & Thomas, R. J., (1982). The United Farm Workers Union: From Mobilization to Mechanization, *Center for Research on Social Organization (CRSO) Working Paper*.

Friedland, W. H., & Thomas, R. J. (1974). Paradoxes of Agricultural Unionism in California. *Society*, 11(4), 54-62.

Geçgin, Ercan. (2009). *Ankara-Polatlı Örneğinde ve Sosyal Dışlanma Açısından Mevsimlik Tarım İşçiliği*. YL. Tezi. Ankara Üniversitesi DTCF-Sosyoloji Bölümü

Gökalp, Deniz. (2007). *Beyond Ethnopolitical Contention: The State, Citizenship and Violence in the 'New' Kurdish Question in Turkey*, Doctoral Dissertation. The University of Texas at Austin.

Gönen, Z, and Deniz Y. (2011) "Legitimizing violence and segregation: Neoliberal discourses on crime and criminalization of urban poor populations in Turkey." Bourke, A., Dafnos, T. and Kip, M. (eds.), *Lumpencity: Discourses of Marginality, Marginalizing Discourses*, Ottowa: Red Quill Books, 75-103.

Görücü, İ., & Akbıyık, N. (2010). Türkiye'de Mevsimlik Tarım İşçiliği: Sorunları ve Çözüm Önerileri. Düşünce-Yorum *Sosyal Bilimler Araştırma Dergisi*, 3(5), 189-219.

Gözel, O. (2007). *The Implementation of the Ottoman Land Code of 1858 in Eastern Anatolia*. Doctoral dissertation, METU

Gülalp, Haldun. (2007). *Vatandaşlık ve Etnik Çatışma: Ulus Devletin Sorgulanması.* Metis Yayınları

Gülçubuk B., Karabıyık E., Tanır F. (2003), *Baseline Survey on Worst Forms of Child Labour in the Agricultural Sector: Children in Cotton Harvesting in Karataş*, Adana. Retrieved from http://www.ilo.org (2011).

Gülçubuk, B. (2012). Tarımda Çocuk Emeği Sömürüsü ve Toplumsal Duyarlılık. *Çalışma ve Toplum Dergisi*, (33).

Gümüş, Adnan. (2005). "Çukurova'nın Ötekileri", *Tiroj*, Mayıs-Harizan

Gündüz-Hoşgör, A., & Smits, J. (2006). The Status of Rural Women in Turkey What is the Role of Regional Differences? *NiCE Working Paper* 06-101 March 2006

Gündüz-Hoşgör, A., & Smits, J. (2008, April). Variation in labor market participation of married women in Turkey. In *Women's Studies International Forum* (Vol. 31, No. 2, pp. 104-117). Pergamon.

Güneç, S. (2008, May 4) Sakarya'ya Sosyolojik İnceleme. *Zaman*. Retrieved from zaman.com.tr

Gupta, A and Ferguson, J. (Ed.). (1997). *Culture, Power, Place: Explorations in Critical Anthropology.* Duke University press.

Gürsoy, Ö. B. (2010). Bir Yaşam Biçimi Olarak Sosyal Dışlanma: Türkiye'de Mevsimlik Tarım İşçileri, In *Sınıftan Sınıfa*. Ayşe Buğra (ed.), İletişim Yayınları, 33-65.

Hanioğlu, M. Ş. (2008). The Second Constitutional Period, 1908–1918. In *The Cambridge History of Turkey* (ed.) Reşat Kasaba. 4, 62-111.

Hann, C, Hann I. B. (2001). "Rize'de Çay Üreticileri". *Toplum ve Bilim*. No. 88

Harding, S. G. (1986). *The Science Question in Feminism*. Cornell University Press.

Harper, D. J. (1996). Accounting for Poverty: From Attribution to Discourse. *Journal of Community & Applied Social Psychology*. 6(4), 249-265.

Hattatoğlu, D. (2001a). Ev Eksenli Çalışma Stratejileri. In *Yerli Bir Feminizme Doğru*, Akgökçe N., İlyasoğlu A. (ed.),173-205.

Hattatoğlu, D. (2001b). *Evde Çalışan Kadınlar arası Dayanışma ve Örgütlenme*. Doktora Tezi. İstanbul Üniversitesi.

İçduygu, A., Romano, D., & Sirkeci, İ. (1999). The ethnic question in an environment of insecurity: the Kurds in Turkey. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 22(6), 991-1010.

İçduygu, A., Sirkeci, İ., & Aydingun, I. (1998). Türkiye'de İçgöç ve İçgöçün İşçi Hareketine Etkisi. In *Türkiye'de İç Göç*. Türkiye Ekonomik ve Toplumsal Tarih Vakfı. 125-151.

İHD. (2008). *Ordu Griesun ve Sakarya'da Mevsimlik Fındık İşçileri ile İlgili Araştırma ve İnceleme Raporu*. Retrieved from: www.ihd.org.tr

Ilcan, S. M. (1994). Peasant struggles and social change: migration, households and gender in a rural Turkish society. *International Migration Review*. Pp. 554-579.

İlkkaracan, İ. (2012). Why so few Women in the Labor Market in Turkey? *Feminist Economics*, 18(1), 1-37.

Işık, Ş. (2007). *Sakarya'nın Tarım Coğrafyası*. Yüksek Lisans Tezi. Sakarya Üniversitesi

İskender, H. Ü. (2001). *Bir Tarımsal Ürün Olarak Olarak Fındığın Toplumsal Yapı Üzerindeki Etkileri (Karasu Örneği*). Yüksek Lisans Tezi. Sakarya Üniversitesi.

Kaleci, H. (2007). *Mevsimlik Tarım İşçilerinin Sosyolojik Analizi: Eskişehir Örneği,* YL. Tezi. Anadolu Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimsel Enstitüsü

Kalkınma Atölyesi (2012) *Model Action Plan for Children Working in Sugarbeet Cultivation in Turkey*. Retrieved from: http://www.kalkinmaatolyesi.org

Karacan, S. (2011). Geçici İşçilik, Kalıcı Yoksulluk: Mevsimlik İşçiler, *Hariciye*, Mart 2011 pp. 64-8

Karadeniz, O. (2011). Türkiye'de Atipik Çalışan Kadınlar ve Yaygın Sosyal Güvencesizlik. *Çalışma ve Toplum*, 2(29), 84-127.

Karadeniz, O. (2012). Extension of Health Services Coverage for Needy in Turkey: From Social Assistance to General Health Insurance. *Journal of Social Security*, 2, 103-23.

Kaya, A. (2009). *Türkiye'de İç Göçler: Bütünleşme mi, Geri Dönüş mü? İstanbul, Diyarbakır ve Mersin örnekleri* (Vol. 246). İstanbul Bilgi Üniversitesi.

Kaya, Y. (2015). İskan ve Toprak Dağıtımı Politikaları Işığında Çiftçiyi Topraklandırma Kanunu. *Journal of Life Economics*. Retrieved from http://www.jlecon.com

Kazgan, G., (1963). Ziraat İşçilerinin Sendikalaşması, *Sosyal Siyaset Konferansı*, Ondördüncü Kitap (Istanbul): 47-66.

Keyder, Ç. (1983). Paths of Rural Transformation in Turkey. *The Journal of Peasant Studies*, 11(1), 34-49.

Keyder, C. (1989). Social Structure and the Labour Market in Turkish Agriculture. *International Labor Review*.

Keyder, Ç., & Yenal, Z. (2011). Agrarian Change under Globalization: Markets and Insecurity in Turkish Agriculture. *Journal of Agrarian Change*, 11(1), 60-86.

Keyman, E. F., & İçduygu, A. (2003). Globalization, Civil Society and Citizenship in Turkey: Actors, Boundaries and Discourses. *Citizenship Studies*, 7(2), 219-234.

Kirişci, K., & Winrow, G. M. (1997). *The Kurdish Question and Turkey: An Example of a Trans-state Ethnic Conflict*. Psychology Press.

Kılıç, Ş., Yücel, M., & İnceoğlu, M. (1992). *Biz ve onlar: Türkiye'de Etnik Ayrımcılık:* araştırma-röportaj (Vol. 5). Metis Yayınları.

Kıray, M. (1999). Sosyo-Ekonomik Hayatın Değişen Düzeni: Dört Köyün Monografik Karşılaştırılması. In *75. Yılda Köyden Şehirlere* Oya Baydar (ed.), pp. 214-229

Koçak, O., & Çakmak, Y. Z. (2011). Pazarcılık Sektörünün Enformel Boyutu Üzerine Bir Araştırma: Yalova Örneği. *Sosyal Siyaset Konferansları Dergisi*, (60), 223-258.

Koruk, İ. (2010). İhmal Edilen Bir Grup: Göçebe Mevsimlik Tarım İşçileri. *TTB Mesleki Sağlık ve Güvenlik Dergisi*. 38/2010 pp: 18-22

Kosegi, A. S. (2001). H-2A Program: How the Weight of Agricultural Employer Subsidies is Breaking the Backs of Domestic Migrant Farm Workers, *The. Ind. L. Rev.,* 35, 269.

Küçükkırca, İ., A. (2012). Etnisite, Toplumsal Cinsiyet ve Sınıf Ekseninde Mevsimlik Kürt Tarım İşçileri. *Toplum ve Kuram*, 6, 1-16.

Laclau, E., Mouffe, C., (2008). *Hegemonya ve Sosyalist Strateji: Radikal Demokratik bir Politikaya Doğru*. İletişim Yayınları.

Lindisfarne, N. (2000). *Dancing in Damascus: Stories*. SUNY Press.

Lordoğlu K., & Çınar S., (2011) "Mevsimlik Tarım İşçileri: Marabadan ÜcretliFındık İşçiliğine", In *Sosyal Haklar Uluslararası Sempozyumu III Bildiri Kitabı*, Petrol İş Yayını 116, İstanbul, pp. 419-448.

Lordoğlu, K., & Etiler, N. (2014). "Batı Karadeniz Bölgesinde Mevsimlik Gezici Tarım İşçiliğinde Çalışan Çocuklar Üzerine Sınırlı Bir Araştırma". *Çalışma ve Toplum*, 41(2).

Luna, G. T. (1997). Infinite Distance: Agricultural Exceptionalism and Agricultural Labor, *An. U. Pa. J. Lab. & Emp. L.*, 1, 487.

