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Global Production and Migrant Networks – Risk dynamics

- Changing dynamics of GPNs
  - High value agriculture exports
  - Coordination, dominance of buyers
  - ‘Value’ commercial/social (eg. Fairtrade)

- Migrant labour in GPNs
  - Sustains GPNs in many developing countries (eg. Bangladesh, China, India, Ghana).
  - Enhances employment, incomes, well being

- GPNs drivers of:
  - Risk: downward commercial pressures, concentrated shocks, migrant labour buffer
  - Opportunities: new avenues for protection
Social protection, migrant and global production networks
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Ghana Pineapple Sector

- Rapid growth pineapple exports (70,000 tons of $US22 million in 2004)
- Destinations EU (especially UK and German supermarkets)
- Volatility of export markets (switch from Sweet Cayenne to MD2 drop to 47,000 tons in 2005)
- Labour intensive, year round production
- Estimated 30-40% migrants from Central and Volta regions
Research Aims

- Assess comparative risks and vulnerabilities faced by migrant workers in pineapple exports (primary and secondary migrants)
- How should effective social protection be adapted for migrant labour?
Migrant Labour in Pineapples

- Two groups identified:
  - *Primary Migrants*: independently migrated in search of work, current location separate from ‘hometown’ of origin
  - *Secondary migrants*: born locally to migrants or migrated as children with family, current location separate from the ‘hometown’ to which they remain affiliated.
Case Study - Research Methodology

- Key informant interviews (No = 20+)
- Mapping of GPNs – selection of 4 locations
  - Small farms and outgrowers
  - Medium sized producers
  - Large exporter/producers
- Certification/Agreements: Eurepgap, Fairtrade, (larger exporter/producers only)
- Farm level semi-structured interviews
- Worker questionnaire (no=282) and FGDs (no=8)
- Selected family life histories (no=4)
## Spread of Workers Across Farms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Production Level</th>
<th>Category 1</th>
<th>Category 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Location 1</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location 2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location 3</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location 4</td>
<td>41</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>149</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Exporter
  - Location 1: 91
  - Location 2: 0
  - Location 3: 17
  - Location 4: 41
  - Total: 149

- Large farm
  - Location 1: 8
  - Location 2: 3
  - Location 3: 1
  - Location 4: 7
  - Total: 19

- Small outgrower
  - Location 1: 26
  - Location 2: 0
  - Location 3: 23
  - Location 4: 15
  - Total: 64

- Independent smallholder
  - Location 1: 7
  - Location 2: 4
  - Location 3: 15
  - Location 4: 24
  - Total: 50

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total</th>
<th>132</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>56</th>
<th>87</th>
<th>282</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Note:** The table shows the distribution of workers across different categories of production levels and locations.
Profile of migrant workers

- Profile of participants: 108 Primary migrants, 147 secondary migrants (27 indigenes - comparator group)
- Gender ratio 2:1 male to female
- Age: primary migrants on average older than secondary
- Education: primary migrants better educated (62% JSS+) than secondary (50% JSS+)
- Skill: primary migrants more often in skilled jobs (spraying and packing)
- Primary migrants origin:
  - 50% Volta Region, 21% Eastern Region
  - 66% moved to find employment
  - 72% living with dependent household members
Risks and vulnerabilities of migrant workers in pineapples

- Pineapples provides higher incomes BUT higher risks (eg. MD2 switch)
- Job security:
  - primary migrants more often in permanent jobs, secondary migrants in temporary/‘casual’ jobs
  - 97% primary migrants and 91% secondary migrants worked year round
  - 50% primary migrants, 39% secondary migrants had contracts of employment
- Wages insufficient to live and support dependents BUT provide regular income
- Secondary migrants more supplementary sources of income than primary migrants
Regimes of Reciprocity

- Primary migrants found work through social networks (secondary direct through employer)
- Hometown levies to welfare fund (paid by resident and non-resident citizens):
  - Primary migrants more likely to contribute
  - Secondary migrants expected to contribute, but often said unable to because of low incomes
- Primary migrants more likely to send remittances (mainly parents at origin)
- In times of need
  - All migrants turned to family and friends in equal ratio (57%)
  - 9% primary migrants turned to community, 12% secondary migrants.
Migrant Worker

- “Yes it has helped me because I am able to send some money at the end of the month to my mother in Volta. I am able to buy cloth and save some money too.”
Public/Employer based protection

- Social Security (SSNIT)
  - 40% primary migrants
  - 32% secondary migrants
  - 55% of workers in export farms with standards covered, only 12% in non-export farms without standards

- Employer benevolence
  - 43-45% of primary and secondary migrants would turn to their employer in times of need
Private/CSR based protection

- CSR & private initiatives
  - Private standards (Eurepgap & labour codes)
  - Fairtrade and buyer/export initiatives

- Trade Union CBAs
  - 48% export farms with standards, 5% in farms without standards
  - Permanent workers NOT temporary and casual workers

- Migrant workers rights and social protection based on employment status
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Conclusion

- Pineapple exports providing source of income and protection for migrant workers – BUT export risks
- Primary migrants:
  - More likely in permanent work
  - Better Public and Private based protection (especially in large export farms with CBAs and Fairtrade)
  - More dependent on pineapples (with risks)
  - Stronger origin hometown protection, family networks important
- Secondary migrants:
  - More likely in temporary & casual work
  - Poorer public and private based protection
  - Less dependent on pineapple employment with alternative income sources
  - Lower origin hometown protection, family networks important
- Addressing commercial risks key to promotive/transformative protection IF temporary/casual migrants covered