Lyon, B. (2005). Farm workers in Illinois: Law reforms and opportunities for the legal academy to assist some of the state's most disadvantaged workers. *S. Ill. ULJ*, 29, 263.

Makal, A. (2001). Türkiye'de 1950-1965 Döneminde Tarım Kesiminde İşgücü ve Ücretli Emeğe İlişkin Gelişmeler. *Ankara Üniversitesi SBF Dergisi*, 56(03).

Maldonado, M. M. (2009). 'It is their nature to do menial labour': the racialization of 'Latino/a workers' by agricultural employers. Ethnic and Racial studies, 32(6), 1017-1036.

Mango, Andrew (2008) Atatürk. In Kasaba, R. (Ed.). *Turkey in the Modern World.* Cambridge University Press. 147-172

Marsh, A. "Etnisite ve Kimlik: Çingenelerin Kökeni", In *Biz Buradayız: Türkiye'de Romanlar, Ayrımcı Uygulamalar ve Hak Mücadelesi*, (Eds.) Ebru Uzpeder, Sinan Gökçen, Mart Matbaacılık, İstanbul, 2008,19-27.

Marshall, T. H. (2000). Citizenship and Social Class. *The Welfare State Reader*, 32-41.

Martin, P. (2002). Guest Workers: New Solution, New Problem?, *Pew Hispanic Cente*r.

Martin, P. L. (1985). Migrant Labor in Agriculture: An International Comparison. *The International Migration Review*, 19(1), 135-143.

Mazlumder. (2008). *"Sakarya (Kocaali ve Karasu) Mevsimlik Tarım İşçilerinin Sorunları Raporu"* Retrieved from http://www.mazlumder.org

McDaniel, J., & Casanova, V. (2003). Pines in Lines: Tree Planting, H2B Guest Workers, and Rural Poverty in Alabama. *Southern Rural Sociology*, 19(1), 73-96.

Meçin, M. (2004). *The Question of Urban Integration and Forced Migration from East and Southeast Anatolian Regions after 1980: The Case of Mersin.* Doctoral dissertation. METU

Milli Prodüktivite Merkezi. (1982). *Tarım ve Orman İşçilerinin sorunlarına İlişkin Çözüm Önerileri.* Ankara

Mutlu, S. (1996). Ethnic Kurds in Turkey: A demographic study. *International Journal of Middle East Studies*, 28(04), 517-541.

Mutlu, Y. (2009). *Turkey's Experience of Forced Migration after 1980s and Social Integration: A Comparative Analysis of Diyarbakır and Istanbul*. Master Thesis. Middle East Technical University.

Nacar, C. (2014). Labor Activism and the State in the Ottoman Tobacco Industry. *International Journal of Middle East Studies*, 46(03), 533-551.

Narin, R. (2007) *19. Yüzyılda Adapazarı'nda Yabancıların Ekonomik ve Sosyal Yaşama Etkileri*, Yayımlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Sakarya Üniversitesi

Narin, R. (2009) Duyun-u Umumiye İdaresi ve Adapazı. *Karadeniz Araştırmaları*. 21/2009, 45-59

Narin, R. (2014) *Ada'dan Pazar'a Sakarya*. Sakarya Ticaret ve Sanayi Odası Yayınları

Ministry of Labour and Social Security General Directorate of Labour (2014, November). National Employment Strategy 2014-2023, Retrieved from http://www.uis.gov.tr

Öğünç, P. (2014) Oğlum, Kızım Neden Bu Toprakları Bırakıp Gidiyorsunuz, *Birikim*, 2.12.2014, Retrieved from http://www.birikimdergisi.com/haftalik/oglum-kizim-neden-bu-topraklari-birakip-gidiyorsunuz

Okçuoğlu, İ. (1999). *Türkiye'de Kapitalizmin Gelişmesi/İç Pazarın Oluşma Süreci.* Ceylan Yayıncılık: İstanbul

Önder, Ö. (2013). *New Forms of Discrimination and Exclusion: Gadjofication of Romani Communities in Turkey*. Doctoral Dissertation. METU: Turkey

Önen, S. (2012). Mevsimlik Tarım İşçiliği ve Çingeneler. *Sosyal ve Beşeri Bilimler Dergisi*, 4(2).

Önen, S. (2013). Citizenship Rights of Gypsies in Turkey: Roma and Dom Communities. *Middle Eastern Studies*, 49(4), 608-622.

Ong, A. (2005). (Re) articulations of citizenship. *Political Science and Politics*, 38(04), 697-699.

Ong, A. (2010). *Spirits of Resistance and Capitalist Discipline: Factory women in Malaysia*. Suny Press.

Ortiz, S. (2002). Laboring in the Factories and in the Fields. *Annual Review of Anthropology*, 395-417.

Öz, M. (2000). Tahrir defterlerindeki sayısal veriler. *Osmanlı Devleti'nde Bilgi ve İstatistik*. Retrieved from http://yunus.hacettepe.edu.tr/~mehoz

Özbek, A. (2007). *New Actors of New Poverty: The Other Children of Çukurova*. Yayınlanmamış YL. Tezi. METU

Özbekmezci, Ş. & Sahil S. (2004) Mevsimlik Tarım İşçilerinin Sosyal, Ekonomik ve Barınma Sorunlarının Analizi, *Gazi Üniv. Müh. Mim. Fak. Der*., 19:3, 2004, 261-274.

Özuğurlu, M. (2011). *Küçük Köylülüğe Sermaye Kapanı. Türkiye'de Tarım Çalışmaları ve Köylülük Üzerine Gözlemler*. Nota Bene Yayınları. Ankara.

Pamuk, S., (2008). Economic Change in Twentieth-century Turkey: is the Glass more than Half Full. In Kasaba, R. (Ed.) *Turkey in the Modern World*. Cambridge University Press. pp. 266-300

Pascale, C. M. (2013). *Making Sense of Race, Class, and Gender: Commonsense, Power, and Privilege in the United States.* Routledge.

Pelek, D. (2010). *Seasonal Migrant Workers in Agriculture: The Cases of Ordu and Polatlı.* Boğaziçi University Ataturk Institute for Modern Turkish History, Master Thesis, Istanbul

Pinarcioğlu, M., & Işik, O. (2008). Not Only Helpless but also Hopeless: Changing Dynamics of Urban Poverty in Turkey, the Case of Sultanbeyli, Istanbul. *European Planning Studies*, 16(10), 1353-1370.

Polopolus, L. C., & Emerson, R. D. (1991). Entrepreneurship, Sanctions, and Labor Contracting. *Journal of Agricultural and Applied Economics*, 23(1), 57.

Purdie-Vaughns, V., & Eibach, R. P. (2008). Intersectional invisibility: The distinctive advantages and disadvantages of multiple subordinate-group identities. *Sex Roles*, 59(5-6), 377-391.

Redfield, P. 2005. Doctors, Borders, and Life in Crisis. *Cultural Anthropology* 20(3). pp. 328-361.

Rosaldo, R. (1988). Ideology, Place, and People Without Culture. *Cultural Anthropology*, 3(1), pp. 77-87.

Saka, B. (2010). *Türkiye'de Devlet-Köylü İlişkisinin Değişim Dönüşüm Süreçleri,* Yayımlanmamış Yüksel Lisans Tezi, Ankara Üniversitesi Siyasal Bilgiler Fakültesi

Saraçoğlu, C. (2009). Exclusive Recognition: The New Dimensions of the Question of Ethnicity and Nationalism in Turkey. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 32(4), 640-658.

Saraçoglu, C. (2010). *Kurds of Modern Turkey: Migration, Neoliberalism and Exclusion in Turkish society* (Vol. 95). IB Tauris.

Saraçoğlu, C. (2011). *Şehir, Orta Sınıf ve Kürtler*. İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları.

Şeker, M. (1986). *Türkiye'de Tarım İşçilerinin Toplumsal Bütünleşmesi*. Değişim Yayınları.

Şeker, M. (1987). *Güneydoğu Anadolu Projesi: Sosyal ve Ekonomik Sorunlar*. Vyayınları: Ankara

Şekerci, F. (2004). *Türkiye'de 1980 sonrası Tarım Sektörünün Yapısal Analizi ve Sakarya Örneği*. Yayımlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi. Sakarya Üniversitesi

Selvi, H. (2005). II. Meşrutiyet Dönemi'nde Adapazarı ve Çevresi (1908-1918). In *Sakarya İli Tarihi*, Mustafa Demir (ed.) 1, 449-496.

Sharpe, J., & Spivak, G. C. (2014). A conversation with Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak: Politics and the imagination. *Signs*, 40(1).

Şirin, F. S. (2013). Türk Aydınının Anadolu'ya Yönelişinde Balkan Savaşları'nın Rolü. *Tarih İncelemeleri Dergisi*, 28(2), 523-548.

Sirkeci, İ. (2000). Exploring the Kurdish population in the Turkish context. *Genus*, 149-175.

Sirman, A. N. (1988). *Peasants and Family Farms: the Position of Households in Cotton Production in a Village of Western Turkey*. Doctoral dissertation, University of London.

Sirman, N. (1988b), Pamuk Üretiminde Aile İşletmeleri, in *Türkiye'de Tarımsal Yapılar 1923-2000*, Sevket Pamuk and Zafer Toprak (eds.), Ankara: Yurt Yayınevi

Sirman, N. (2001). Sosyal Bilimlerde Gelişmecilik ve Köy Çalışmaları. *Toplum ve Bilim,* 88, 251-255.

Sönmez, A. (2001). Fındık Üretiminde Toprak Ağalığı ve Kırsal Dönüşüm. *Toplum ve Bilim.* 88.

Soytemel, E. (2013, December). The Power of the Powerless: Neighbourhood based self-help Networks of the Poor in Istanbul. In *Women's Studies International Forum* (Vol. 41, 76-87). Pergamon.

Staples, J. (2007). *Livelihoods at the Margins: Surviving the City*. Left Coast Press.

Şimşek, Z. (2011) (haz.) *Mevsimlik Tarım İşçilerinin ve Ailelerinin İhtiyaçlarının Belirlenmesi Araştırması.* Nüfus/Tarım İşgücü Göçü/Yaşam Koşulları/Üreme Harran Üniversitesi Tıp Fakültesi Halk Sağlığı Anabilim Dalı ve Birleşmiş Milletler Nüfus Fonu, Ankara.

T.C. Çalışma ve Sosyal Güvenlik Bakanlığı (2014) Türkiye Tarafından İmzalanan ILO Sözleşmeleri, (Haz.) Fazıl Aydın. Yayın No: 08 Ankara, 2014

T.C. Sakarya Valiliği (2015). *İl Brifingi*. Sakarya

Tarım–İş, (1992). *Türkiye'de Tarım ve Orman İşçilerinin Yasal Sorunları Sempozyumu*. Tarım-İş Yayınları, Ankara.

Tartan, A. (2012, April 7) Küçük Osmanlı Sakarya. *Hürriyet*. Retrieved from http://www.hurriyet.com.tr

Taşkan, S. (2007). *The Experiences of Urban Poverty among Recent Immigrants in Ankara: Social Exclusion or not?* Unpublished Master Thesis, Middle East Technical University

TBMM (2015) Mevsimlik Tarım İşçilerinin Sorunlarının Araştırılarak Alınması Gereken Önlemlerin Belirlenmesi Amacıyla Kurulan Meclis Araştırma Komisyonu Raporu. TBMM, Ankara

Teoman, Ö. (2001) Türkiye Tarımında Kapitalist Dönüşüm Tartışmalarına Bir Katkı, G. Ü. İ.İ.B.F. Dergisi, 3/2001, 41-60

Thilmany, D., & Martin, P. L. (1995). Farm Labor Contractors: Playing New Roles in California Agriculture. *California Agriculture*, 37-40.

Thomas, R. J. (1992). *Citizenship, Gender, and Work: Social organization of Industrial Agriculture*. Univ of California Press.

Tilly, C. (1999). *Durable inequality*. Univ of California Press.

Tuna, F. (2009, May 6) Adapazarı Kız-Erkek Mektebi (1913), *Medyabar,* Retrieved from medyabar.com

Tuna, F. (2010, January 13) Son Osmanlı Şehri: Adapazarı. *Medyabar* Retrieved from www.medyabar.com

Türkyılmaz, U. (2008, May 4) Sakarya'ya Sosyolojik İnceleme. *Akşam*. Retrieved from tumgazeteler.com

Ufuk, C. (2008) *Adapazarı Ovası'nda Sanayinin Yer Seçimi Üzerinde Etkili olan faktörler ve Sanayinin Dağılımı*. Yüksek Lisans Tezi. Sakarya Üniversitesi

Ulukan U. & Ulukan N. C. (2011) “Fındık Üretiminde Çalışma İlişkileri ve Mevsimlik İşçiler: Perşembe Örneği”, In *2000'li Yıllarda Türkiye'de İktisat ve Siyaset Rüzgarları*, Gamze Yücesan Özdemir et al. (eds). , Efil Yayınevi

Üstel, F. (2004). *Makbul Vatandaşın. Peşinde: II. Meşrutiyetten Bugüne Vatandaşlık*. İletişim Yayınları. İstanbul.

Uzun, E. (2015). Kürt Fındık İşçileri: Bir Karşılaşma Mekânı Olarak Akçakoca. *Moment Dergi*, 2(1).

Verduzco, C. (2010). *A Case Study on Contracted Seasonal Workers and Farm Labor Contractors in the Stockton Area.* Master Thesis. California Polytechnic State University

Wacquant, L. (1989). The Puzzle of Race and Class in American Society and Social Science. *Benjamin E. Mays Monograph Series*, 2(1), 7-20.

White, J. B. (2004). *Money Makes Us Relatives: Women's Labor in Urban Turkey*. Psychology Press.

Yeğen, M. (1996). The Turkish State Discourse and the Exclusion of Kurdish Identity. *Middle Eastern Studies*, 32(2), 216–229.

Yeğen, M. (1999). The Kurdish Question in Turkish State Discourse. *Journal of Contemporary History*, 34(4), 555–568.

Yeğen, M. (2007). Turkish Nationalism and the Kurdish Question. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 30(1), 119–151.

Yeğen, Mesut. (2004) “Citizenship and Ethnicity in Turkey,” *Middle Eastern Studies,* Vol. 40, No. 6

Yıldırak, N., Gülçubuk, B., Gün, S., Olhan, E., & Kılıç, M. (2003). *Türkiye’de Gezici ve Geçici Tarım İşçilerinin Çalışma Ve Yaşam Koşulları ve Sorunları*. Ankara: Tarım-İş Sendikası Yayınları

Yıldırım, E. (1997) Anadolu Sendikacılığının Gelişimi Sakarya Örneği, In *Dünden Bugüne Adapazarı Sempozyumu*. (Haz.) Bilal Eryılmaz & Eyüp Sabri Kala. Sakarya Universitesi Basımevi.

Yıldırım, U. D. (2015) *Türkiye Tarımında Yapısal Dönüşüm ve Mevsimlik Tarım İşçileri: Sakarya Örneğ*i. Sav Yayınları: İstanbul

Yörük, E. (2009, December 22) Zorunlu Göç ve Türkiye’de Neoliberalizm. *Bianet.* Retrieved from http://www.bianet.org

Yüce, S. N.(2015, December 21). Mecliste X ile Sansürlenen Roman Vekil Konuştu. *Sol* Retrieved from www. sol.org.tr

Yükseker, D. (2006). “Yerinden Edilme ve Sosyal Dışlanma: İstanbul veDiyarbakır’da Zorunlu Göç Mağdurlarının Yaşadıkları Sorunlar”, In *Zorunlu Göç İle Yüzleşme: Türkiye’de Yerinden Edilme Sonrası Vatandaşlığın İnşası*. Derya Demirler, Mert Kayhan (eds.), İstanbul: TESEV Yayınları, 216-233.

Zizek, S. (1997). Multiculturalism, or, the Cultural Logic of Multinational Capitalism. *New Left Review*, 28-51.

Zurcher, E. J. (2004). *Turkey: A Modern History*. IB Tauris.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A: INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

Personal Information

1 Age 2 Sex

3 Place of Living 4 Place of Birth

5 Education 6 Literacy 01 Yes 02 No

7 Marital Status

Family Information

8 Household Type

9 Household Population: … Adults … Children

10. Household members with formal/insured jobs: … Occupations: ...

11. Household members with insecure/temporary jobs: … Occupations: …

12 Household members – self-employed: … Occupations:

13 Household Members – who are not working now:

01 Student 02 Housekeeper 03 Retired 04 Temporary worker/unemployed now

05 Sick/Disabled 06 Military Service 07 Unemployed 08 Other

14 Owner of the House:

15 Who provides household income?

Self /Siblings/Spouse/Mother/Father/In-laws/Other…

16 Her contribution to household income:

17 Social Security:

18 Migration History of the Family: Where? When? Why?

19 Agricultural Landownership in the Family

20. Family Occupation/Craftsmanship

Work Experience

21 Started working at the age of … Occupation … Hiring Process: …

22 Started working in agriculture at the age of … Occupation … Hiring Process …

23 Works …. days a week.

24 Works … months in a year.

25 Crops: Tasks:

26 Average Daily Wage

27 Relations with co-workers

28 Organization of Work in Details (Hiring – Employer – Intermediary – Wages – Crew –Conditions – Transportation – Lunch/Water – Payment)

29 Crew/Intermediary Relations Hiring Process:

30 Migration for Work: Seasonal/Daily/No

31 Intermediaries (Women/Men/Ages/Acquaintance)

32 Social ties with the intermediary(ies): Neighbor/ Family member/ Friend/ From the same ethnic group/Other ...

33 Responsibilities and earnings of intermediary(ies)

34 Feelings and concerns about intermediary

35 Employers (Landowner/Trader) Hiring Process:

36 Permanent or changing employers

37 Is there any work contract signed between you and employer?

38 Social ties with employer(s)

39 If there is a problem with employer/intermediary, how do you solve this problem?

40 Work-related Health Problems

41. Work-Related Strategies:

42. Future Expectations

APPENDIX B: CURRICULUM VITAE

PERSONAL INFORMATION

Surname, Name: Mura, Elif Sabahat
Nationality: Turkish (TC)
Date and Place of Birth: 1981, August 12 / Sakarya
Marital Status: Married
Phone: +90 312 210 31 35
email: elifuyars@gmail.com

EDUCATION

Degree	Institution	Year of Graduation
MS	METU Political Science and Public Administration	2007
BS	METU Political Science and Public Administration	2004
High School	Sakarya Anadolu High School, Sakarya	1999

WORK EXPERIENCE

Year	Place	Enrollment
2007- Present	METU Sociology	Research Assistant

APPENDIX C: TURKISH SUMMARY

Bu çalışma, Adapazarı'nda yaşayan tarım işçilerinin ücretli emek süreçlerini belgeler ve bu süreçlerin bir parçası olan aracılığa ilişkisel bir perspektifle yaklaşmayı önerir. Araştırma, aracılık pratiğinin dinamiklerinden biri olarak, Adapazarı'nda işçilerin ücretlerini garantiye almak ve iş olanaklarını genişletmek için sosyal ağları kullanma ve genişletme stratejilerine odaklanmıştır. İşçi failliğine odaklanan saha çalışmasının hedefi işçileri kurbanlaştıran-nesneleştiren genel-geçer söyleme ve ötekileştiren aracı steryotipine alternatif bir bakış açısı geliştirmektir. Tez, aracılık pratiğini işçilerin kültürü ve/veya gelenekleriyle ilişkilendiren anlayışa alternatif olarak, tarımda ücretli emek süreçlerinin analizinde işçi failliğine, iş ilişkisinin gerçekleştiği özgül bağlama, işverenin sorumluluğuna ve işçiler için yasal güvencesizliği yaratan politik süreçlerin rolüne dikkat çekmeyi amaçlar.

Adapazarı'nda gerçekleştirilen saha çalışmasının sağladığı veriler ile steryotipik tarım aracısı imgesi arasındaki farkı sorunsallaştıran araştırma, tarım işçileri üzerine söylem analizi ile desteklenmiştir. Araştırmanın verileri, tarım işçileri üzerine kapsamlı bir literatür analizi, tarihsel basın taraması (1950'den günümüze *Milliyet* arşivi) ve saha çalışmasıyla toplanmıştır.

Tarımda ücretli emek süreçlerine yakından bakmak bir yandan tarım iş kolunda emeklilik, tazminat, iş yeri ve ulaşım güvenliği, sigorta ve işe bağlı diğer hakları olmadan çalışan bütün işçiler için çalışma haklarının acil gerekliliğine bir dikkat çekme çabasıdır. Türkiye'de mevcut yasalar—işletme büyüklüğü sınırı sebebiyle—tarımda özel sektörde çalışan işçilerin büyük çoğunluğunu İş Yasası kapsamı dışında bırakır. Bir yandan da, bu çalışma, genel toplumun bazı yapısal eşitsizliklerine, özelikle kadınlar ve dezavantajlı etnik azınlıkların bu güvencesiz tarım emek pazarında yoğunlaştığına dair bulguları destekler. Adapazarı'nda gerçekleştirilen saha çalışması tarım işlerinin merkez mahallelerde yaşayan kadınlardan 1990'larda genişleyen şehrin çeperindeki yeni göçmen ve azınlık grupların yerleşik olduğu mahalallere doğru el değiştirdiğine dair veriler sunmaktadır. Özellikle etnik azınlıkların yoğun yaşadığı mahallelerde günlük ücretlenen güvencesiz tarım işlerinin halen insanların ana gelir kaynaklarından biri olması, şehirde son dönemde gelişen endüstri ve servis sektörünün yarattığı iş imkanlarına her grubun eşit erişim şansının olmadığını gösterir.

Çalışma, tarımda ücretli emek süreçlerinin analizinde işçileri işveren karşısında savunmasız bırakan yasal ayrıksıcılığa *[legal exceptionalism]* ve tarım işçilerini dışlayan emek yasalarının günümüzdeki meşruiyetine eleştirel bir vurgu yapar. Devlet, bu bağlamda—son dönemde pek çok siyasetçi ve bürokratın tariflediği gibi tarım işçilerini koruyucu/kollayıcı bir aktörden ziyade—tarımda ücretli emek süreçlerinin işçiler için güvensiz yapısını şekillendiren ve hali hazırda tarım emek pazarının aktif rol alan bir bileşeni olarak ele alınır. Türkiye'de politik süreçler—gerek güvencesiz iş pazarını yapılandıran yasalar gerekse sosyal devlet ilkesiyle çelişen eşitsizlikleri körükleyen yasal pratikleri dikkate aldığımızda—tarım iş pazarının işçiler açısından güvencesizliğini sürdürmesinde önemli rol oynar. Yarınsız/güvencesiz tarım sektöründe ücretli çalışan azınlık grupların ve kadınların (bireysel olarak) sosyal haklara erişim sorunu, bir sosyal adalet ve eşit vatandaşlık krizine işaret eder. Bu çalışmanın katılımcısı tarım işçilerinin tarihsel olarak—Türkiye'de sosyal haklara erişim için gerekli olan—toprak mülkiyetine, düzenli/güvenli işlere, sendikalara ve diğer kurumsal sosyal ağlara erişimi kısıtlıdır. Çalışma, tarım işçilerinin iş yasası kapsamı dışında bırakan yasal ayrıksıcılığın günümüzdeki "meşru" süreğenliğiyle bu sektörde yoğun olarak çalışan azınlık grupların ve kadınların sosyal haklardan dışlanma sorununu bir arada düşünmeyi önerir. Sektördeki çalışma hakları sorunu bir vatandaşlık krizi olarak karşımızda durmaktadır.

Tarımsal emek pazarının işçiler için yasal korumadan yoksun ve kısa dönemli iş ilişkisinin yaygın olduğu yapısı içinde işçilerin ücretli emek süreçleri birbirlerinden epey farklılaşabilir. Mevcut tekinsiz yapı içinde, Adapazarı'ndaki Roman işçiler gibi ücretlerini garanti altına alma konusunda sorun yaşayan ve kendi haklarını koruyabilecek sosyal ağlara en uzak işçi grupları görece daha katmanlı ve hiyerarşik iş organizasyonlarında çalışmaya mecbur kalabilir. Başka bir deyişle, iş pazarının güvencesizliğini, işçiler kendi durum ve koşullarına göre—sosyal ağlara erişim, damgalanma, dışlanma, hane üyelerinin genel iş pazarında konumu—değişen biçimlerde deneyimler. İşçilerin ücretli emek süreçleri arasında ortaya çıkan bu farklılaşma, aracılık pratiklerinde karşımıza çıkan çeşitliliği kısmen açıklamaktadır.

Bu çalışmada, "tarım aracısı" kategorisinin ilişkilere ve bağlamlara odaklanarak çözümlenmesi hedeflenmiştir. Bu yüzden, pozisyonu bireylerle özdeşleştiren ve kültürel-geleneksel kodlarla tanımlanan "aracı" (elçi, dayıbaşı, simsar) kavramı yerine pratiğe ve ilişkilere vurgu yapan "aracılık" kavramı öne çıkarılmıştır. Sahada, tarımsal ücretli emek süreçlerinde kazanç, emek, sorumluluk ve otorite açısından birbirinden farklı pek çok aracı pozisyonu incelendi. Adapazarı ve çevresinde "yerli kadın aracılar" yöredeki geniş sosyal ağları sayesinde çiftçilerle farklı bir ilişki kurabilirken; Roman gruptaki erkek

işçibaşı ve aracılar genellikle tüccarlar ve yerel kadın aracılar vasıtasıyla iş bağlıyordu. Kentte yaşayan kadınlar arasında tarımsal emek pazarında en yaygın görülen aracılık pratiği işçilerin kalıcı veya geçici olarak tutabildiği işçibaşı (işçi-aracı) pozisyonu olarak ortaya çıktı. Bazı işçi aracılar devamlı bir veya birkaç tüccar ile çalışırken, diğerleri ise sadece bir ürün için elinde olan çiftçi-tüccar bağlantısıyla aracılık yapıp, diğer ürünlerde işçi olarak çalışmayı sürdürüyordu. Özetle, aracılık, işçi-aracılığın yaygın olduğu Adapazarı sahasında geniş biçimde işçilerin devamlı veya geçici olarak gerçekleştirebildiği bir pratik olarak gözlenmiştir. Bu bağlamda hatırlamak gerekir ki, tarım işçilerinin büyük kısmını İş yasası kapsamının dışında bırakan ve işvereni sorumluluktan azade kılan yasal ayrıksıcılık, ücretli emek sürecinin önemli sorumluluk alanalarını aracıya yükleyen Tarımda İş Aracılığı Yönetmeliği işçilerle birlikte benzer şartlarda güvencesiz çalışan işçi-aracıları da işveren karşısında ücretlerini ve koşullarını koruma konusunda güçsüz bir konuma düşürmektedir.

Saha Çalışması

Saha çalışmasının verileri Adapazarın'da iki dönem (Mayıs-Eylül 2011/Haziran-Ağustos 2012) katılımcı gözlem ve görüşmeler ve Haziran-Eylül 2015 döneminde işçilerle yapılan yarı-yapılandırılmış derinlemesine görüşmelerle toplandı. Katılımcılara diğer katılımcıların yardımıyla (kartopu yöntemi) ulaşıldı. İlk iki yılın verileri araştırmacı tarafından günlük tutulan saha notları ve kimi görüşmelerin ses kayıtlarından; 2015 döneminin verisi ise (52 görüşme) ses kayıtları ve araştırmacının doldurduğu yarı-yapılandırılmış görüşme notlarından oluşmaktadır. Analiz için SPSS sistemine geçirilen 2015 saha çalışmasının görüşmeleri hem açık uçlu ve hem de kısa cevaplı anket tipi sorular ve işçiler tarafından verilen cevapları içermektedir.

2011-2012 yıllarında gözlenen işçi gruplarının birbirinden farklılaşan çalışma örüntüleri 2015 saha çalışmasının mekanlarını ve katılımcılarını belirlerken temel alındı. Esas olarak gruplar arası farklılıkları ve çeşitliliği göstermek için seçilen bu örneklem tarım işçileri adına temsil edici değildir.

Adapazarı ve çevresinde tarımsal üretim büyük ölçüde, Türkiye tarımının tipik bir özellği sayılan, pazar için üretim yapan küçük işletmelerde gerçekleşir. Şehrin çeperindeki günlük ücretlendirilen tarım işleri tarihsel olarak Adapazarı'nda yaşayan kadınların önemli bir gelir kaynağı olagelmiştir. Ancak süregiden makineleşme ve şehirde 1990'larda hızlanan endüstrileşme süreci (yerleşim alanlarının genişlemesine sebep olarak) şehrin içinde ve çeperindeki yevmiyeli işlerin sayıca azalmasına yol açtı. Yine de bugün halen kentin

çevresindeki tarım işleri kentin çeperlerinde Roman ve Kürt mahallelerinde yaşayan pek çok kadın için temel geçim kaynağı olmayı sürdürmektedir.

Bu tez çalışması kapsamında 2011-2012 yıllarında köylerde ve şehirde işçi, işveren ve yerel yöneticilerle görüşmeler gerçekleştirildi ve 2015 yazında yürütülen saha çalışması bu pilot görüşmelerin bulguları ışığında yapılandırıldı. 2015 yazında, saha çalışmasının odaklandığı mekanlar patates hali ve şehrin çeperindeki tarım işlerinin organize edildiği ve işçilerin yaşadığı beş mahalle olarak belirlendi: Güneşler, Arabacıalanı, Yeni Mahalle, Bağlar, Karaköy.

Patates hali tüccarlar tarafından toplatılan patates ve soğanların (günlük ücretlendirilen) kadın işçiler tarafından temizlenip paketlendiği ve toptan satışının yapıldığı bir mekandır. Tarım işvereni olan toprak sahibi ve tüccarlar işçi kaynağı olarak da hali kullandıkları için –ihtiyaç olduğu hallerde hale gelip işçi talep ederek–patates hali aynı zamanda tarım işlerinin örgütlendiği/organize edildiği bir mekan olagelmiştir. Halde en düşük ücretle çalışan grubu oluşturan işçi kadınlar genellikle halin çevresindeki yürüme uzaklığında olan (merkeze yakın) mahallelerde yaşar: Tepekum, Hacıoğlu, Tabakhane, Yeni Cami ve Pabuççular Mahalleleri, ve Çarşamba Pazarı Mevkii. Öte yandan, şehrin çeperlerindeki mahallelerde yaşayan işçiler için tarım işlerinin örgütlenme mekanı yine mahalledir. Merkeze görece daha uzak olan bu mahallelerde işveren toprak sahibi ve tüccarlar genellikle mahalleye gelerek veya mahalledeki bir aracıya ulaşarak işçi talep ettikleri için buralarda tarım işleri genellikle işçilerin yaşam alanında örgütlenir. Bu sebeple, buralarda akrabalık ve komşuluk ilişkileri, iş olanaklarını artıran veya azaltan bir faktör olarak, işçilerin iş yaşamlarının da bir parçasını oluşturur.

Adapazarı ve çevresinde çapalama, hasat ve paketleme gibi tarım işlerinde ağırlıklı olarak kadınlar çalışır. Bölgede tarım işleri, kasacılık gibi özel tanımlı bazı işler dışında, genel olarak kadın işi olarak görülür. Kadınlar tarlada kimi zaman tanıdık genç erkekleri de içeren ekipler halinde çalışır. Şehirde yaşayan işçi grupları arasında yalnızca Roman yetişkin erkekler hasatta kadınlarla birlikte giderek artan oranlarada çalışırlar. Bu sebeple alan çalışması temel olarak kadın işçilerle yürütüldü. Çalışmanın katılımcıları kentte yerleşik ve farklı çalışma örüntüleri gösteren Türk, Kürt ve Roman kadın tarım işçileridir. Araştırma grubu tam zamanlı veya yarı zamanlı; geçiçi veya düzenli çalışan; iş için göç edenler ve sadece yerleim yeri yakınında çalışan işçileri kapsayacak şekilde geniş tutuldu. Bu bağlam, aracılığın pek çok biçimini bir arada incelemeye ve pratiğin farklı dinamiklerini tartışmaya açmaya olanak verdi. Dahası, saha literatürde sıklıkla kültür-gelenekleriyle aracılık sistemi arasında koşutluk kurulan Kürt işçileri, yerleşik bir oldukları bir bağlamda görece daha stabil ve süreğen ilişkiler kurabildikleri bir emek

pazarında gözlemleme olanağı verdi. Başka bir deyişle, Adapazarı tarım iş pazarının sunduğu dinamik ve farklı etnik grupları kapsayan emek süreçleri mevcut literatürde genellikle kültürel-geleneksel yönleriyle tanımlanan aracılık pratiğinin çağdaş çalışma ilişkilerinin bir parçası olarak incelenmesi için uygun bir bağlam oluşturdu.

Saha çalışması, işçilerin emek süreçlerini organize etmek için sosyal ağları nasıl kullandıklarına odaklandı. Kadın işçilerin değişen ve gözetimsiz iş ortamları ve değişen ücretlendirme biçimlerinin ortaya çıkardığı belirsizlikleri yönetmek için başvurdukları yöntemler dikkate alındı. Kadınların arkadaş, komşu, akraba ve aile gibi farklı sosyal ağları iş ilişkisi bağlamında nasıl değerlendirdikleri üzerinde çalışıldı. Adapazarı'nda Roman kadınlar daha çok komşu ve akraba ilişkilerine yatırım yaparken, Kürt kadınlar bir kısım patronu da içeren geniş etnik ağlar kullanarak ve çalışma arkadaşlarıyla bağları güçlendirerek mahalle sosyal ağlarını aşabilmekte, Türk gruptan kadınlar ise daha çok iş arkadaşlarıyla olan ilişkilerine yatırım yapmaktaydı. Çalışma tam da bu farklı stratejileri kadınların iş yaşamlarının elzem parçaları haline getiren koşul ve bağlamların izini sürdü. Özetle, işçilerin gündelik mücadelelerini ve stratejilerini emek pazarındaki konumları, iş pazarının yapısı ve iş ilişkisinin gerçekleştiği özgül bağlamlarla ilişkilendiren saha çalışmasının analizi "geleneksel/kültürel" kodları sebebiyle aracılar tarafından sömürülmekten başka şansı olmayan işçileri anlatan ötekileştirici ve kurbanlaştırıcı retoriğe bir eleştiri olarak şekillendirildi.

Aracılık Tartışması

Bu tez çalışmasında, Türkiye'de tarım aracılarının mevcut popular temsillerini hem kültürel göndermeleri hem de gizledikleri bakımından sorunsallaştırılmıştır. Yaygın aracı temsil ve analizlerini irdelemenin üç temel motivi şöyle sıralanabilir:

İlk olarak, modernleştirici devlet karşısında geleneği temsil eden tarım aracısı ikiliği devletin tarım iş pazarındaki rolüne dair yanlış bir izlenim verir. Buradaki basit ikiliği, öncelikle devletin tarım iş pazarının güvencesizliğindeki rolünü ve tarım emek pazarında aracılık sistemini destekleyen düzenlemeleri dikkate alarak sorgulamak gerekir. Doğu-Batı; modern-geleneksel gibi hegemonik karşıtlıklara dayanan (kültürel) gerilikle ilgili göndermeler işçileri geleneksel kültürü ise modernleştiren bir özne olarak devlet arasında, iş yasasının kapsamı, aracılık sistemini destekleyen düzenlemeler ve hatta azınlıklara yönelik şiddet gibi politik süreçleri gizleyen bir karşıtlık kurar. İcracıların çoğu kayıtsız olsa da, Türkiye'de tarım aracılığı yasal bir pozisyon olarak tanımlanmıştır. Ve özellikle son dönem METİP sürecinde gözetim/kontrol gibi saiklerle esas olarak aracısız (dolaşan, göç eden) işçileri tehdit olarak görme ve engelleme çabası hem uygulamada hem de

bürokratların yazılarında belirgin bir şekilde karşımıza çıkmıştır. 2010 yılında yürürlüğe given Başbakanlık Genelgesi'nin 10. maddesinde işçilerin ve ailelerin kimlik bilgier alınacak, ayrıca mahalli kolluk kuvetlerince konakladıkları bölgeye güvenlik amaçlı devriye faaliyetleri yapılacaktır denilmektedir. Yıldırım (2015) 2011-2'de Sakarya'da yürüttüğü alan çalışması sırasında fındık hasadı için Kocaali'ye gelen işçilerin kimlik numaralarının emniyete güvenlik sorgusundan geçirildiğini ve kimliklerinin fotokopisinin alıdığını rapor etti. (335) Ben de benzer şekilde bu çalışmada da Karasu ilçesindeki Emniyet Müdürlüğü ziyaretinde işçilerin aracıların iletişim bilgileri ve aracıya bağlı işçilerin geldikleri yerlerin kaydedildiği dosyalar incelendi (Saha Notları, 2011). Bu noktada dikkat çekici olan, Yıldırım (2015)'ın da belirttiği gibi işçilerin sayıları ve geldikleri bölgelerle ilgili kayıt ve bilgilerin sadece jandarma ve emniyet tarafından tutuluyor olmasıdır (335). Dahası, METİP'i (Mevsimlik Gezici Tarım İşçilerinin Çalışma ve Sosyal Hayatlarının İyileştirilmesi Projesi) tanıtan yazısında Erdoğan (2010) bu süreçte artık işçilerin şehir içinde, otogar ve istasyonlarda, parklarda, vs. gelişi güzel konaklama ve beklemelerine fırsat verilmeyeceğini ifade etmişti. Aslında işçilere konaklama yeri sağlama sözüyle birlikte zikredilen bu karar Sakarya'da hasat zamanı istasyonda bekleyen kolluk güçlerinin iş bağlantısı olmayan işçilerin şehre girişini ve garda konaklamasını engelleyerek geri göndermesi olarak sonuç verdi (Saha Notları, 2011). Dolayısıyla, bu gözetim kararının kendisi aracılık sistemini—sosyal bağları en aracılar lehine bağlantısız işçilerin aleyhine olacak şekilde—destekleyen bir uygulamadır. Özetle, devletin bu müdahalesi mevsimlik göç eden işçiler bağlamında işverenle önceden iş bağlama şansı olmayan işçilerin sektördeki iş imkanlarını daraltıp ve sektördeki geniş sosyal ağlara sahip aracıların işçiler karşısındaki konumlarını güçlendirmiştir.

İkincisi, işçi ve aracılar arasındaki ilişkinin eleştirisinin (sömürme, el koyma, otorite kurma, bağımlı emek) geniş yer tuttuğu literatürün aracı vurgusunu işverenin görece görünmezliği bakımından sorgulamak gerekir. Milliyet gazetesinin arşivinde yapılan tarihsel analiz, tarım işçilerinin haber yapılma biçimlerinin 1980'lerde bir kırılmaya uğradığını göstermektedir. 1970'ler boyunca tarım işçileriyle ilgili haberlerde hakim olan haklar ve kalkınma söylemleri 1980 sonrası yerini kurbanlaştırıcı retoriğe ve işçilerin kültürel ötekiler olarak temsiline bırakmış görünür. İşverenin görünmezliği 1980 sonrası tarım işçisi haberlerinin genl bir özelliği olarak ortaya çıkmıştır. Bugüne dek büyük ölçüde benzer seyreden 1980 sonrası yeni tip tarım işçileri haberlerinin bir özelliği de tarımda ücretli emek süreçlerinin aktif aktörleri olarak aracıların sorumlulukları üzerine vurgu olmuştur. Aşağıdaki iki örnek son dönemde 17 işçinin ölümüne yol açan trafik kazasıyla ilgili olarak Milliyet gazetesinde yer verilen haberlerden alındı:

> ‘…Bu insanlar insan cambazıdır. Onların sırtından para kazanırlar. Aldığınız paranın yarısını onlar alır…’ (Dayıbaşılar insan cambazı, 01.11.2014, Milliyet)

> ‘Mevsimlik tarım işçileri, hem aldıkları ücretin azlığından hem de bölgede yaygın olan dayıbaşılık sisteminden yakınıyor…’ (Eski Mısır’da köle düzeni gibi, Milliyet, 5.11.2014)

Tarım işçilerinin zor koşullarını konu alan aşağıdaki haber ise 1980 sonrası tarım işçileri üzerine haber yapma biçimini tipik bir örneği olan ve Milliyet’te yayımlanmış bir haberin alt başlığıdır:

> Utanç treni ile Adapazarı'na fındık toplamaya gelen doğu insanı, daha istasyonda “köle muamelesi” ile karşılaşıyor. Üstü aranan, insan simsarları yüzünden ekmek parası kuşa dönen bu insanları, yöreliler de dışlıyor (Çağdaş Köleler, Milliyet, 19.08.1998).

Bu işçi yanlısı haberde olduğu gibi, tarım işçileri üzerine güncel literatürde yazarlar aracıları genellikle aktif ve sorumlu özneler olarak tarif eder. Ücretli emek süreçinin diğer aktörlerini ise gizli özneler olarak pasif cümler kalıpları içinde görünmezleştirirler. İşçiler aranır. Kim olduğunu bilmediğimiz bazı yerel gruplar tarafından dışlanır. Yine kim olduğu muğlak olan yetkililerin onları koruması gerekir. Böylece, haberlerde ve hatta pek çok akademik çalışmada, işaret edilen, görselleştirilen sadece işçiler ve aracılar olur. Böylece 1980 sonrası kalıplaşan genel-geçer anlatıda, işçiler çaresiz kurbanlar, aracılar işçilerin halinden sorumlu özneler olarak karşımıza çıkar. Oysa ki, 1970’lerin tarım işçileri üzerine haberciliği işçilerin işçi olmakla ilgili sorunlarına, örneğin iş boykotu, işverenle anlaşmazlık ve benzeri konulara odaklanıyordu. İşveren, jandarma ve işçilerin olay yerindeki konumları ve açıklamalarına yer verilen bu az sayıdaki haberlerin yerini 1980 sonrası tarım işçilerini çadır alanlarında bir yoksul grubu olarak işaretleyen, iş sürecinden bağımsız, işçilerin çaresizliklerine ve kötü yaşam koşullarına odaklanan ve bolca görselle birlikte yer verilen haberler alır. 1980 sonrası dönüşümün iyi tarafı sektörüdeki çocuk işçiliğine ve trafik kazaralarına dikkat çekilmesi ve basının ilgisinin artması olarak sıralanabilir. Ancak bu dönemden sonra sadece haberlerde değil neredeyse tüm literatürde hakim olan işçileri kurbanlaştırıcı retoriği eleştirmek de elzem görünmektedir. Kurbanlaştırıcı retorik, işçiler için çalışma hakları talebine alternatif olarak ve işin kendisini kötüleyen, olumsuzlayan bir mesaj verir. Hemen her zaman kendine özgü bir kurtuluş perspektifi ve işin olumsuzlanmasını beraberinde getirir. Buna göre kötü koşullar tarım işinin doğasından kaynaklanır, kurtuluş ise o işi yapmayabilecek kadar güçlenmekten başka bir şey değildir.

> İşgücünün yaklaşık % 25’inin istihdam edildiği tarım sektöründe, özellikle gezici işçi olarak çalışan grup, tarımın kendine özgü niteliklerinden dolayı oldukça ağır koşullarda çalışmaktadır (Erdoğan 2010: 1-2).

Özetle, 1980 sonrası söylemsel kırılmayı da dikake alarak, tarım işinin yapıldığı koşullarının değişmesinin ön şartlarından biri olan işveren sorumluluğunun tartışma dışı kalması literatürdeki mevcut 'sorumlu' aracı vurgusunu sorgulamak için güçlü bir motivasyon oluşturmaktadır.

Son olarak, literatürdeki hakim 'sorumlu' aracıların etkinliğinin işçilerin kültürel farklarıyla açıklanması kurbanı suçlayan bir dilin ipuçlarını verir. Tarımda ücretli emek süreçleri üzerine yazılmış raporlarda, özellikle Doğulu/Kürt işçilerin kültürel farklılıkları ve geleneksel hiyerarşilerini ücretli emek süreçlerine aktardıkları sıklıkla vurgulanmaktadır Bu bağlantılarla tanımlanan aracı üzerine vurgu tarımda ücretli emek süreçlerinin adaletsizliğini açıklarken tartışmanın odağını tarım emek pazarının yapısı ve işveren sorumluluğundan, işçilerin özsel niteliklerine—*a priori* tanımlanan kültürüne veya geleneklerine—çeker. İşverenin sorumluluğunu dikkate almayan ve varlığını işçilerin kültürüyle açıklandığı tarım aracısının sömüren özne olarak öne çıkarıldığı ücretli emek süreci analizleri, aslında işçilerin kendi olumsuz koşullarından kültürleri dolayımıyla yine kendilerinin sorumlu olduğu bir çerçeve çizmektedir. Başka bir deyişle, eğer aracılar ücretli emek sürecindeki adaletsizliğinin kaynağı ve raporlarda, makalelerde net bir şekilde işaret edilen tek aktif sömüren aktörüyse, ve bu aracılar ototritelerini işçilerin geneleklerine/kültürüne (aşiret değerleri, saygı kültürü ve benzeri) borçluysa, suç emek pazarına bu ilişkiyi taşıyan işçilere geri döner. Aracının, geleneksel otoritenin temsilcisi, geçimişin kalıntısı gibi ifadelerle aktüel çalışma ilişkileri bağlamının dışında tanımlanması, literatürün işçileri nasıl ötekiler olarak kodladığına dair ipuçları verir.

Bu üç sebeple, tez, tarım işçileri üzerine literatürdeki ücretli emek süreci analizlerinin aracının eylemlerinin altını çizerken işvereni görünmezleştiren yaygın biçimine eleştiri getirir. Adapazarı'nda gerçekleşitirilen alan çalışması, işçilerin temel dertleri ile literatürün öne çıkardığı sorunlar arasındaki açıyı gösterir niteliktedir. İşçiler, genellikle yaşlılık gelirleri ve emeklilikle ilgili endişeler yaşar ve emek süreçlerinde kendi pozisyonlarını işverene karşı tanımlarken, mevcut akademik literatür aracıların kazanımlarını ücretli emek süreçlerinin temel sorunu olarak öne çıkarmaktadır. Buna göre literatürdeki bağımlı emek, özgür olmayan emek, geleneksel otorite, ilksel ilişkilerin sonucu, çağdışı sistem ve bunu gibi aracılarla ilgili vurgular, çoğu zaman işverenin davranışlarını ve emek pazarının yapılandıran yasamanın/politik süreçlerin rolünü görünmezleştirecek şekilde tartışmanın odağına oturur. Bu yüzden, bu çalışmada, saha verilerinin analizi tarımda ilgili literatürde sıklıkla rapor edilen olumsuz çalışma koşulları ve işçi istismarı konusunda aracıların yanında işverenin sorumluluğunu ve devletin rolünü tartışan bir çerçeveyle desteklendi. Çalışmada literatürün aracı vurgusu, sadece devletin ve

işverenlerin rolünün gözden kaçması açısından değil, aracıyla ilksel ilişkilerine yapılan vurgu ile Doğulu ve/veya Kürt işçilerin ötekileştirilmesi bağlamında da sorgulandı. Çeşitli etnik gruptan işçilerin emek süreçlerini içeren Adapazarı emek pazarının sunduğu veriler aracıları işçilerle ilksel/komünal/kültürel bağları sayesinde sömüren geleneksel aracı tipini sorgulamak için uygun bir bağlam sundu. İş ilişkisini gerçekleştiği özgül bağlamlara ve işçilerin konumlarını dikkate alan analiz aracılık pratiğinin çeşitli dinamiklerine dair yorumda bulunmak için elverişli bir veri seti oluşturdu.

Sonuçlar

Bu çalışmada, aracılık, tarımsal ücretli emek süreçlerinde işçi sömürüsünün sebebinden ziyade yasal güvencesizlik ve politik süreçlerle risk ve yükün işçilerin sırtına yüklendiği ve kısa dönemli emek talebinin yoğun olduğu tarım sektörünün bir semptomu olarak değerlendirilmiştir. Türkiye'de tarım işçileri üzerine güncel literatür içinde özel olarak Doğulu ve/veya Kürt işçilerin kültürel farklılığına yapılan vurgu sorunsallaştırıldı. Metodolojik sorunlar bir yana (aşırı-genellleme, işçilerin yanlış bilinç gibi tür yanılsama içinde olduğunu varsayma, *a priori* tanımlanan kültürel kodların ücretli emek süreçlerini şekillendirdiğini varsayma), bu çalışmada kültürel farklılık vurgusunun kurbanı suçlayan bir mesaj verdiğini öne sürülmektedir. Literatürde kurbanı suçlayan hakim dil üç yaygın eğilimin birleşimiyle ortaya çıkmaktadır: *ücretli emek süreçlerinde işvereni görünmezleştiren ve aracıyı öne çıkaran yaygın cümle kalıpları; aracılık sistemini tarımda çağdaş çalışma ilişkilerinin bir parçasından ziyade çağdışı, iptidai bir gelenek olarak konumlayan ifadeler; ve tarım iş pazarında aracıların etkinliğini Doğulu ve/veya Kürt işçilerin kültürel kodlarına/geleneklerine bağlayan ifadeler*.

1- Ücretli emek süreçlerinde işvereni görünmezleştiren ve aracıyı öne çıkaran yaygın cümle kalıpları:

> Elçiler, işçinin günlük ücretinin %10'una el koymaktadır (Ulukan & Ulukan 2011: 14).
>
> Sömürü ilişkisi işçilerin aracılara her konuda bağımlı oldukları bir çalışma düzeninden kaynaklanmaktadır. Aracıların, işçileri bağımlı hale getirmelerinde bazı faktörler önemli rol oynar. (Çınar & Lordoğlu 2011: 435)
>
> Elçilerin, işçilerin ücretlerinden aldıkları komisyonlar nedeniyle zaten düşük olan işçi ücretlerinin daha da düşerek işçilerin yoksullşamasına neden oldukları elçilere dair eski gözlemlerin bir parçasını oluşturmaktadır (Çınar 2014: 144)
>
> Elçilerin işçiler için yerine getirdiği görevler, onların yaşamlarını kolaylaştırıyor gibi görünse de bunların hepsi işçilerin elçilere olan bağımlılığını güçlendirmektedir. Bir elçiye bağlı olmadan işçi iş bulamaz, çalıştığı yerde hiçbir sorununu tek başına çözemez hale gelir. Bu bağımlılığı yaratmak ve derecesi elçinin yaptığı işin vasıfları arasındadır. İşçiden ve işverenden aldığı komisyonlar dışında sayısız gelir elde etme yöntemini kendisi için yaratmıştır (Çınar 2014,16 Haziran: 33).

> İşçilerin gelirlerindeki düsüklügün önemli bir nedeni olarak da isçilerden elçilerin aldıkları kesintiler oluşturmaktadır… Tarım aracılarının (elçi) uzun yıllar içerisinde yapılaşma haline olan bu sömürü sisteminde işlevleri çok büyüktür (Geçgin 2009: 85, 133).

> Elçi gibi bölgeye göre değişen adlar taşıyan aracıların geçici işçiyi ne gibi yollarla istismar ettiği resmi raporlarda da açıkça görülmektedir… [Aracıların] … mevcudiyetleri geniş çapta işçi istismarına yol açtığı gibi işverenin işçi temsilcisi ile anlaşma geleneğinin yerleşmesine de imkân bırakmamaktadır… (Kazgan 1963: 55, 60).

> Daha fazla işçinin daha fazla gelir anlamına gelmesi ise dayıbaşının kazanımında yukarı seyreden bir grafik çizmektedir. Sistemin bir gereği ve uzantısı olarak; dayıbaşı patron ve işçi arasında iletişimi ve koordinasyonu sağlayan bir aracı olma mevcudiyetini sürdürmekte ve pek çok haksızlığa sebebiyet vermektedir. (Dayıbaşı Terörü, Milliyet, 2015, April 26).

> Ücretler gidilen yerlere ve ürün desenlerine göre değişse de değişmeyen tek şey aracıların ücretlerden aldığı komisyondur. Genel olarak günlük ya da götürü ücretin yüzde 10'u komisyon olarak alınmaktadır (TBMM 2015: 88).

> Mevsimlik işçiler çalışma koşulları, çalışma süreleri, ve ücret bakımından kötü koşullar içinde bulunurlar. Bunların durumlarını ağırlaştıran önemli bir neden de, iş bulmalarında, iş yerlerine getirilmelerinde ve işverenlerle aralarındaki her türlü ilişkide aracıların rol almasıdır (Kaleci 2007: 160).

Bu örneklerde görüldüğü gibi literatürde aracılar genellikle emek süreçlerinin sömüren, el koyan, kesinti yapan aktif özneleri olarak tanımlanmaktadır. İşverenin eylemleri ise gizli özne ve pasif cümle kalıpları arasında kaybolur; işveren ücrete el koyuyorsa *işçiler ücretlerini almada problem yaşamaktadır*; işveren düşük ücretle işçi çalıştırıyorsa *işçilerin ücretleri düşüktür*; işverenler genç işçi çalıştırıyorsa *genç işçilik bölgede yaygın olarak kullanılmaktadır*; işveren çocuk işçi çalıştırıyorsa *tarım işçileri tüm aile bireylerinin katılımıyla çalışmaktadır*:

> Mevsimlik tarım işçileri aracı dışı iş buldukları bazı durumlarda ücretlerini almada problem yaşayabilmektedirler (Karaman & Yılmaz 2011: 222).

> Mevsimlik işçilerin ücretleri çok düşüktür. Buna karşılık çalışma saatleri uzundur (Çınar 2014: 34).

> Mevsimlik işçilerin ücretleri diğer yerli çalışanlarla aynı oranda değildir. Çoğunlukla daha düşük ücret almaktadırlar (Karaman & Yılmaz 2011: 216).

> Mevsimlik işçilerin ücretleri diğer yerli çalışanlarla aynı oranda değildir. Çoğunlukla daha düşük ücret almaktadırlar (Karaman & Yılmaz 2011: 216).

> Ucuz emek olarak görülen kadınlar, iş bulma konusunda erkeklere oranla biraz daha şanslıdırlar… Ne var ki hiç bir iş güvencesi olmayan bu yevmiyecilik işinde kadınlar, bir ay boyunca hafta sonları da dahil, sabahın erken saatlerinden akşamın geç saatlerine kadar çalışsa bile, kazanacağı para asgari ücreti bile bulmamaktadır (Arslan 2003: 14).

> Aracısız çalışan mevsimlik tarım işçileri: İş ve para garantileri bulunmamaktadır. İş bulduklarında çalışıyorlar, iş bulamadıklarında çalışmıyorlar. Düşük ücret karşılığında çalışabiliyorlar (Karaman & Yılmaz 2011: 220).

> Bu durum genç işçiliğin bu bölgede yaygın olarak kullanıldığının bir göstergesi olmaktadır (Etiler & Lordoğlu 2014: 123).

> Tarım işçilerinin daha çok kazanmak ve bir an önce işi bitirmek için yaşına bakılmaksızın elinden iş gelen tüm aile bireylerinin katılımıyla çalıştıkları bilinen bir gerçektir (Görücü & Akbıyık 2010: 212).

Böylece literatürdeki analizlerin çoğu, yapısal sınırlarla ve güçlüklerle hareketleri kısıtlanan işverenler ve yoksulluk, çaresizlik ve mecrubriyetlerin kısıtlarıyla seçim yapamayan işçilerin karşılaştığı ücretli emek süreçlerinin aktif ve sorumlu failleri olarak aracıların yapıp ettiklerine odaklanır.

2-Aracılık sistemini tarımda çağdaş çalışma ilişkilerinin bir parçasından ziyade çağdışı, iptidai bir gelenek olarak tarif eden ifadeler:

> Yönetmelikle izin verilen ve çağdışı bir yaklaşım olan "Tarım Aracılığı" uygulamasına son verilmelidir. (Görücü & Akbıyık 2010: 214).

> Aracı, gerek işverenler gerekse işçilerin ihtiyaç duyduğu bir aracılık sistemi bugünün değil belki de *yüzyıllardır süren bir sistemin günümüzdeki izdüşümüdür*. İşçiler ve işverenler arasında ilişki kuran bir aktör olmasına rağmen, mevsimlik gezici tarım işçilerinin ücret, barınma, sağlık ve yaşam şartlarına ilişkin yaşadığı sorunların kaynaklarından biri de aracılardır (TBMM 2015: 88-9).

> Elçiler … bugün bile çalışma ilişkilerinin önemli bir aktörü olmaya devam etmektedirler. (Çınar 2014: 144).

Bu ifadelerde aracılık pratiği çağdaş istihdam sistemlerinden farklı olan eskinin değişime direnen bir kalıntısı olarak kodlanır. Geçtiğimiz yıl, mevsimlik işçilerin sorunlarını incelemek ve çözümler sunmak amacıyla toplanan Meclis Araştırma Komisyonu'nun raporunda da benzer şeklide tarım işçilerinin aracılar aracılığıyla iş bularak *ilkel* emek sömürüsüne maruz kaldığı belirtilmiştir:

> Mevsimlik gezici tarım işçileri çoğunlukla çavuş, dayıbaşı, elçi denilen iş aracıları aracılığı ile iş bulmakta, çalışma yerlerine götürülmekte, ödenecek ücretlerin belirlenmesinde de iş aracıları belirleyici olmaktadır. Bu ilişkinin bizatihi kendisi, işçilerin ucuz, ilkel emek sömürüsüne maruz kalmalarını beraberinde getirmektedir (TBMM 2015: 195).

Bu örneklerde geçmişin bir kalıntısı olarak tariflenen aracılık pratiği aslında küresel olarak tarım emek pazarlarında sık rastlanan, işverenler tarafından emek kontrolü ve işçi maliyeti açısından tercih edilen, devamlılığı işverenler için ekonomik getirisinden ve bunu garanti altına alan çağdaş siyasi tercihlerden kaynaklanan bir sömürü sisteminin parçasıdır. Bunlara ek olarak, literatürde aracılık sistemini tarif ederken kullanılan *geri* (ilerlemesi, çağdaşlaşması gereken) kodunun kimi zaman—köylü bilincine sahip, feodal ilişkiler içinden gelen, yarı-işçi yarı-köylü ve benzeri biçimlerde tariflenen—işçilere de yakıştırıldığını belirmek gerekir. Aracılık pratiğinin emek pazarı ve ücretli emek

ilişkisinin dışında aranan kökleri gibi, buradaki sorun da, işçilerin emek pazarındaki konumlarından ziyade *a priori* tanımlanan özsel (bilinç, kültür ve benzeri) niteliklerine göre tanımlanması ve sınıflandırılmasıdır.

3-Tarım iş pazarında aracıların etkinliğini Doğulu ve/veya Kürt işçilerin kültürel kodlarına/geleneklerine bağlayan ifadeler:

> …. ağa/ortakçı arasındaki üretim ilişkisinin şekillendirdiği hiyerarşik sosyal yapı, ayrıca bazı yerlerde buna eklenen aşiret düzeni, çok katmanlı ve katı bir hiyerarşiye sahip toplumsal ilişkilerin … çalışma ilişkilerine aktarılmasına neden olmuştur (Çınar 2014: 176).

> Feodal üretim ilişkilerinde ağanın ortakçılarına sağladığı korumayı yeni toplumsal yapılanma içinde bulamayan, ortakçılık geçmişinden gelen mevsimlik tarım işçileri için aracı önemli bir boşluğu doldurmuştur (Çınar & Lordoğlu 2011: 435).

> Çoğunlugunun Kürt kimligine sahip olması, dahası bir üst kimlik olarak da toplum içinde "Doğulu" ifadesini de kullanmaları, aşiret bağlarının yüksekliği, dinsel kimliğin baskın karakteri grup dayanışmasının yüksekliğine ve geleneksel cemaat örüntüsünün hala var olduğunu göstermektedir. Bu yapı etnik ekonomi ile süreklilik kazanmaktadır. Elçiye, çavusa duyulan güvenle birlikte itaatkârlık da söz konusu olmaktadır. Bu durum hiyerarsik yapının gelenekselci yapıdan beslendigini ve etnik ekonominin yapılaşmasında en önemli kanıt olarak gösterilebilir (Geçgin 2009: 140-1).

> Mevsimlik tarım işçileri, geçmişte içinde yer aldıkları geleneksel üretim yapısı içinde ortakçılık ilişkilerinin belirlediği koşullandırmalardan kurtulmuş değilerdir; toplumsal psikolojik erk sahibi büyük toprak sahibi ağanın yokluğunu hala yadırgamaktadırlar (Şeker 1986: 126-7).

Bu üç yaygın eğilim bize tek tek yazarların niyetlerinden bağımsız olarak literatürün genel olarak *işçilere* odaklandığını; kendi kültürlerine içkin sosyal hiyerarşiler sebebiyle iptidai bir sistemle sümürülen, ücretlerinin bir bölümüne el konan işçilerden bahsettiğini gösteriyor. Eğer tarım iş pazarında aktif olarak sömüren, ücrete el koyan, kazanç sağlayan aracılarsa, bu aracıların faaliyetleri çağdaş çalışma ilişkilerinin bir getisinden ziyade kültürün/geleneğin bir kalıntısıysa, ve üstelik aracılar tarım iş pazarında Doğulu ve/veya Kürt işçilerin sosyal hiyerarşilerini ücretli emek sürecine taşıması sebebiyle etkin ise– [demek ki] tarım işçilerinin temel problemi öncelikle kendi *kültürlerinden* kurtulamamaladır. İşçileri hem kurbanlaştıran hem de ötekileştiren bu hakim dil, aracılığın dinamiklerini; iş pazarının yapısını ve güvensizliğini, işçilerin bununla başetmek için başvurduğu startejileri, işverenlerin tercihlerini ve kısa dönemli ücretli emek talebini tartışma dışı bırakmaktadır. Dahası, işçilerin kültürel/sosyal ağlarını sadece olumsuz "geri, geleneksel" gibi ifadelerle anmak, bu sosyal ağların iş pazarında ücreti garantilemek ve yeni iş imkanlarına ulaşmak gibi avantaja dönüştüğü durumları gözden kaçırmamıza yol açmaktadır.

Bu noktada saha çalışmasının bulgularını gözden geçirmek aracılık üzerine tartışmayı genişletmek için faydalı olacaktır. Adapazarı sahasında çalışma şartları, işverenle ilişkiler, görevler ve çalışma dönemleri bakımından pek çok farklı çalışma örüntüsü görülmektedir. Saha çalışmasının üç temel çıkarımı şöyle sıralanabilir:

1- Şehirdeki işçi grupları diğer sektörlerdeki işlere ve başka gelir getirici aktivitelere erişim bakımından eşitsiz durumdadır. Güvenesiz tarım işleri merkeze daha yakın mahallerlerden şehrin çeperlerindeki yeni göçmen-işçi mahalllelerinde yaşayanlara doğru kaymaktadır. Merkeze yakın mahallelerde yaşayan Türk kadın katılımcılar genellikle (kendi aile üyeleri, akraba, ve komşularından farklı olarak) bireysel olarak tarımda çalışır ve tarım işçiliğini genellikle şehirdeki endüstri ve servis sektörünü tercih eden (güvenceli çalışan) çocuklarına devretmezler. Buna karşın, Roman katılımcılarda ve Kürt katılımcıların bir bölümünde görülen toplu (aile, akraba ve komşularla beraber) çalışma örüntüsü ve yaş yelpazesinin genişliği bu grupların sektörde işçi olarak devam edeceklerini gösterir. Bu süreç başta Romanlar olmak üzre çalışma kapsamındaki etnik azınlık mensubu işçilerin sosyal haklardan mahrum kalacağı bir çalışma biçimine devam edeceğini gösterir.

2- Şehirde işçiler günlük ücretlenen tarım işlerine erişim bakımından eşitsiz durumdadır. Özellikle az nüfuslu çeper mahallelerden Kürtlerin yoğun olduğu Bağlar ile Karaköy Roman yerleşimindeki işçiler tarım işlerine ve bunun için gerekli sosyal ağlara erişim sorunu yaşamaktadır ve tarlada çalışma dönemlerini artırmak istemektedir. Kürt katılımcılar hanehalkı erkeklerinin inşaat, pazarcılık gibi sektörlerdeki işlerden sağladığı düzenli gelirden ve bölgede işçi talep eden Kürt (mısır ve marul) tüccarlarıyla direk iş bağlama imkanından yararlabilmekte, ve Türk kadınların çalışma ekiplerine Romanlara nazaran daha rahat girebilmektedirler. Roman kadınlar ise sosyal dışlanma ve damgayla da baş etmek zorundadırlar ve çalışma dönemlerini artıracak nitelikli sosyal ağlardan yoksun olarak genellikle eşleri ve yakın akrabalarıyla birlikte çalışırlar.

3- Yetersiz sosyal ağlar ve dışlanma/damgalanmanın yarattığı koşullar Roman gruptaki işçilerin görece daha katmanlı/hiyerarşik bir iş organizasyonunda çalışmasına yol açar. Kentteki Türk ve Kürt işçiler genellikle sadece kadınlardan oluşan ve hiyerarşik olayan çalışma ekipleriyle iş yaparken, Roman işçiler kendileriyle işveren arasında daha çok kişinin olduğu, daha hiyerarşik yapılar içine çalışan eğilimi gösterirler. Bu sebeple, daha çok insana komisyon öderler. Bölgede genellikle tüccarlar tarafından istihdam edilen Roman işçiler işverenlerini tanıma oranı diğer işçilere kıyasla çok düşüktür. Romanlar

aynı zamanda çalışma dönemlerini artırmak için mevsimlik göç etmeye en yatkın grup olarak tanımadıkları/bilmedikleri farklı aracılarla çalışmaya da görece daha açıktır.

Parçalı ve çeşitli etnik grupları barındıran Adapazarı tarım emek pazarının bu derinlemesine analizi tarımda ücretli emek süreçlerini güvensizliğini ve aracılık pratiğinin dinamiklerini anlamak için önemli ipuçları sunar. Niteliksiz sosyal ağlar, damgalanma ve sosyal dışlanma ile daha güçlü aracı pozisyonları kullanma arasındaki bağlantı saha araştırmasının bulgularından birisidir. Grup genel toplumdan ne kadar dışlanmışsa (yaşam alanı, genel emek pazarındaki konum ve benzeri) ücretlerini korumak ve iş imkanlarını artırmak için aracılığa başvurma oranı o kadar yüksek olur. Adapazarı örneği ayrıca aracıların—çalışma ekiplerini kimlerin beraber daha iyi çalışacağı gibi detayları planlayarak kurma, yeni başlayanları idare edecek deneyimli ekiplerde eğitme, işverenin taleplerine göre preformansı düşük olan işçilerin yerini/görevini değiştirme gibi—yönetsel pratiklerinin işveren tercihi açısından önemini gösterir. Tarım işçileri, genellikle vasıfsız işçi olarak tanımlansa da, ekip çalışması, uyum ve hız özellikle tarla işlerinde emek maliyetlerini ciddi şekilde düşüren önemli bir etkendir (Thomas 1992; Ortiz 2002). Aslında, vasıfsız olarak anılan bu işlerde zaman maliyetini düşürmek için ekip olarak çalışan deneyimli işçiler gerekir (Ferguson 2007: 22). "Becerinin kolektif niteliği" *[the collective dimension of skill]* (Thomas 1992: 97), aslında işverenlerin aracılarla ve hali hazırda kurulmuş deneyimli ekiplere çalışmayı tercih etmesinin en önemli sebeplerinden biridir.

Tezin son bölümünde, saha çalışmasının bulguları, benzer diğer çalışmaların bulguları, literatür analizi ve Amerika Birleşik Devletleri örneği (FLC) bir arada değerlendirilerek aracılık tartışmasına bir katkı sunulmuştur. ABD örneğine, Türkiye'de aracılık kurumunun iptidailiği, gelenekselliği, kültürel temellerine odaklanan analizleri dengelemek için başvurulmuştur. Aracılık üzerine konuşurken odağı işçilerin kendi karakteristik özelliklerinden (kültürleri, gelenekleri, farklılıkları) emek pazarının yapısına ve güvensizliğine, koruyucu emek yasalarının sınırlarına, devletin aracılık sistemini desteklemesine, işverenlerin tercihlerine ve işçilerin tüm bunlarla başetmek için geliştirdikleri stareteji ve yöntemlere çekmek amaçlanmıştır. Devletin tarım emek pazarında aracılık sistemini desteklemesine (özellikle METİP sürecinde kontrol/gözetim amacıyla araçsallaştırarak) yapılan vurgu genel-geçer söylemde yerleşmiş olan geneleksel aracı modern(leştirici) devlet karşıtlığının bir eleştirisidir. Mevcut durumda işverenlerin kısa dönemli emek talebini ve emek pazarının güvensizliğini dikkate alarak işçilerin aktif olarak aracılarla çalışmayı tercih etmesinin işverene karşı kendilerini korumak ve iş

imkanlarını artırmak, sağlık yardımı, iş için göç ve yeni bir bölgede çalışmaya başlamak, jandarmayla ilişkileri kolaylaştırmak gibi pek çok sebebi olabilir.

Aracılık pratikleri *[labor contractors]* sadece Türkiye'de değil, küresel olarak işçi istismarı ve sömürüsüyle birlikte anılmaktadır. Ancak aracılığı sorunun kökeninden ziyade siyasi süreçler ve yasal muafiyetlerle bütün riskleri işçinin omuzlarına yüklenmiş sektörlerin bir semptomu olarak yorumlamak daha yerinde olacaktır. Bugün, Türkiye tarım emek pazarında aracıların işçi istismarını körükleyen, işçilerin ücretlerini ve koşullarını garanti altında almak ve sağlık, ulaşım gibi imkanlara ulaşmak için desteğe olan ihtiyaçlarıdır. Tarımda istismarı ve sömürüyü azaltmank için bu sektörde yoğunlaşan Kürt, Roman ve/veya kadın işçilerin sosyal haklara erişim sorununu çözmek; ve bu amaçla öncelikle işçileri çalışma haklarıyla işverenler karşısında güçlendirmek gerekmektedir.

APPENDIX D: TEZ FOTOKOPİSİ İZİN FORMU

ENSTİTÜ

Fen Bilimleri Enstitüsü ☐

Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü ■

Uygulamalı Matematik Enstitüsü ☐

Enformatik Enstitüsü ☐

Deniz Bilimleri Enstitüsü ☐

YAZARIN

Soyadı : Mura
Adı : Elif Sabahat
Bölümü : Sosyoloji

TEZİN ADI : Dynamics of Intermediation in the Agricultural Labor Market: Women Workers in Adapazarı, Turkey

TEZİN TÜRÜ : Yüksek Lisans ☐ Doktora ■

1. Tezimin tamamından kaynak gösterilmek şartıyla fotokopi alınabilir. ☐

2. Tezimin içindekiler sayfası, özet, indeks sayfalarından ve/veya bir bölümünden kaynak gösterilmek şartıyla fotokopi alınabilir. ☐

3. Tezimden bir bir (1) yıl süreyle fotokopi alınamaz. ■

TEZİN KÜTÜPHANEYE TESLİM TARİHİ: