

Working Paper  
T-30

## **Social Protection for Migrant Labour In the Ghanaian Pineapple Sector**

S. BARRIENTOS\*, J. ANARFI\*\*, N. LAMHAUGE\*\*\*,  
A. CASTALDO\*\*\*\*, N. AKUA ANYIDOHO\*\*

\* Institute for Development Policy and Management, University of Manchester

\*\* Institute of Statistical, Social and Economic Research, University of Ghana

\*\*\* Institute of Development Studies

\*\*\*\* Sussex Centre for Migration Research, University of Sussex

**September 2009**



The UK Department for International Development (DFID) supports policies, programmes and projects to promote poverty reduction globally. DFID provided funds for this study as part of that goal but the views and opinions expressed are those of the author(s) alone.

Development Research Centre on  
Migration, Globalisation and Poverty  
Arts C-226, University of Sussex  
Brighton BN1 9SJ

Website: <http://www.migrationdrc.org>  
Email: [migration@sussex.ac.uk](mailto:migration@sussex.ac.uk)  
Tel: +44 (0)1273 873394  
Fax: +44 (0)1273 873158

This paper may be reproduced free of charge in any format provided the source is acknowledged.

## Executive Summary

The expansion of export production for global supermarkets has generated new employment channels for internal rural-rural migrant workers in Africa. Yet analysis of migrant labour in the global economy tends to focus on rural-urban migration or the movement of workers across international borders. Internal migrant labourers work at the interface of the advancing commercialisation of global agriculture and of more traditional forms of rural livelihood generation. Agro-export production involves inherent risks, particularly from commercial shocks as consumer trends change. How the benefits and risks affect migrant workers is little understood. To what extent do migrant workers gain from incorporation into agro-exports? What are the avenues for protection of migrant workers in a rapidly changing global economy? How can strategies be enhanced to reduce the impact of negative shocks on migrant labour?

This paper examines these questions based on a study of the pineapple export sector in Ghana. This is a new and growing export crop, contributing to the role of agro-exports in reducing poverty within Ghana. Ghana's pineapple export sector has grown rapidly between 1986 and 2002, with production increasing from 2,600 to 42,000 metric tons. Production for export is based mainly in the Eastern Region, in locations north of Accra. The main export destinations are in Europe (particularly Germany and the UK), where supermarket retailing is becoming the dominant retail outlet. Supermarkets have increasingly required compliance with standards relating to agricultural practice (eg. Eurep-gap) and social compliance. More recently there has been a move by some producer and exporter groups to become Fairtrade and Organic accredited.

Pineapple production is labour intensive, and case studies indicate that approximately one third of workers are migrants from other regions within Ghana, particularly the Volta and Central Regions. The aim of the project was to assess the comparative risks and vulnerabilities faced by internal migrant workers in pineapple exports, what channels for social protection are open to them, and how they can be made more effective for migrant workers. The risks these workers face were highlighted in 2002-4 when a sudden switch by global supermarkets took place from the traditional pineapple variety grown in Ghana to a new variety (MD2). Much of the production of Sweet Cayenne went unsold and exporters failed to meet payment obligations. Small-scale producers were least able to cope or make the switch. Many migrant workers were made unemployed or went unpaid. Children were withdrawn from school as the crisis hit household incomes. This highlights the importance of protection for migrant workers in a sector subject to commercial shocks.

The project draws on an analysis of global production networks (GPNs), whereby linkages between production, distribution and consumption are coordinated through lead buyers or supermarkets. GPN analysis facilitates exploration of the interaction between the commercial dynamics of the sector, and the social context of employment, which combined generate both potential risks and channels of protection for migrant workers.

The intersection between global production networks and social protection was unpacked through a case study in the pineapple export sector. Key informant interviews were carried out with over 20 government, NGO, trade and commercial organisations. Four key pineapple growing locations were identified in which exporters, large farms, out-growers (small-scale farmers selling direct to the same exporters or larger farms) and independent producers were selected. These were selected as a purposive not a representative cross-section of the pineapple sector. Interviews took place with farm managers/owners and a total of 282 workers using both a survey and focus group discussions. A stakeholder workshop was held in Accra in the latter part of the study to discuss provisional findings. Two different value chains were identified at producer level: Category 1 exporters and large farms and their outgrowers who directly supply supermarkets and are expected to comply with technical and social standards; and Category 2 medium-sized and smaller independent farms indirectly exporting through agents who did not have to comply with technical or social standards.

Two groups of migrant workers were identified on the pineapple farms: (i) those who have independently migrated in search of work, and whose current location is different from their 'hometown' of origin – primary migrants; and (ii) those who were born to migrants or migrated as children with family, and whose current location is separate from the 'hometown' to which they remain affiliated – secondary migrants. In this paper, we explore the extent to which the employment benefits, risks and protection needs of these two groups are likely to differ based on their employment position within the pineapple export sector.

The study found that primary migrants were on average older, better educated/skilled, and more concentrated on larger farms. They tended to benefit from greater employment security, better health and safety provision, and levels of employment protection. Secondary migrants were younger, with lower education levels and skill, and more concentrated on smaller farms. They had less employment security, health and safety provision, and employment protection.

Regardless of migrant status, on average 55 percent of the respondents were permanent workers (although primary migrants were slightly over the average). Amongst the non-permanent workers there was a clear

difference according to migrant status - 14 percent of primary migrants were temporary workers and 28 percent casual.<sup>1</sup> A much higher percentage of secondary migrants were casual workers. However, despite the overall high percentage of casual workers, a large majority - 97 percent of primary and 91 percent of secondary casual migrants - said that they worked throughout the year. Their actual work is thus often not reflected in their formal employment status – less than a third of all migrants had written employment contracts -, which means they are less able to access their legal employment rights or employment-related benefits.

Overall, primary migrants said that they were better off than they would have been if they had not migrated. However, primary migrants were more dependent on pineapple employment with less alternative sources of income, and more vulnerable in the case of employment shocks. Secondary migrants were more likely to have alternative sources of income and access to land or small-scale plots. Their risks were therefore diversified and, to this extent, they were less vulnerable to sudden shocks arising from changes in the export sector - such as the sudden switch from Sweet Cayenne to MD2 as the pineapple for export.

Social protection acts as a buffer against the risks and vulnerability faced by migrant workers and their households. The migrant labourers in this study could access social protection through three channels.<sup>2</sup> Each one of these channels contributes to a differing extent to the form of social protection available, and different actors that may be involved in protection provision.

*Reciprocity Regimes refer to the cross-cutting informal family and community networks and institutions, and might include informal savings clubs and funeral societies.*

Many migrants in focus group discussions indicated that they often migrate to pineapple areas because they know others from their family or hometown in those places (these individuals are usually those who inform new migrants about employment opportunities in the pineapple sector). The study found that family members are ranked highest as the people migrant workers will turn to in times of need (56-57% of both primary and secondary migrants). A lower proportion indicated that they would turn to friends, and even less to their communities (9% of primary and 12% of secondary migrants).

Being older, primary migrants were more likely to shoulder greater responsibilities than secondary migrants. If they had dependent family in the place of origin, there was greater expectation on them to remit than their

---

<sup>1</sup> Temporary workers were employed for more than six months but less than twelve months per year, casual workers for less than six months on the same farm.

<sup>2</sup> Adapted from Sabates-Wheeler and Waite (2003), here we differentiate between the three channels prevalent in the context of GPNs.

younger counterparts, especially where parents were still living in their home towns. Secondary migrants felt they were often unable to meet expectations of hometown support, and were therefore less likely to be able to turn to their hometown for protection later in life.

This raises the question as to whether commercialisation through larger export farming is contributing to greater individualisation and a decline in more traditional community-based rural social networks. Family networks, especially of primary migrants also employed in the same sector, appear to have little hope of addressing covariant risks that might arise, such as commercial instability in the level of exports. Further research would be needed comparing new and traditional agro-export sectors to investigate this issue in more depth.

*Public Regimes refer to social assistance and insurance arrangements to mitigate risk either through direct state benefits funded from taxation, such as state allowances, or private schemes or through employer-based funds, such as pension and health insurance.*

Government social assistance and insurance and employer benevolence go part of the way to addressing risk and vulnerability by supporting the protection of workers in the event of idiosyncratic and covariant risks. The main government-based scheme in Ghana is through the Social Security National Insurance Trust (SSNIT) which provides a formal social protection mechanism. However, levels of coverage through SSNIT are on average low with only 41% of primary and 33% of secondary migrants contributing. Workers on Category 1 farms were more likely to benefit from coverage, but even here 45% remained uncovered. Therefore enforcement of public regimes of reciprocity in the pineapple sector is at best patchy. The fact that a large number of casual workers were in effect working all year round means they were not able to access their full employment entitlements.

*Private Regimes are dependent on employer benevolence, corporate social responsibility, and translate into an extension of labour rights to migrant workers.*

The study found that workers rank their employer as the second most likely person after family that they would approach in times of need, even though many are unsure as to whether they would receive help. A new dimension to social protection for workers in pineapple exports is through the implementation of standards and corporate social responsibility by large buyers (particularly European supermarkets) in their global production networks. On the basis of anecdotal information it appears that these standards have begun to address issues of worker rights, which could contribute to enhancing their social protection. Given primary migrants are more likely to be employed as permanent workers and on category 1 farms, they are more likely to benefit than

secondary migrants. To the extent that standards and social responsibility enhance the security of producers within the value chain (eg. Eurepgap), or promote social justice (eg. Codes of labour practice and Fairtrade) it *could* be argued that they have the potential to promote greater social protection. But these improvements still only reach a limited section of the workforce, rarely benefitting temporary and casual workers.

### *Key Policy Conclusions*

- ***Global export production provides benefits for rural-rural migrants:*** Primary migrants who had taken an active choice to migrate reported that they were in a better position as a result. In this study primary migrants were also more concentrated in permanent employment, where the benefits of employment protection were higher. Promotion of permanent employment incorporating legal benefits and rights in global export production can contribute to poverty reduction in rural areas.
- ***Commercial risks that compound the vulnerability of migrant workers should be addressed:*** Primary migrants were more dependent on their employment than secondary migrants, and therefore more exposed in the event of adverse commercial shocks. Shocks can occur for a number of reasons, including supermarket pressure on prices and sudden changes in consumer demand. Commercial and government actors need to do more to buffer the effects of adverse shocks on producers and migrant workers. In the MD2 crisis, had buyers made a more gradual shift and engaged in dialogue with government and donors, measures could have been put in place to support the transition from one product to the next with less damaging economic and social consequences.
- ***The employment status of workers needs to be regularised to be protected:*** 45% of all migrants were temporary and casual workers but a significant proportion were found to be working all year round, without benefiting from the protection accruing to permanent workers. Their employment status needs to be regularised to ensure they enjoy the full protection which they should be entitled to in accordance with the actual amount of work they do.
- ***Channels of social protection need greater synergy and focus on migrant workers:*** Social protection can be accessed through different channels within global production networks involving: family and community, government, and private employers, supermarket standards and social responsibility initiatives. There needs to be greater synergy between these, with a specific focus on the protection needs of migrant workers.
- ***Collective Bargaining Agreements (CBAs) should include temporary and casual workers:*** Currently CBAs only cover workers on permanent contracts. They need to be extended to include all

workers to ensure that temporary and casual workers also receive their proportionate entitlements, and are given permanent status if working all year.

- **Enforcement of government employment benefits:** Ensuring workers' receipt of government employment benefits is enforced in the pineapple sector; all workers need to participate in SSNIT.
- **Extend benefits of private protection to all workers:** Social standards and Fairtrade initiatives found under private regimes of protection have the potential to play a more promotive role. But this can only be realised if these benefits are extended to all migrant workers. Currently neither of these channels are addressing those in temporary or casual work, even if they actually work most of the year. Only if these workers were more systematically reached, involving a significant shift in coverage, could these channels play a more promotive role.

#### *Key Contact Details*

Dr Stephanie Barrientos, IDPM, University of Manchester,

Email [Stephanie.barrientos@manchester.ac.uk](mailto:Stephanie.barrientos@manchester.ac.uk)

Professor John Anarfi, ISSER, University of Ghana,

Email [jkanarfi@isser.ug.edu.gh](mailto:jkanarfi@isser.ug.edu.gh) or [jkanarfi@yahoo.com](mailto:jkanarfi@yahoo.com)



## Table of contents

<b>Executive Summary</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>1. Introduction</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>2. Pineapple Export Production – Sector overview</b>	<b>13</b>
2.1 <i>Ghana’s pineapple sector</i>	13
2.2 <i>Structure of the pineapple sector</i>	14
2.3 <i>Migrant Labour in Ghana’s Pineapple Sector</i>	16
2.4 <i>Standards in the Pineapple sector</i>	16
2.5 <i>Recent trends in Ghana’s pineapple sector</i>	18
2.6 <i>Social Protection for Migrant Labour</i>	19
<b>3. Analysis of Migrant Labour in Global Production Networks</b>	<b>22</b>
<b>4. Research Methods</b>	<b>26</b>
<b>5. Case study of pineapple migrant workers</b>	<b>30</b>
5.1 <i>Profile</i>	30
5.2 <i>Employment</i>	31
5.3 <i>Income</i>	34
5.4 <i>Health</i>	35
<b>6. Enhancing protection of migrant labour in global production</b>	<b>38</b>
6.1 <i>Reciprocity Regimes of Protection: Social and Community-Level Networks</i>	38
6.2 <i>Public Regimes of Protection: Social Assistance &amp; Insurance - Employer-level protection</i>	42
6.3 <i>Private Regimes of Protection: Corporate Social Responsibility &amp; voluntary initiatives</i>	43
<b>7. Conclusions</b>	<b>47</b>

## 1. Introduction<sup>3</sup>

The changing dynamics of global production, and the associated changes in job opportunities, is an increasing driver of internal migration. Following export liberalisation in the 1980s, many African countries have moved into the production of high value agro-exports (HVAEs). Horticultural products (including fresh fruit, vegetables and flowers) are challenging traditional crops (such as tea, coffee and cocoa) as export earners. HVAEs are increasingly produced for export into global production networks dominated by large supermarket chains, which demand high quality standards (technical, environmental and social) from their suppliers. This production is providing new employment and income earning opportunities in rural areas. In many African countries this is stimulating flows of rural-rural migration from poorer regions to areas of agro-export crop production. Employment in HVAEs can offer benefits to migrant workers beyond those provided by more traditional sources of agricultural livelihood; but it also carries with it specific risks arising from the concentration of production linked to being locked into global value chains. This paper examines the role of migrant labour in Ghanaian pineapple production, a crop which is often produced for export to Northern supermarkets. It assesses the comparative risks and vulnerabilities faced by migrant workers. Finally, it considers how social protection for internal migrant workers can be promoted through a combination of public, private and community provision in the context of global production.

The pineapple export sector yields higher income for producers than crops grown for domestic markets and provides new employment opportunities for internal migrants to improve their livelihoods. The benefits to migrant workers are the potential to earn higher wages than in other agricultural sectors, and the possibility of regular employment (much migrant employment in the pineapple sector is year round). However, export production also involves high commercial risks, which tend to be offset onto weaker actors in the chain. Producer risks (such as price volatility or delayed payments) are often passed down the supply chain to workers. This can result in low wage rates and poor benefits, lack of employment security, and inadequate health and safety standards/provision. In the event of a sudden commercial shock (as happened in the early 2000s with the sudden switch from the Sweet Cayenne to the MD2 variety of pineapple), failure to export can result in widespread non-payment of wages or loss of employment. Migrant workers and dependent households are potentially most vulnerable in this context, with the lowest ability to manage risk by drawing on their own assets or calling on extended family and community support networks.

---

<sup>3</sup> We would like to thank the research assistants and Masters students at ISSER who participated in the fieldwork and analysis for their assistance on this project.

The implications for the protection of migrant workers and their dependents are only beginning to be understood. If we understand social protection as comprising all interventions that address risk and vulnerability, then insertion into global value chains potentially generates new avenues that could complement existing protective mechanisms. This paper focuses on a case study of internal migrant labour in the Ghanaian pineapple sector. It seeks to examine the specific dynamics of migrant employment in the sector, and the benefits and risks faced by those workers. It explores how the protection of migrant labour can be enhanced, involving not only government, but also other commercial actors in the value chain.

The paper is divided into five further sections. Section two provides an overview of the pineapple sector in Ghana. Section three examines the analytical literature on global production networks, migrant labour and social protection. Section four outlines the research methodology used for this case study. Section 5 examines findings on the employment of migrant workers in the Ghanaian pineapple sector. Section six examines the challenges and opportunities for the protection of migrant workers, and considers the role of different channels or regimes of protection. Section seven concludes.

## 2. Pineapple Export Production – Sector overview

Trade carried out within global production networks needs to be contextualised in relation to the local economic and social environment in which production is embedded. In the case of Ghana the expansion of agro-exports (including HVAEs) is playing an increasingly important role in the country's economic development, as well as poverty reduction. Here we examine this economic context in more detail before considering further the role of migrant labour in the process.

### 2.1 Ghana's pineapple sector

Ghana's agricultural export sector has historically depended on its traditional exports (gold, timber, and cocoa). In response to structural adjustment programmes (SAPs) and other policy changes promoting economic liberalisation in the early 1980s, the non-traditional agricultural export sector received increased support from the government and the donor community (Takane, 2004). The export of fruits and vegetables has subsequently experienced a steady increase (see table below). In 1999, pineapples accounted for 15 percent of Ghana's non-traditional agricultural exports, totalling 33,000 tons compared to only 57 tons in 1983 (*ibid.*). In 2004 Ghana exported 70,000 tons of pineapples worth around \$US22 million, making it a major supplier to the European market together with Côte d'Ivoire and Costa Rica (Danielou & Ravry, 2005). While large global producers of pineapples such as the Philippines and Indonesia process much of their production into juice and canned pineapple, Ghana is one of the main exporters of fresh produce (Achuonjei, 2003).

Although the pineapple sector in Ghana primarily targets the European market (Germany, Italy, Belgium, and the UK), there is also a sizable domestic market. While a number of processing companies produce pineapple juice for urban consumers, the domestic market also plays a crucial role in absorbing excess supply that does not meet the European quality requirements.

**Table 2.1 Pineapple Exports**

**Export of Fresh Pineapples from Ghana, 1978-1999 (tons).**

Year	1978	1979	1980	1981	1982	1983	1984	1985
Pineapple Export	48	54	8	10	44	57	650	1,807
Year	1986	1987	1988	1989	1990	1991	1992	1993
Pineapple Export	2,668	4,130	4,191	7,947	9,440	10,674	9,753	13,157
Year	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999		
Pineapple Export	14,954	15,764	27,603	25,124	21,940	33,440		

*Source: Obeng (1994) and Ghana Export Promotion Council, cited in Takane, (2004).*

The production of pineapples is geographically concentrated along the coastal savannah. Goldstein and Udry (1999) attribute this concentration to soil characteristics, rainfall patterns and proximity to the international airport and ports used for export. Land used for pineapple farming tends to be more acidic and have lower organic carbon content than that used for other crops (ibid.). A large proportion of the coastal areas were therefore uncultivated before investments were made in the pineapple sector. Traditional village leaders were thus eager to lease the land to investors (Takane, 2004). The leases are usually 30-50 years long, ensuring investors sufficient return on their initial outlay. The investors' land-use rights are further protected by the Land Title Registration Law (1986) introduced as part of the SAPs.

## *2.2 Structure of the pineapple sector*

Although the pineapple sector is often seen as being suitable for mechanisation, in Ghana it has to a large extent been based on small-scale producers who supply an estimated 45 percent of the produce being exported (Goldstein and Udry, 1999; Jensen, 2005) – aka 'outgrowers'. They typically supply export companies and larger farms, who export a larger quantity than they themselves can produce. While smallholders benefit from cheaper family labour, they are restricted by their limited access to inputs and credit (Obeng, 1994 cited in Jensen, 2005).

Pineapple farmers in Ghana are usually grouped into three categories according to their size ranging from small-scale and outgrowers, to medium-sized farmers and large-scale producers/exporters (ibid.; Danielou & Ravry, 2005; Fold and Gough 2008). While the majority of the small-scale farms are owned by the local population, some of the medium-sized and larger farms are established through joint ventures with international partners (ibid.). In 2004-2005 the first multinational agribusiness corporation Compagnie Fruitière, registered locally as Golden Exotic (in which Dole has a 40 percent stake), also entered the market (ibid.).

Small-scale producers and outgrowers typically grow pineapples on less than 20 hectares of land (Takane, 2004). The pineapple sector is well-suited to small-scale farmers since the initial investment is minimal and the gestation period of 13 months is relatively short. The close proximity of pineapple-growing areas to urban centres also secures farmers access to markets (Danielou & Ravry, 2005). While small-scale producers sell primarily for the local market, many outgrowers have formal or informal arrangements with exporting and processing companies (ibid.). When demand is high, exporters sometimes outbid each other for the outgrowers' fruit, while they may fail to honour prior agreements when the market is limited (Yeboah, 2005a). Exporters will also reject the fruit if they do not meet the European quality standards on size, colour, weight

and sugar/acid content (Danielou & Ravry, 2005). Despite these risks and the long payment cycles of up to six months, many outgrowers prefer to sell their fruit to exporters since prices are higher (Takane, 2004). Where a formal relationship is established between the two parties, the exporter may supply the outgrower with inputs such as seeds, chemicals and cash advances (Danielou & Ravry, 2005). After the harvest, the cost of the inputs is subtracted from the pay for the produce (ibid.). This practice however became less common in the late 1990s and onwards when the pineapple sector experienced financial difficulties due to enhanced competition from Costa Rica (MOFA interview, 2006).

The medium-sized farms usually range between 20-150 ha (Takane, 2004). Many owners of these farms are not native to the community but lease the land from traditional rulers for 30-50 years. The long lease assures sufficient return on initial investment. The non-resident owners often employ farm managers to supervise the daily activities on the farm (ibid.). In order to minimise risk, farmers may choose to supply to a number of exporters and local processing companies since they usually rely on oral agreements (ibid.). Some exporters provide farm owners with information on recommended field practices to meet European quality standards (ibid.).

Large-scale producer-exporters operate under a number of different organizational models. While some rely on their own production to ensure a consistent quality, others depend to varying degrees on outgrowers and medium-sized farmers to supply some or all of the fruit (Danielou & Ravry, 2005). When own production does not meet demand, exporters often prefer to source other exporters and large-scale commercial farmers since they are likely to be bound to the same quality standards (Takane, 2004). It is also more cost- and time-efficient than sourcing from a large number of small-holders. As noted earlier, there are usually no formal agreements between exporters and outgrowers. While this enables exporters to reduce the amount they buy from outgrowers when demand falls, it also means that outgrowers can sell their fruit to other exporters with whom they do not have such direct relations, who sometimes offer higher prices (Yeboah, 2005a). As long as exporters are credit-constrained and cannot meet demand, the unreliable supply from the outgrowers makes it difficult for them to enter long-term contracts with European importers (ibid.). Takane (2004) argues that as exporters increasingly secure long-term land leases, it will be easier for them to meet demand from their own production.

### *2.3 Migrant Labour in Ghana's Pineapple Sector*

Pineapple production is labour intensive, and requires the year round employment of a core labour force. Rapid growth of the sector has been facilitated by the influx of internal migrant labour, primarily based on rural-rural migration. Case studies in different locations indicate that one third or more of the labour force (35-40%) are internal migrants, who are predominantly male but include some female (Osae, 2005). Migrant workers primarily come from other parts of Ghana, mainly the Central and Volta regions. Ghana has a long history and culture of migration (Manuh, 2005). Labour migrants have played a major role in Ghana's economic development when many of them were attracted into the mining and cocoa sector, which needed human capital (Knudsen, 2008).

There are many types of migration, each type determined by the motive or reason for migrating. Any person who moves to settle in a new place on a permanent or semi-permanent basis for the purpose of selling their labour is a labour migrant. This should be differentiated from labour mobility, which can also include daily or short-term movements for work, such as commuting, although as households become more 'multi-spatial' (or transnational), it is often difficult to distinguish clearly between the two (Knudsen, 2008). Migration in Ghana, as elsewhere in Africa, is often circulatory. It does not necessarily involve a clean break from one's place of origin. The goal for many migrants is to eventually return "home". They therefore maintain a close link with their hometown whilst in migration. This takes the form of visits, communication and participation in certain activities in the hometown such as festivals, funerals and development programmes. Many migrants build houses in their hometowns before they invest in housing at their current place of residence. This highlights the complex and often diverse local social networks from which migrant labour entering employment in pineapple production can often be drawn.

### *2.4 Standards in the Pineapple sector*

Farmers can also be differentiated according to the level of certification they have acquired. While the majority of the smallholders and outgrowers have no certification, the exporters must be EurepGap certified in order to enter the European market. In addition to that, many retailers have developed their own specifications for imported fresh fruits and vegetables on appearance, residue levels, packaging, labelling etc. (Sessay, 2006). Meeting these standards however has been a challenge for the small and medium-sized Ghanaian producers, threatening the successful growth of the sector (ibid.). In an attempt to address this issue, the Government of Ghana in partnership with the Horticultural Export Industry Initiative, the German Technical Cooperation

Organization and USAID is working towards certification of all small-scale producers who export (Ministry of Trade, 2006). This is primarily done through EurepGap Option 2 certification of farmer groups. This ensures that farmers adopt safe and sustainable production techniques, especially with reference to pest management (ibid.). In collaboration with Ghana Standard Board (GSB) the horticultural sector also works towards the satisfaction of international quality standards, through the creation of standards and inspection manuals, and the implementation of testing procedures in pack houses and at export departure points.

In addition to technical standards, many European supermarkets have begun to request assurances, through codes of labour practice, covering employment conditions in the production of the fruit they source. This ethical trade resulted from NGO and trade union campaigns against poor labour conditions during the late 1980s and early 1990s. The more comprehensive codes are based on the rights enshrined in the UN Declaration of Human Rights and International Labour Organisation (ILO) Core Conventions, including provisions on discrimination, freedom of association and collective bargaining, child and forced labour, as well as health and safety. They also require that producers comply with all relevant labour legislation, or the code, which ever sets the higher standard (Barrientos and Dolan 2006). Ghanaian pineapple farms exporting directly to large supermarkets are therefore expected to comply with labour codes.

Some pineapple farms in Ghana have also been able to take advantage of the preferential terms offered by Fairtrade. The Fairtrade movement has traditionally sought to achieve its goals through facilitating the involvement of small-scale producer cooperatives in international trade and providing them with a number of guarantees, typically: a “fair” price for their products, stable supply relationships, access to credit, and a social premium for community development projects. Fairtrade farms employing wage labour are also required to meet employment standards, as set out in codes of labour practice. At the same time, through publicising the plight of marginalised producers and linking them with consumers in the North, the movement aims to raise consciousness about “unfair” trading practices and challenges the impersonal capitalist market practices which characterise global trade (Murray and Reynolds, 2000). During the 1990s Fairtrade ballooned from being a small market niche to having total annual sales of approximately half a billion Euro in 2002 (Young, 2003). While Fairtrade is principally concerned with the terms of trade between buyers and producers, ethical trade (as it is understood in the UK) is focused on ensuring that working conditions in global value chains meet minimum international standards in the mainstream of commercial retailing (Smith and Barrientos, 2005). However, as Fairtrade has expanded its remit in working with larger commercial farms, it has also included labour conditions in its remit. Unlike fair trade, ethical trade provides no price incentives, and is simply a stipulation of supply.



## *2.5 Recent trends in Ghana's pineapple sector*

The risks associated with exporting to multinational enterprises (MNE) and supermarket buyers through global production networks was highlighted in 2000. In that year, Ghana's position in the international market was seriously affected by the emergence of Costa Rica as a competitor on the European market, capable of supplying consistently high-quality produce. Ghana's main variety of pineapple exported until then had been Sweet Cayenne. But in 1996 Costa Rica had introduced a new pineapple variety called MD2, developed by Del Monte (Danielou and Ravry, 2005; Fold and Gough, 2008). MD2 soon gained popularity for its yellow skin colour, golden colour of the meat, sweeter taste, lower acidity level and its durability under transport (ibid.). Although Ghana maintained a market share of 7-8 percent throughout 2000-2004, it failed to keep pace with the rising demand for MD2 pineapples (ibid.). Therefore, as Sweet Cayenne was gradually replaced by MD2 in buyers' baskets, pineapple exports from Ghana decreased from 70,000 tons in 2004 to 47,000 tons in 2005. Large quantities of Sweet Cayenne were not harvested in 2006 and the switch over to MD2 proved very painful. The introduction of MD2 resulted in a sudden commercial shock. The sudden loss of sales meant many producers did not receive payments from exporters they had already supplied, or were unable to sell their output at all. Wages went unpaid, and many workers lost their jobs (particularly temporary and casual workers). The sudden fall in these migrants' household income led many to withdraw their children from school, with long-term detrimental effects on their future.

It is possible that the sector would not have been so badly hit if it had reacted sooner to the switchover to MD2 (MOFA, 2006). The Ghanaian Ministry of Agriculture bought in 2000 some MD2 suckers, but was threatened with legal action by Del Monte, who at the time claimed to have a patent on the variety. Even when it was later discovered that Del Monte did not have the patent, it took time for the farmers to adopt MD2 since much of the inputs were not available. Only in 2003 did two of the larger exporters, Bomarts and Tongu, set up tissue culture cultivation, but by then the sector had already suffered great losses (ibid.). The dwindling margins producers received for their fruit also made it difficult for them to convert to MD2. In an attempt to assist, the government set aside \$2 million to provide low-interest loans for larger exporters to buy planting material (ibid.). The Horticultural Export Initiative was introduced in 2005 to assist smallholders, who otherwise could not access the expensive inputs. Over an 18-month period, 30 million MD2 plantlets, plastic mulch, nurseries and other planting material were allocated to 140 small-scale producers grouped into cooperatives of 8-15 members (ibid.). In return, the cooperatives supplied the land, labour, and any other input. Finally, to improve the quality and consistency of the Ghanaian pineapples, the government in collaboration with donor organisations assisted smallholders in getting EurepGap certification. Large investments have also been made

in the port in Tema, where new cooling facilities have been installed (ibid.). The MD2 crisis provides a clear example of the sudden shocks which an export sector dependent on stringent transnational and supermarket buyers can experience (Fold and Gough, 2008).

Despite the devastating impact of the switch to the MD2 variety on the Ghanaian pineapple sector, some argue that it has been a blessing in disguise (MOFA, 2006). It has caused the demand for pineapples in Europe to double and in the US to triple, to a total of 1.75 million tons of fresh and 1.6 million of processed pineapple in 2005 (ibid). To reap the benefits of this growth, the aim of the Ghanaian pineapple export sector is to regain 10 percent of the market over the next 10 years and 20 percent over the next 20 years (ibid.). It is anticipated that the sector will be able to deliver at its previous capacity in MD2 by 2007 (TIPCEE, 2006). Although exports continue to be dominated by fresh fruits, local processing into sliced pineapple, fruit salad and juicing is on the rise (Danielou & Ravry, 2005). This is a good alternative for fruits rejected for export due to their size, colour and acidity levels (ibid.).

However, to stay competitive it is crucial that Ghana's pineapple sector is able to constantly adapt to changing market trends, be it the introduction of new fruit varieties or the entrance of multinational companies such as Dole/Compagnie Fruitière, Del Monte, Chiquita and Fyffe (GEPC 2006). This demands good knowledge of changing market trends and the market for the Ghanaian produce. Achuonjei (2003) argues that since price rather than quality is a priority for the German market, which is the major destination for Ghanaian pineapples, this also ought to be considered when formulating Ghana's market strategies. At the same time, it is worth keeping in mind that the emphasis in price is less important in countries such as the UK, where quality and reliable supply are key elements (ibid.). In order to capture the higher quality the UK consumers are willing to pay, it is therefore crucial to improve quality, consistency and suitability of the Ghanaian pineapples.

## *2.6 Social Protection for Migrant Labour*

When examining social protection for migrant workers in Ghana's pineapple sector it is important to consider social background in addition to physical mobility. One's migrant status to a large extent determines peoples' financial obligations and the kind of informal social protection they are entitled to. Although people born in a place different from their hometown may be able to assimilate into that society, they face challenges. The fact that they were born in a particular place of residence, but originate from a different hometown, means they are not entitled to certain rights in their current location, such as the right to land and the right to certain social

positions. Migrants can gain access to such rights through marriage, but only as long as the marriage lasts.<sup>4</sup> Since these influence social protection, it is important to distinguish between indigenes whose families originate from the locality and migrants of differing status, i.e. whether they physically migrated to their current place of residence or they were born in a town other than their hometown.

In order to differentiate the various forms of migrant worker status, this project distinguished between primary and secondary migrants. A “primary migrant” refers to people that have actively migrated from their previous place of residence to their current place of residence in search of work. In this study we differentiate at the district level. So, if a person is born in one district but currently resides in another s/he will be considered a primary migrant. At the same time, the person must intend to stay at their current place of residence. A “secondary migrant” is defined here as someone who lives in a place that differs from his/her hometown. The hometown is the persons’ acknowledged place of origin. A person who was brought to a current place of residence as a child is an accompanied migrant. As a minor, s/he did not take part in the decision-making to migrate. His or her status is similar to a person who was born to a primary migrant at the current place of residence. Both are treated as secondary migrants largely because they were not part of the decision-making process. Traditionally, however long a migrant stays in a place, s/he is still a stranger and strangers do not have as much political power as indigenes. Such a situation could limit a person’s access to some informal social protection networks. Therefore, for the purpose of this study, it was found important to distinguish between primary and secondary migrants.

The commonality observed in our study between secondary and primary migrants, compared to indigenes, was that they lacked entitlement to land, rights to which are associated with membership of family/cultural groups. Thus, in the villages and small towns around the pineapple growing areas, there was a clear demarcation between indigenes collectively recognised as land owners and ‘landlords’, and migrants who leased or bought land on less favourable terms, or who worked as care-taker farmers or share-croppers on land belonging to others. When one larger pineapple producer started buying up land in the surrounding villages, secondary migrants often lost their leased lands and were compensated only for their crops, while indigenes were compensated financially for their lands or were given other parcels of land.

This overview highlights some of the complex social arrangements underpinning migrant labour in the rural sector. An important dimension is the persistence of traditional forms of protection that have been carried over

---

<sup>4</sup> For a more detailed discussion of the profile and trends in Ghanaian migration with an international focus see Manuh (2005), and Black and Ammassari (2004).

to migrant flows in and out of hometowns of origin and destination. How this protection plays out can vary for different groups as they have entered into employment in the expanding pineapple sector. It also helps to portray the diversity of socially embedded customs underpinning employment within this global production network. Interaction between this social diversity of workers and commercially-driven global production plays an important part in shaping the differing channels that can contribute to promoting protection for these workers.

### 3. Analysis of Migrant Labour in Global Production Networks

The expansion of high value agricultural exports has been significant over the past two decades, with an estimated growth by the World Bank (2008) of 6-7% per annum.<sup>5</sup> HVAEs are estimated to account for two thirds of agricultural trade in terms of value (Dolan and Sorby, 2003). Horticulture alone accounted for 43% of agro-food exports, worth about US\$138 billion in 2004 (World Bank, 2008). A distinguishing feature of HVAEs is the extent to which production is linked into more integrated supply chains, compared with more traditional export crops. Global value chain (GVC) analysis has helped to explore the dynamics of the inter-linkages between commercial actors within a chain (Kaplinsky, 2000; Gereffi, Humphrey et al. 2001). It focuses on the way in which production, distribution and retailing are coordinated with an increasing focus on consumer-led output. Large buyers (supermarkets in the case of food) occupy a powerful commercial position within these chains. They play a dominant governance role which allows them to dictate production and distribution conditions down to supplier level. This contrasts with traditional arms length export markets, occupied by more fragmented commercial agents, where primary producers and final buyers are remote, or in the case of traded commodities have quite dislocated connections.

Changing patterns of trade are an important stimulus for new migrant flows. An important context for the analysis of economic migration linked to global production are the changing dynamics of transnational capital and trade flows between developed and developing countries. A systems approach helps to map these out at an aggregate level, and track the spatial inter-linkages between these and flows of migrant labour (Skeldon, 1997). Analysis of the dynamics of migrant labour in global value chains pushes us to examine further the macro to meso linkages between coordinated commercial actors within chains and the wider networks of migrant labour drawn in to sustain production. However the analytical tools of the GVC approach have proved less well equipped to analyse how these play out in diverse developing country contexts at a local level. GVC analysis has been challenged by the broader conceptual approach of Global Production Networks (GPN), which incorporates the social and institutional environment in which commercial actors are embedded (Henderson, Dicken et al., 2002). Whilst it has much in common with GVC analysis, this wider approach explores mediation between global commercial and local social dynamics that involve synergies and tensions that can vary within and between homogeneous export chains and diverse developing country supply

---

<sup>5</sup> HVAEs are an expanding group of agro-exports such as fresh fruit, vegetables, flowers and meat that have become more easy to export through cool chain advances and sell for a premium on world markets compared to more traditional developing country agricultural exports such as tea, coffee, cocoa and sugar (World Bank 2008).

locations.<sup>6</sup> With some exceptions, GVC and GPN analysis have tended to overlook the role of labour, particularly migrant workers, and tended to focus on firms as the main unit of investigation (Pelger and Knorringa, 2007).

In the value chain and production network literature, there has been increasing analysis of the challenges for producers selling to dominant buyers who dictate the terms of supply. One dimension has been the increase in exacting standards, ranging from those covering good agricultural practice (such as Eurep-gap renamed Global-gap), environmental criteria, and more recently, the social conditions of production (Smith, Auret et al., 2003; Dolan and Humphrey, 2004; Vorley, 2004). Another dimension has been the increasingly stringent commercial terms, relating to price and volatility of orders. These have put pressure on producers, as dominant buyers use their governance of value chains to capture the high values resulting from improved quality themselves, whilst passing on the risk element downwards to producers. And the ultimate buffer against commercial risk and volatility at farm and packhouse level for producers operating on tight margins is labour (Acona 2004; Barrientos and Kritzinger, 2004; Oxfam, 2004).

Much of the analysis of economic migration linked to globalisation has tended to focus on international movement from poorer to richer countries or internally on rural-urban flows of labour to work in labour intensive manufacturing industry (Harris, 1995; Skeldon, 1997; Castles and Miller, 2003). Rural-rural migration, and the use of migrant labour in domestic and export agriculture has a long history in many developing countries (Lucas, 1997; de Haan, 1999). It can play an important role in meeting seasonal variations in the demand for labour, and allows poor rural households to diversify or improve their income earning opportunities. Rural-rural migration is found in the production of some traditional export crops, for example in Ghana's cocoa export sector (Hill, 1963; Arhin, 1985; Knudsen, 2008). However, the rapid expansion of HVAEs in the past decade has contributed to new rural-rural migrant flows in a number of countries specialising in this type of production. Within Africa it has been essential to the rapid growth of horticulture and floriculture in Kenya, South Africa, Zambia, Zimbabwe, as well as Ghana (Dolan and Sorby, 2003; Barrientos and Kritzinger, 2004). In some produce ranges women account for a high percentage of the migrant workforce (particularly flowers, where they can account for up to 80%). Often migrant workers come from rural areas in poorer regions, and their earning capacity can contribute to the livelihood diversification of small producer households at origin. Rural-rural migration into HVAEs is an expanding dimension of employment in global production, which researchers are only beginning to examine.

---

<sup>6</sup> In this paper we draw on both the GVC and GPN approaches. A GVC approach helps unpack the commercial risks within interlinked supply chains, a GPN approach helps unpack the wider social and institutional context of those commercial operations, which frames the protection of migrant networks.

Social protection has evolved as an important strategy for addressing risk and vulnerability in the contemporary global economy. Globalisation raises the need for social protection because it generates greater risk and uncertainty, particularly among the poor. However, analysis of the linkages between social protection and global value chains or production networks has been limited (Barrientos and Barrientos, 2002). There are different approaches to social protection, with the World Bank focusing on social risk management by households and communities, and the ILO focusing on protecting living standards and human rights (Sabates-Wheeler and Waite, 2003). From a rights perspective, the ILO, sees social protection defined as “entitlement to benefits that society provides to individuals and households – through public and collective measures – to protect against low or declining living standards arising out of a number of basic risks and needs”. Given a focus on workers in global production networks, this approach provides an important link between labour and social protection. Where migrant workers are drawn in to meet expanding output in GPNs, they are both simultaneously homogeneous units of production essential to meeting commercial targets and standards, as well as social beings with rights and needs from diverse household and livelihood backgrounds.

A GPN approach provides a potentially powerful framework for combining the analysis of the migrant workers and changing forms of social protection in a global economy for three reasons:

- Firstly, it emphasises the complexity of supply networks that can feed into supermarket value chains. This is helpful when employment takes place on multiple small, as well as large, farms. It allows us to unpack the different forms of work that can co-exist within the same sector, providing different roles in the provisioning of global supply. The position of workers in production and their employment status in turn affects the specific risks and vulnerabilities different groups of workers (migrant and indigenous) face. This helps to identify the different needs and entitlements of specific groups of workers to social protection both through their employment, and through wider public provision.
- Secondly, a GPN approach allows us to consider the social embeddedness of employment linked to supermarket supply chains. This facilitates consideration of diverse and complex social arrangements that can facilitate or reduce the ability of informal protection networks to cope with risk and shocks.
- Thirdly, a GPN approach can help to identify formal and informal institutional arrangements and actors linked to a particular sector, and give a perspective on the different roles these might play in developing social protection strategies. It helps to identify the complexities of addressing risk, vulnerability as well as entitlements of workers within the context of particular sectors that link into global production and sourcing (Barrientos and Ware, 2002).

Analysis of social protection strategies for migrant workers is still at an early stage (Sabates Wheeler and Waite, 2003). Here we probe the linkages between global production networks and social protection in terms of the different levels of protection: preventative, protective, transformative and promotive (Sabates-Wheeler and Waite, 2003; Devereux and Sabates-Wheeler, 2004). Unpacking the institutional dimension found in global production networks, we can identify three different channels and association groups of actors with the potential to play a role in protection – social networks, government and private companies. These correspond to three specific social protection regimes:

- *Reciprocity Regimes of Protection:* Reciprocity regimes relate to wider social and community networks that support migrant workers both in accessing and coping with employment as a means of addressing risk and vulnerability and enhancing well-being. These can play both a protective and preventative role in addressing migrant risk and vulnerability.
- *Public Regimes of Protection:* Public regimes relate to formal protection involving assistance at the individual employer level based on government insurance and employer-based schemes. These can play both a protective and preventative role in providing protection, and in some cases might help to promote new forms of protection, however our contention is that alone these are unable to be transformative given the external drivers of risk through GPNs.
- *Private Regimes of Protection:* Private regimes relate to individual employer benevolence and to wider pressures for protection through the commercial export chain through standards and fair trade, based on notions of rights and empowerment, which could help to extend protection into having a more transformative impact. Where effective, these could play a more promotive and transformative role, if they help to address the underlying risks faced by workers in the commercial context of global production.

Promoting social protection for migrant workers in the context of increasing commercial risks and rising social standards at producer level provides both opportunities, but also significant challenges. This paper unpacks some of the complexities involved with particular reference to the production of Ghanaian pineapples. It examines the role of different actors who can contribute to the social protection of migrant labour in the context of global production networks. This approach facilitates a shift from government as the primary vehicle to a wider range of programmes, entitlements, and stakeholders in the provision of social protection. It can be extended beyond government alone to incorporate private actors and social networks in the design, financing, and provision of social protection strategies.



#### 4. Research Methods

The research for this project was carried out in 2006-2007. The key methodological approach used was a global production network mapping which involved (a) mapping the commercial value chain in which migrant labour was located and (b) mapping the institutional actors and networks linked to the commercial chain. Within this, the global end of the commercial chain was limited and was investigated primarily through secondary literature and data. The main focus of the primary research was in Ghana on linkages from exporter to worker, with the aim of investigating protection of migrant workers on a local level. The project used a case study approach, combining qualitative and quantitative research methods. The findings are indicative, but not statistically representative of migrant labour in the pineapple sector as a whole. A case study approach enabled an in depth investigation of the commercial and institutional complexities of social protection for migrant workers in a global commercial context, in a situation where there was little previous research and publications were limited. The research methods used included:

- A literature and data review: examining trade data and information, different approaches to analysis of the HVAE sector relevant information on migrant labour in Ghana and other HVAE countries.
- Key informant interviews: were conducted in Ghana with respondents from over 20 organisations (a) within pineapple value chain including importers, exporters, producers (small/med/large) (b) with related actors - government, donor, trade union, NGO and trade professionals.
- A quantitative survey: following a mapping of the pineapple value chain within Ghana, a cross section of producers (exporter, large and small) was selected from four locations, reflecting different types of engagement in the pineapple value chain. At every location the research team first went to the export company or farm. From the managers they received information about the workers at the farm and were informed which outgrowers they had arrangements with. Once the workers at the farm had been interviewed, they contacted the outgrowers and arranged with the farmers to access workers. For reasons of maintaining producer confidentiality and anonymity the names of the producers and their precise location is not being reported.

The locations were mapped in relation to two categories within global production networks. Category 1 refers to large producers/exporters and their designated outgrowers who have EurepGap, fair trade and collective bargaining agreements (henceforth referred to jointly as CBA-EG). They therefore meet the highest level of standards required by some European supermarkets. Category 2 includes producers/exporters, their

outgrowers and independent small-scale producers who do not fall into Category 1. They are therefore not certified to reach the highest European supermarket standards, although they do supply into Europe.

The original target for the sample survey was 300 workers in total, comprising migrants and indigenes. There was no available sampling frame for migrant workers in pineapple exports. When piloting the survey instruments, it became apparent that rather than differentiating simply between migrants and indigenes, a distinction needed to be made between primary or secondary migrants, with secondary constituting a large majority of the workers (as discussed above). The focus of the study subsequently shifted from examining the differing access to social protection based on whether workers status was (a) secondary migrants who were better integrated in the host society or (b) primary migrants who had actively migrated themselves. A small sample of indigenous workers was interviewed across the locations, in order to provide a control for those issues that were relevant to all workers - irrelevant of migrant status. In total 282 interviews were carried out, 108 with primary migrants, 147 with secondary migrants and 27 with indigenes. Given the small size of the indigene group we do not report specifically on them here, except to contrast their position in discussion.

Focus group interviews: In addition to the worker survey, 8 focus group discussions were held, two in each location, four in-depth household histories were drawn up, one in each location, as well as individual in-depth worker interviews.

The final breakdown of worker interviews by category is as follows:

**Table 4.1 Worker Interviews by Category within GPNs**

Production Level	Category 1	Category 2	Total
Exporter	91	58	149
Large farm	83	8	19
Small outgrower	26	38	64
Independent small-scale	11	39	50
Total	139	143	282

As reflected in the gender profile of the sector/farms, the sample included more men than women. The gender ratio in the sample was almost 2:1, independent of migrant status. In terms of the workers in each farm category, the number was almost equal across the categories, 139 in category 1 and 143 in category 2. The gender ratio was also roughly the same in both categories: 73-74 percent male and 26-27 percent females. In category 1 a higher percentage of workers were between ages 14-29, 60 percent, compared to 45 percent in category 2. Category 1 had a higher ratio of primary migrants, 42 percent compared to 35 percent in category 2.

Mapping the global production network demanded purposive rather than random sampling. It helped to yield in-depth case study information that facilitated comparative migrant employment and protection dynamics in relation to each commercial chain. The interviewees were selected when the research team arrived on the farm with the aim of obtaining a spread across different types of worker, but which did not necessarily generate a random sample. In many cases, access to the workers was limited to their lunch breaks or while they were waiting for the transport organised by the farm. This dictated the nature of the sample since not all the workers would assemble at the same location in the larger farms, and may have introduced some bias (access to workers otherwise would have been more restricted). The nature of the tasks the workers were involved with also determined when they were most likely to be on the farm.

In piloting and early interviews with different actors and producers, it became apparent that there were different interpretations of the terms used. For clarification the research team adopted the following set of definitions:

**Table 4.2 – Summary of definitions used in the study**

<b>Definitions</b>	
<b>Hometown</b>	One's official place of origin. It is not necessarily the place of birth. It corresponds to a person's family origin and his/her ethnic base.
<b>Place of birth</b>	Where a person was born. This may be outside a person's ethnic base or country
<b>Current place of residence</b>	Where a person currently lives. This could be different from a person's hometown or place of birth. If a person's current place of residence is different from his hometown, he is a migrant. Someone living in his place of birth may or may not be a migrant if his hometown is different from his place of birth.
<b>Household</b>	Persons living together and who share common source of food and general livelihood. They may or may not be related by blood.
<b>Dependents</b>	All the persons who depend on a person for sustenance and financial support. They could live together in the same household or not. Some dependents depend on remittances from migrants.
<b>Primary migrant</b>	Persons that have independently taken the decision to migrate from their previous place of residence to their current place of residence. In our case we differentiate at the district level. So, if a person was born in one district but currently resides in another he/she will be considered a primary migrant.
<b>Secondary migrant</b>	Someone who is born in their current place of residence or brought there as a child and did not independently decide to migrate, but considers their hometown, which is their own acknowledged place of origin, to be elsewhere. There may not be a formal record. Indigenes may find their names in Church registers, for example.
<b>Indigenes</b>	Persons who were born at their current place of residence and consider it to be their hometown.

## 5. Case study of pineapple migrant workers

### 5.1 Profile

Of the primary migrants 50 percent came from the Volta Region, 21 percent came from the Eastern Region, and 11 percent came from Greater Accra. There was very limited circular migration, and most had only moved once. Focus group discussions and in-depth interviews indicated that people migrated for a number of reasons. A common motivating factor was the low level of income and difficulty of making a livelihood at place of origin. Many primary migrants coming from poorer regions, particularly the Volta Region, were dependent on low productivity or semi-subsistence farming and trading.

The majority of primary migrants interviewed knew of people who had migrated to their destination areas, whether these were family, friends or acquaintances from their places of origin. Women migrated under different circumstances than men – they tended to move with or to join their husbands and other family members; men were more likely to migrate alone. Women usually migrated with a specific destination and employment or other opportunity in mind, whereas men were more likely to move until they found appropriate employment. In general, the interviews do not suggest that women's decisions to migrate were perceived negatively by family and the community. 72% of primary migrants were living with dependent household members.

Secondary migrants working in pineapples tended to be younger than primary migrants. Secondary migrants were as likely as primary migrants to be married (52 and 53 percent respectively). Primary migrants are also better educated than secondary migrants - 62 percent of primary migrants were educated to JSS or higher, while only 50 percent of secondary migrants fell within these categories. Further investigation is needed of these findings. A possible explanation, drawing on earlier literature, is that primary migrants, who themselves have taken an active decision to migrate, tend to be better educated than their counterparts left behind. Primary migrants often leave their places of origin because they are unable to get jobs suited to their educational status. They are more proactive in seeking to improve their circumstances, however, they often do not get jobs commensurate to their educational status at the destination either, and are funnelled into low status, low paid jobs. In the case of secondary migrants, a possible explanation is that the more educated members of the same household migrated away to urban and other areas where income earning opportunities were greater.

## 5.2 Employment

The research found that 66% of all primary migrants moved to their current place of residence in search of work, either in the pineapple sector or elsewhere. Of these, less than half specifically were aware that the pineapple sector could offer employment. When asked how they were informed about job opportunities in the pineapple sector, primary migrants were more likely to state that they had been informed through family and friends, while secondary migrants were more likely to have been informed directly by the farmer. In both cases however, the highest frequency was in friends having been the source of information.

Independent of migrant status, on average 55 percent of the respondents were permanent workers (although primary migrants were slightly over the average of 55 percent). Amongst the non-permanent workers there was a clear difference according to migrant status - 14 percent of primary migrants were temporary workers and 28 percent casual. Amongst the secondary migrants a much higher percentage were casual workers (44 and 41 percent respectively).

According to Ghanaian labour law, a permanent worker is employed for 12 months per year continuously, a **temporary worker** is someone working for a minimum of 6 months per year (whether continuously or intermittently) but less than 12 months. A **casual worker** is employed less than 6 months per year (whether continuously or intermittently). However, respondents were often not clear about the difference between temporary and casual, and many workers formally employed on this basis were actually working most of the year. Primary migrants were most likely to be employed by export farms, while secondary migrants were more likely to be employed by small outgrowers and independent farmers. Older workers are also more likely to be employed on export farms while the younger workers dominate in small outgrower farms.

**Table 5.1 Work Status**

Type of worker	Primary Migrants	Secondary migrants	Total
Permanent	62 57.94%	79 53.74%	155 55.16%
Temporary	15 14.02%	8 5.44%	24 8.54%
Casual	30 28.04%	60 40.82%	102 36.30
Total	107 100%	147 100%	281 100%

Despite the high percentage of casual workers, a large majority said that they worked throughout the year. This was 97 percent of primary and 91 percent of secondary migrants who said that they worked all year round. Therefore their actual work was often not reflected in their formal employment status, and as discussed later this means they are less able to access the legal rights they should have been entitled to.

**Table 5.2 Nature of work schedule**

Nature of work schedule	Primary migrant	Secondary migrant	Total
Throughout the year	106 97.25%	134 91.16%	240 93.75%
Other	3 2.75%	13 8.84%	16 6.25%
Total	109 100%	147 100%	256 100%

There are different possible explanations as to why primary migrants are more likely to be either permanent or temporary workers, while secondary migrants are more prone to be casual workers. Further investigation is needed into this finding. One explanation is that primary migrants are better informed about better job opportunities in the pineapple sector through friends and family, while secondary migrants were more informed by the farmer to meet seasonal fluctuations in labour demand.

Another explanation relates to differences between types of migrants in terms of access to land and the terms under which access is negotiated. Secondary migrants born in migrant destinations often had access to farm lands that their parents (as primary migrants with long residence in the destination areas) had leased. This difference with relation to land was given by interviewees in focus group discussions (FGDs) as one reason why there are more primary than secondary migrants working on the pineapple farms; the former do not have land, or do not have land under favourable terms, to make an adequate living from farming alone. In the FGDs migrants indicated that indigenes had better access to land to farm. This partly explains why secondary migrants might choose to be employed on a casual basis; they tended to have their own farm land for subsistence or other forms of income-generating activities. It may also be due to a difference in perspective – secondary migrants might choose to be casual labourers, even in the absence of a second livelihood option, because they do not want to think of themselves as pineapple workers. In general, this occupation is not one that secondary migrants look on positively - for many interviewed, it was a stop-gap measure or a stepping-

stone to something better. In contrast, primary migrants are more dependent on the pineapple sector as a primary and long term source of income and livelihood.

When looking at the type of agreement the workers have with their employer, no clear pattern emerges. While primary migrants are most likely to have a written contract they are also most likely to have no contract at all. 50% of primary migrant permanent workers have written agreement compared with 39% of secondary permanent workers. This goes against Ghanaian labour law which states that: 'The employment of a worker by an employer for a period of six months or more, or for a number of working days equivalent to six months or more within a year shall be secured by a written contract of employment.' [Republic of Ghana (2003a) Labour Act (Act 651) Section 12 (1)]

**Table 5.3 Contract of Employment**

Type of agreement with employer	Permanent	Temporary	Casual	Total
<b>Primary Migrants</b>				
Written agreement	50%	6.67%	10%	32.71%
Verbal agreement	24.19%	40%	56.67%	35.51%
No agreement	25.81%	53.33%	33.33%	31.78%
<b>Secondary Migrants</b>				
Written agreement	39.24%	0%	13.33%	26.53%
Verbal agreement	43.04%	62.50%	53.33%	48.30%
No agreement	17.72%	37.50%	33.33%	25.17%

Respondents working on category 1 farms were more likely to have written agreements, but it was surprising to find that more than half of the workers on export farms either have no or only a verbal agreement. Small outgrowers and independent farms usually only provide verbal agreements to their workers. In addition to being more likely to have a written contract with their employers, workers in category 1 are also more likely to be employed on a permanent basis. This enhances the security of their income earning opportunities compared to workers in category 2.



### 5.3 Income

The research found that on average primary migrants received a higher wage income than secondary migrants, across all categories of employment. Primary migrants were also more likely to be housed by their employer than secondary migrants. 43% of primary migrants received housing as a non-wage benefit, compared to 18 % of secondary migrants. This could partly reflect the profile of primary migrants as older and better skilled in more stable employment as permanent or temporary (rather than casual) employment. Focus group discussions indicated that primary migrants were less likely to earn supplementary incomes while indigenes and secondary migrants were more likely to earn additional incomes from other sources. This indicated the higher level of dependency of primary migrants on their employment in the sector and hence them facing higher risks (the loss of income and housing) in the face of unemployment in the event of personal or sector shocks.

**Table 5.4 Income from Pineapples by migration status**

Type of worker	Permanent	Temporary	Casual	Total
<b>Primary Migrants</b>				
Less than 400,000 cedis per month	11 (18.64)	5 (33.33)	7 (25.93)	23 (22.77)
400,000 – 999,000 cedis per month	48 (81.36)	10 (66.67)	20 (74.07)	78 (77.23)
Total	59 100	15 100	27 100	101 100
<b>Secondary Migrants</b>				
Less than 400,000 cedis per month	21 (26.92)	4 (50.00)	21 (35.59)	46 (31.51)
400,000 – 999,000 cedis per month	57 (73.08)	4 (50.00)	38 (64.41)	99 (68.28)
Total	78 (100.00)	8 (100.00)	59 (100.00)	145 (100)

In the study migrant workers were earning around the Ghanaian minimum wage of 16,000 cedis per day in 2006 (equivalent to 432,000 cedis per month for working 6 days per week or 27 days per calendar month).<sup>7</sup> Permanent workers were more likely to earn above the minimum wage, and in our case study, of the 78 permanent respondents providing wage information, primary migrants were on average better paid than

<sup>7</sup> The prevailing average exchange rate was cedi 9200 per 1USD.

secondary migrants. Temporary and casual workers were more likely to be paid below the minimum wage, and in our study primary migrants in these categories on average received lower pay than secondary migrants. Individual wages alone do not determine whether or not a household is above the poverty line, which is affected by all household income sources. Many participants of the focus groups said that the pay is insufficient. However, for primary migrants their income was more than they had been able to earn previously, and of particular importance was that the job provided a regular income. The pineapple export sector can clearly constitute a good source of employment and income for primary migrant workers compared to their place of origin.

In terms of satisfaction with the level of employment security, 45 percent of primary migrants and 35 percent of secondary migrants were not satisfied with the level of employment security. Moreover, these can also be subject to sudden shocks or variations arising from changes in the value chain. This was most clearly demonstrated around 2003, when Ghanaian farmers had to suddenly switch from the export of Sweet Cayenne to MD2 as the type of pineapple preferred in export markets. The sudden loss of sales meant many producers did not receive payments from exporters, or were unable to sell their output at all. Wages went unpaid, and many workers went unemployed during the period (particularly temporary and casual workers). This led to stories of migrant workers depending on employers for basic subsistence, and withdrawing their children from school as they could no longer afford the costs. Smaller producers in particular went under as a result of this crisis as they were least able to afford the costs of the switch to MD2 (Fold and Gough, 2008). This left larger exporters and farms as the dominant players, and as major employers of wage labour, reinforced the role of migrant workers in sustaining the export sector.

#### *5.4 Health*

Workers' health is a particular issue in the agro-export sector. The types of risks faced include exposure to chemicals (pesticides and herbicides) and physical injury through arduous or hazardous work. Risk of exposure will partly depend on the type of activities workers are engaged in. With reference to the activities that respondents are involved in on the farms, we found no significant difference between primary and secondary migrants in preparation of the land, planting of pineapples, weeding, harvesting and carrying water/other items. Primary migrants however, are more likely to be involved in spraying and in packing than secondary migrants. This appears to be related to the greater age, education and experience of primary migrants. Spraying for example, is a specialised job which older, more experienced workers are likely to get.

Generally, there are only minor differences between the activities men and women are engaged in. No female primary migrant interviewed was involved in spraying and only one female secondary migrant carried out spraying. A higher percentage of primary female migrants worked in the packhouses (64 percent) compared to secondary female migrants (47 percent). This also corresponds with our earlier observation that primary migrants tend to be older and better educated. The higher overall proportion of women in packhouse compared to field work reflects the situation described in horticulture studies in many other countries, where a preference for women in the handling of produce has been found (Dolan and Sorby, 2003). Here physical strain can be a problem from having to stand for long hours to injuries incurred from handling pineapples if not wearing suitable protection.

A significant health risk in field work is from exposure to chemicals. In addition to pesticides and herbicides, the MD2 variety of pineapple now requires spraying a week prior to harvest, in order to bring out the yellow colour. In our study, no female primary migrant interviewed was involved in spraying and only one female secondary migrant was. Spraying was primarily carried out by men. At the same time however, the majority of people involved in spraying fall within the 18-29 age category (62 out of 126). Out of all the workers involved in spraying, 13 respondents were also involved in fertilizer application and 11 in forcing. These are all activities involving direct contact with chemicals. International law states that no-one under the age of 20 years should do hazardous work. When looking at the age of people involved in spraying however, we found that out of the 126 respondents who reported doing the spraying, 11 were between the ages 14-20.

Workers should be provided with protective clothing appropriate to the health risks incurred by the tasks they undertake. A trend that is repeated for most farm activities is that primary migrants are more likely to be provided with protective clothing than secondary migrants, independent of the type of farm activity. However, this appears to vary according to the position of the farm in the value chain, rather than whether it belongs to Category 1 or 2. For exporter and large producers primary migrants are more likely to be provided with protective clothing than secondary migrants. These farms are most liable to inspection for meeting standards, and are expected to be compliant with the Eurep-gap standard (subsequently renamed Global-gap), which includes criteria on worker health and safety. Yet our study revealed some workers at this level are unprotected. On small outgrower and independent farms, where formal standards are less likely to be enforced through independent inspection, the percentage with protective clothing was similar to that of larger farms. However, on one farm, the workers told us that while they answered that they were provided with protective clothing, they had only received that the day before we came. At another farm, they mentioned that they were only provided with boots and gloves once. Once they were worn or lost, they weren't replaced.

**Table 5.5 Provision of Protective Clothing**

Provided with protective clothing		Primary Migrant	Secondary Migrant
Exporter/producer	Yes	57 89.06%	48 64.00%
Large farm	Yes	9 100%	6 75%
Small outgrower	Yes	17 89.47%	27 84.38%
Independent smallholder	Yes	14 82.35%	24 75%

On average, 55 percent of the workers had access to basic first aid. Primary migrants were slightly below the average at 51 percent. On average, 55 percent of the workers were compensated when unable to work due to injury at the workplace. The lowest was secondary migrants at 53 percent. On average, 53 percent of all workers were entitled to paid sick leave, but this was lowest for primary migrants at 46 percent.

From the above discussion of employment, income and health risks it can be seen that on pineapple farms, primary migrant workers are overall in a slightly better position than secondary migrants. They are more likely to be employed as waged workers on export and large farms, where externally applied standards are higher. They tend to be slightly older, better skilled, are more likely to be employed in permanent work on export and large farms. Many have migrated to improve their livelihoods, and have found it an improvement compared with their previous situation. Secondary migrants are more likely to be younger and employed by small outgrowers or independent farmers, in temporary or casual work, with lower skill and incomes. However, primary migrants were found to be more dependent on the waged employment in the pineapple sector than secondary migrants, who were more likely to have alternative income sources and access to land or small scale plots. The risks they face are therefore diversified and, to this extent, secondary migrants are less vulnerable to sudden shocks arising from changes in the export sector, such as the sudden switch from Sweet Cayenne to MD2 as the pineapple of choice for export.

## 6. Enhancing protection of migrant labour in global production

### 6.1 Reciprocity Regimes of Protection: Social and Community-Level Networks

Social networks are recognised in the literature as playing an important role in supporting migration, both through providing access to information at the outset, during transition, and by helping adaptation to conditions at destination (de Haan, 1999). These are cross-cutting informal networks and institutions in which migrant workers engage that can also help to buffer the risks and vulnerability they face, and provide mechanisms for protection. These have been termed 'regimes of reciprocity' that function through family and community networks at a local level (Sabates Wheeler and Waite, 2003).

In our study, many migrants indicated in focus group discussions that they have other family members who are migrants in the same area or close by. This is generally why people migrate to pineapple-growing areas – because they know people from their family or hometown in those places (these persons are usually the ones who inform new migrants about employment opportunities in the pineapple sector). In this sense, migrants often do have family that they can turn to in their immediate locale. They can also turn to family in their hometowns. Table 6.3 shows that primary and secondary migrants turned to family in equal proportions - 56-57 per cent. However, a much lower proportion indicated that they would turn to friends, and even less to their communities. Here, primary migrants were even less likely to turn to friends or the community than secondary migrants. Perhaps the difference is in the nature of the help they would seek, and from which family members they would seek such help. This indicates that in this recently growing commercialised agro-export sector, which is generating new levels of in-migration for employment, social networks are less important for support than individual family ties.

**Table 6.3 Turn to Family and Friends for Assistance**

Turn to in times of need (%)	Primary migrants	Secondary migrants
Family	57%	56%
Friends	32%	36%
Community	9%	12%

In focus groups, the most common reason mentioned by migrants for requiring assistance is if they were in dire financial straits and needed to borrow money. In these cases, migrants were not likely to ask for support from family in their hometowns because they were too far away, but also and more importantly, because of the expectation that assistance should flow in the opposite direction. They would ask extended family members in the locale for help, but primary migrants generally expressed reluctance to do this. They said: 'Every migrant is struggling to find their footing so why should one become a burden on others?' This is one reason why migrants reported joining a church group or credit association, and considered these to be their first line of defence against financial difficulties. Migrants (secondary and primary) were however more likely to mention family (in their current locale and in their hometowns) when it came to what might be termed 'moral' support. If one had a funeral, a marriage ceremony, a dispute or other events that required the support or presence of relatives, one could turn to family. There are also a number of cases of people having persistent illnesses returning to their hometowns until they recuperated.

Within Ghana, community-level support is also well established through hometown development funds, local saving unions (Susu), and church-based associations. Hometown development levies are often paid annually and they coincide with festive occasions like Christmas and Easter, when all members of townships in migration are expected to return home. Payments are often made in the hometown, often during a big durbar or festival. A father's payment could be seen as covering those of children migrating with him, particularly if the father presents them as not yet in the age of responsibility.

Local community-based protection is facilitated in Ghana by the common practice of towns imposing development levies on their citizens. These help to cover social and community investments at the local level. Migrants from that hometown are also expected to contribute, and the levies paid by non-resident citizens are often higher than that paid by resident citizens. Migrants are often saddled with a double burden because they are also required to contribute to development levies at their places of destination. The reason is that, as residents in a new place, they enjoy all the facilities just as any other resident. In their places of origin however, although they are not there to enjoy the facilities there, their relatives are, including their children in some cases. Again they are not there to participate in communal labour, a popular way of mobilizing human resources for development at the community level. Payment of levies is to compensate for this.

**Table 6.4 Community based Funds and Associations**

Contribution in Funds		
	Primary migrants	Secondary migrants
Welfare/development fund	21%	11%
Susu	17%	19%
Funeral fund	22%	23%
Association Memberships		
Religious	53%	59%
Community	25%	28%

At the time of death, everybody is traditionally buried in their hometown. At the time of a funeral, family heads are expected to ensure that every member of the family pays their donation, whether resident or not. If an individual fails to regularly pay these donations, the family has to clear all the arrears at the time of his or her death before permit is given for their burial in the hometown. To offset some of the cost involved in funerals for instance, migrants get affiliated to a number of associations at the place of destination. These could be township associations, tribal associations, church associations or trade associations. Members of such associations pay regular contributions and attend regular meetings. In case of bereavement for instance, the association pays a certain amount of money to the affected member and also makes its presence felt at the funeral. If it is the member himself/herself who dies, such benefits may go to either the spouse or the surviving children.

Regimes of reciprocity also involve migrants supporting relatives in the hometown of origin through remittances. The study found that primary migrants tend to remit more regularly; mainly because they usually have immediate family towards whom they have greater obligation (parents, siblings, and so on). Secondary migrants tend to have their immediate family with them locally, and their ties to family at home are more distant; consequently, they have less of a feeling of obligation to remit money to relatives. Being older on average, primary migrants are also more likely to shoulder greater responsibilities than secondary migrants. If their spouses and dependent children are back in the place of origin, there is greater expectation on them to remit than their younger migrant counterparts. The expectation is even higher if the parents of the primary

migrants are still alive in their home areas. Social expectation is that children should look after their parents in their old age particularly when they become invalid. It is said that “if someone looks after you to grow teeth, it is incumbent on you to look after him also to loose his teeth”. Less is expected of secondary migrants because they would be struggling together with their parents in migration.

*“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.”* (Primary Migrant in FGD)

Some migrants, as they settle, are able to send more money back home. It can also be true that, as primary migrants settle into their new locale, and especially as they start growing a family, they tend to reduce their remittances, if not in frequency, then in amounts. This was observed amongst the younger primary migrants who tended to be more conscientious about sending home what little money they made in the early stages of their migration but who, over time, sent less money because, in their words, they had ‘grown up’ and were realising the need to save money for their future and for their nuclear family. Primary migrants also indicated they were restricted in terms of the frequency with which they were able to go home because of the cost involved. Also, when they went home, people expected money, and if they were unable to meet these demands, they might avoid going home. This was more of an issue for some secondary migrants, who had weaker ties to their origin hometown, and therefore felt less of an obligation to visit home.

Generally, primary migrants said that they were better off than they would have been if they had not migrated. This was because of their perception (real or otherwise) that they would have been worse off had they remained in their places of origin, and because of their belief that, regardless of the challenges of their present situation, they have more prospects than they might have had otherwise. In only one case did a young man admit that his peers back in his hometown were doing better than he was, but that only made him more resolved not to return until he had been able to make something of himself.

Overall, family networks help to promote individual social protection, where they enable migrant workers to access more stable employment. They also play a vitally important role in providing support for migrant workers in the face of shocks (idiosyncratic or covariant). Community networks are of lower importance. In the case of primary migrants this may partly reflect pineapple production as a newly emerging export sector drawing in new workers with low local community ties. However, secondary migrants also reported low levels of community engagement, despite being born in the locality. Further research would be needed comparing new and traditional agro-export sectors, but this raises the question as to whether commercialisation through



new agro-export farming is contributing to greater individualisation and a decline in community-based rural social networks. Family networks, especially of primary migrants also employed in the same sector, have little hope of addressing potential covariant risk that might arise, such as commercial instability in the level of exports, and as such remain only protective in their nature.

## 6.2 Public Regimes of Protection: Social Assistance and Insurance - Employer-level protection

Public regimes of protection play an important role in spreading risk and widening the coverage of protection. The role of social assistance and insurance at employer-level is to mitigate risk either through direct state benefits funded from taxation, such as state allowances or private schemes, or through common funds such as social security and health insurance. Public or formal regimes of social protection in the case of waged workers are channelled through the workers' employer.

The main government-based scheme in Ghana is through Social Security National Insurance Trust (SSNIT) which provides a formal social protection mechanism. Workers qualify for old age pension if they contribute for a minimum of 240 months throughout the span of their working life. If they contribute for 12 months within a 36-month period they qualify for invalidity pension. Employers are legally responsible for ensuring all workers are registered with SSNIT after a period of 3 months in employment. Employers contribute 12.5% and workers contribute 5% of earnings to SSNIT. In the survey we found that 41 percent of primary migrants are covered by SSNIT, and 33 per cent of secondary migrants. Workers in permanent employment were much more likely to be covered by SSNIT. Those in temporary and casual employment were least likely to be covered by SSNIT, even though in reality many worked up to 12 months per year.

**Table 6.1 Contributing to SSNIT**

Type of agreement with employer	Permanent	Temporary	Casual	Total
<b>Primary Migrants</b>				
Contributing to SSNIT	37 59.68%	1 6.67%	5 17.24%	43 40.57%
Not contributing to SSNIT	25 40.32%	14 93.33%	24 82.76%	63 59.43%
Total	62 100%	15 100%	29 100%	106 100%
<b>Secondary Migrants</b>				
Contributing to SSNIT	41 51.9%	0 0%	7 11.86%	48 32.88%

Not contributing to SSNIT	38 48.10%	8 100%	52 88.14%	98 67.12%
Total	79 100%	8 100%	59 100%	146 100%

Looking by the type of employer, we found that workers in category 1 are much more likely to be registered with SSNIT than workers in category 2, with 55 percent of workers in category 1 farms covered by SSNIT compared to only 12 percent in category 2. Within both categories, outgrowers were least likely to contribute to SSNIT for their workers. When interviewing a farm manager in category 2 he said that the employees initially had been registered with SSNIT but that the workers had requested that this practice should stop, since the immediate benefit from the pay was more important to them than the long-term benefits of SSNIT.

Overall, government social assistance and insurance and employer benevolence go part of the way to addressing risk and vulnerability by supporting the protection of workers in the event of idiosyncratic and covariant risks. However, levels of coverage through SSNIT are on average low with only 41% of primary and 33% of secondary migrants contributing. Workers on category 1 farms were more likely to benefit from coverage, but even here 45% remained uncovered. Therefore enforcement of public regimes of reciprocity in the pineapple sector is at best patchy. Where public regimes of protection apply they do so only in terms of providing protective and preventative measures that step in at the time of a shock. However, they do not address the commercial drivers that are likely to drive shocks, particularly of a covariant nature (such as commercial instability in the export sector).

#### *Private Regimes of Protection: Corporate Social Responsibility and voluntary initiatives*

Employer benevolence can also be an important source of assistance in times specific shocks such as the death of the worker, a child, or spouse, or the need for a loan. In the survey, 43-44% of primary and secondary migrants said they would turn to their employer in times of need (more in the case of asking for a loan). In focus groups, some of the workers mentioned that they had a good relationship with their employer and as a result would turn to them in times of need. However, often they said employers were not able to provide assistance. Comparing tables 6.3 and 6.5, we find that, whilst primary and secondary migrant workers see family as most important, they are more likely to turn to their employer in times of need than to friends or community networks.

**Table 6.2 Turn to Employer for Assistance**

	Primary migrants	Secondary migrants
Turn to your employer when in need (%)	43%	45%
Turn to your employer for a loan (%)	60%	54%

A new dimension to social protection for workers in pineapple exports is through the implementation of standards by large buyers (particularly European supermarkets) in their global production networks. These standards have begun to address issues of worker rights, which could contribute to enhancing their social protection. However, the standards vary both in their depth and scope. Assessments of the impact of standards on worker welfare indicated that their benefits can be limited (Barrientos and Smith, 2007). Here we consider whether and what contribution they may have made to the protection of migrant workers.

The most common standard operating in pineapple exports is Eurepgap (later renamed GlobalGap). This primarily covers good agricultural practice and environmental issues. But it also includes conditions relating to worker health and safety, and the need to abide by relevant labour regulation. Some leading European supermarkets (particularly in the UK) are increasingly requiring Eurep-Gap certification as a condition of supply, particularly amongst their larger or preferred suppliers. Within Ghana, a number of the exporter and large farms were Eurepgap certified, or in the process of applying for certification. But smaller producers face a number of challenges in terms of certification, particularly relating to the costs and resources required (Fold and Gough, 2008). The main impact of Eurepgap on worker health and safety welfare in the pineapple sector appeared to be on visible issues such as the use of protective clothing on certified farms.

Some supermarkets also have their own codes of labour practice, which all suppliers are meant to comply with. These normally cover ILO Conventions on freedom of association, collective bargaining, discrimination, child and forced labour, health and safety and related issues (Barrientos and Smith, 2007). However, supermarkets apply these more proactively to their top-end suppliers, who are meant to implement them further down their chains. In reality only the largest Ghanaian pineapple exporters with transnational ownership appeared to implement supermarket codes, and our study found little awareness of them amongst other producers or workers. An important condition of most supermarket codes is that employers comply with all relevant employment legislation. As we have seen above, even on category 1 farms where standards apply,

nearly half of all workers remain uncovered by SSNIT, and many casual workers effectively work all year round.

As Fairtrade has grown to include larger 'plantation' producers as members, it has also included principles relating to workers - where they are employed on farms - containing similar conditions to supermarket codes of labour practice (Barrientos and Dolan, 2006). Within the Ghanaian pineapple sector, four producers or producer cooperatives were either Fairtrade certified or at an advanced stage of certification at the time of this research. The first to move in this direction was the producer cooperative Farmapine, which obtained certification in 2003. However, it closed down due to financial problems and irregularities after completion of the fieldwork (Fold and Gough, 2008).

Implementing labour standards has generally proved a challenge for Fairtrade, given its origin as a producer-based scheme (Smith and Barrientos, 2005). In the sector of Ghanaian pineapples, this challenge was addressed by some farms implementing Fairtrade who also negotiated a Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA) with the Ghana Agricultural Workers Union (GAWU). Interviews with GAWU indicated that three of the four Fairtrade farms had done this, and the fourth had trade union representatives on the joint committee overseeing the social premium fund. We found a strong link between farm category and the likelihood of workers belonging to a workers' union, with 48 per cent of workers on category 1 farms being unionised compared to 5 per cent of workers on category 2 farms. CBAs help to ensure that labour standards based on international conventions (primarily the ILO) are met, and provide a mechanism for workers to negotiate terms and conditions. This includes observance of legal minimum wages or above, contracts of employment, benefits such as SSNIT, health and safety and other social provision, helping to promote worker social protection, etc. However, in our study we found that CBAs only covered permanent workers on any farm, and that temporary and casual workers remained outside the agreement. The numbers benefiting are thus limited given permanent workers usually constitute less than half the total workforce, which explains why only 48% of workers in category 1 farm are unionised.

**Table 6. 5 Trade Union Membership by Farm Category**

<b>Belong to workers union</b>	<b>Category 1</b>	<b>Category 2</b>	<b>Total</b>
Yes	67 48.20%	7 4.90%	74 26.24%
No	72 51.80%	136 95.10%	208 73.76%

Total	139 100%	143 100%	282 100%
-------	-------------	-------------	-------------

Overall, standards have helped to enhance social protection in relation to some issues (particularly health and safety), and for some workers (permanent workers on the main farms with Fairtrade and CBAs). Our study did not examine changes over time, but on the basis of anecdotal information it appears that improvements have resulted from protection channelled through standards and corporate social responsibility. Given primary migrants are most likely to be employed as permanent workers and on category 1 farms, they are more likely to benefit than secondary migrants. To the extent that standards and social responsibility enhance the security of producers within the value chain (eg. Eurepgap), or promote social justice (eg. Fairtrade) it *could* be argued they have a potential to facilitate the promotion of social protection. But given these improvements only reach a limited section of the workforce, this could only occur if a wider section of the workforce, particularly temporary and casual workers, were included.

## 7 Conclusions

Internal migrant workers have played a key role in sustaining the growth of pineapple exports, particularly primary migrants who are employed as wage workers by the larger exporters and farmers. Rural-rural migration has brought about benefits for primary migrants who have made the active choice to move from poorer areas (especially those who have managed to secure permanent employment). It has provided income and employment for secondary migrants living in exporting rural areas. However, both groups face risks that arise from working in an export sector where producers are subject to commercial pressures from supermarkets, and exposed to risk from sudden commercial shocks as a result of changes in consumer demand. The concentration of supermarket buyers compounds the adverse effects, as there is little diversity in market outlets.

This case study highlights some of the complexities of promoting social protection for migrant workers in the context of global production networks. An important dimension is the way in which commercial drivers of the export sector and social embeddedness interact in ways that both promote and undermine social protection. The experience of the switch from Sweet Cayenne to MD2 pineapples highlights how shocks can suddenly occur in export sectors. In this scenario, permanent workers benefit from some protection, but temporary and casual workers are the most vulnerable. The extent to which migrant workers are thus exposed to risk and vulnerability depends in part on their employment status. In this case, primary migrants were more likely to be employed in the larger and export farms on a permanent basis than secondary migrants. But they were also the most dependent on wage labour in the pineapple sector, and were less likely to have alternative sources of income and land, as found with secondary migrants. They could therefore be more vulnerable in the case of covariant shocks which might affect members of their wider social networks simultaneously.

In the context of global production networks, social protection can be promoted through different channels involving a range of actors: public and employer-based social assistance and insurance, family and community-based regimes of reciprocity, as well as supermarket standards and social codes within global production networks. However, the extent to which these benefit workers also depends on their employment status, with permanent workers more likely to be covered but not temporary and seasonal workers. In this study, primary migrants were more concentrated in permanent employment, and thus constituted a greater share of the recipients of these benefits. Primary migrants in this position were clearly beneficiaries of internal migration into GPNs, where their situation was generally better than in their origin hometown.

Social standards and Fairtrade initiatives found under private regimes of protection have the potential to play a more promotive or transformative role. But this can only be realised if their benefits are extended to all migrant workers. Currently neither of these channels is promoting the expansion of social protection to those in temporary or casual work, even if they actually work most of the year. Only if these workers were more systematically reached, involving a significant shift in coverage, could they play a more promotive role. However, the protection of all workers (permanent, temporary and casual) is subject to the vagaries and shocks of export chains, as the crisis of Sweet Cayenne/MD2 has highlighted. Without addressing the risks posed by the commercial dynamics, protection is likely to remain constrained to protection. Ultimately migrant workers, whatever their status of employment, only have their local family networks and to a lesser extent their employers to fall back on in times of need.

## 7.1 Key Policy Recommendations

- ***Global export production provides benefits for rural-rural migrants:*** Primary migrants who had taken an active choice to migrate reported that they were in a better position as a result. In this study, primary migrants were also more concentrated in permanent employment, where the benefits of employment protection were higher. Promotion of permanent employment incorporating legal benefits and rights in global export production can contribute to poverty reduction in rural areas.
- ***Commercial risks that compound the vulnerability of migrant workers should be addressed:*** Primary migrants were more dependent on their employment than secondary migrants, and therefore more exposed in the event of adverse commercial shocks. Shocks can occur for a number of reasons, including supermarket pressure on prices and sudden changes in consumer demand. Commercial and government actors need to do more to buffer the effects of adverse shocks on producers and migrant workers. In the MD2 crisis, had buyers made a more gradual shift and engaged in dialogue with government and donors, measures could have been put in place to support the transition from one product to the next with less damaging economic and social consequences.
- ***The employment status of workers needs to be regularised to be protected:*** 45% of all migrants were temporary and casual workers but a significant proportion were found to be working all year round, without benefiting from the protection accruing to permanent workers. Their employment status needs to be regularised to ensure they enjoy the full protection which they should be entitled to in accordance with the actual amount of work they do.

- ***Channels of social protection need greater synergy and focus on migrant workers:*** Social protection can be accessed through different channels within global production networks involving: family and community, government, and private employers, supermarket standards and social responsibility initiatives. There needs to be greater synergy between these, with a specific focus on the protection needs of migrant workers.
- ***Collective Bargaining Agreements should include temporary and casual workers:*** Currently CBAs only cover workers on permanent contracts. They need to be extended to include all workers to ensure that temporary and casual workers also receive their proportionate entitlements, and are given permanent status if working all year.
- ***Enforcement of government employment benefits:*** Ensuring workers' receipt of government employment benefits is enforced in the pineapple sector; all workers need to participate in SSNIT.
- ***Extend benefits of private protection to all workers:*** Social standards and Fairtrade initiatives found under private regimes of protection have the potential to play a more promotive role. But this can only be realised if these benefits are extended to all migrant workers. Currently neither of these channels are addressing those in temporary or casual work, even if they actually work most of the year. Only if these workers were more systematically reached, involving a significant shift in coverage, could these channels play a more promotive role.



## References

- Achuonjei, P. (2003) *Analysis of the Ghanaian Fresh Fruit and Vegetable Industry*, East Lansing, Michigan: Partnerships for Food Industry Development - Fruit and Vegetables, Michigan State University, MI.
- Acona (2004) *Buying Your Way Into Trouble? The Challenge of Responsible Supply Chain Management*, London: Insight Investment Management Ltd.
- Arhin, K. (1985) *The Expansion of Cocoa Production: the Working Conditions of Migrant Cocoa Farmers in the Central and Western Regions*, Accra: University of Ghana, Legon.
- Barrientos, A. and S. Ware Barrientos (2002) 'Extending Social Protection to Informal Workers in the Horticulture Global Value Chain', Washington D.C.: World Bank.
- Barrientos, S. and C. Dolan (eds.) (2006) *Ethical Sourcing in the Global Food System*, London: Earthscan.
- Barrientos, S. and A. Kritzing (2004) 'Squaring the Circle – Global Production and the Informalisation of Work in South African Fruit Exports', *Journal of International Development*, 16: 81-92.
- Barrientos, S. and S. Smith (2007) 'Do Workers Benefit from Ethical Trade? Assessing Codes of Labour Practice in Global Production Systems', *Third World Quarterly*, 28(4): 713-729.
- Black, R., S. Ammassari, et al. (2004) 'Migration and Pro-Poor Policy in West Africa', Working Paper 8, Brighton: Migration DRC, University of Sussex.
- Castles, S. and M. J. Miller (2003) *The Age of Migration, International Population Movements in the Modern World*, Basingstoke: Palgrave.
- Danielou, M. and C. Ravry (2005) 'The Rise of Ghana's Pineapple Industry: From Successful Take-Off to Sustainable Production', African Region - Working Paper Series No. 93, Washington D.C.: World Bank.
- Dannson, A., C. Ezedinma, et al. (2004) 'Strengthening Farm-Agribusiness Linkages in Africa: Summary Results of Five Country Studies in Ghana, Nigeria, Kenya, Uganda and South Africa', AGSF Occasional Paper 6, Rome: Food and Agriculture Organisation, United Nations.
- de Haan, A. (1999) 'Livelihoods and Poverty: The Role of Migration - A Critical Review of the Migration Literature', *Journal of Development Studies*, 36(2): 1-47.
- Devereux, S. and R. Sabates-Wheeler (2004) 'Transformative Social Protection', IDS Working Paper No.232, Brighton: Institute of Development Studies.
- DFID/FAO/ODI (2001) 'Strategic Programme for Information on Sustainable Livelihoods - Ghana Country Component', London: ODI.
- Dolan, C. and J. Humphrey (2004) 'Changing Governance Patterns in the Trade in Fresh Vegetables between Africa and the United Kingdom', *Environment and Planning*, 36(3): 491-509.
- Dolan, C. and K. Sorby (2003) 'Gender and Employment in High-Value Agriculture Industries', Washington: World Bank.
- Fold, N. and K. Gough (2008) 'From Smallholders to Transnationals: the Impact of Changing Consumer Preferences in the EU on Ghana's Pineapple Sector', *Geoforum*, 39: 1687-1697

- GEPC (2006) 'Ghana's Fresh Produce Hits the Market with Increased Volume, Diversifies and Premium Quality Products', Accra: Ghana Export Promotion Council.
- Gereffi, G., J. Humphrey, et al. (2001) 'Globalization, Value Chains and Development', *IDS Bulletin* 32(3).
- Goldstein, M. and C. Udry (1999) 'Agricultural Innovation and Resource Management in Ghana', Final report to IFPRI under MP17, Yale University: New Haven, CT.
- Government of Ghana (2002) Food and Agriculture Sector Development Policy (FASDEP), Accra: Ministry of Food and Agriculture.
- Harris, N. (1995) *The New Untouchables, Immigration and the New World Worker*, London: I.B. Tauris.
- Henderson, J., P. Dicken, et al. (2002) 'Global Production Networks and the Analysis of Economic Development', *Review of International Political Economy*, 9: 436-64.
- Hill, P. (1963) *The Migrant Cocoa Farmers of Southern Ghana: A Study in Rural Capitalism*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Kaplinsky, R. (2000) 'Spreading the Gains from Globalisation: What can be learned from value chain analysis?', *IDS Working Paper* (110).
- Knudsen, H. M. (2008) *Livelihoods, Mobility and Settlement Dynamics in Ghana's Cocoa Frontier*, Copenhagen: Department of Geography, University of Copenhagen.
- Lucas, R. (1997) 'Internal Migration in Developing Countries', in Rozenzweig, M. R. and O. Stark, *Handbook of Population and Family Economics*, Elsevier Science B.V.: Maryland Heights, MO.
- Manuh, T. (ed.) (2005) *At Home in the World? International Migration and Development in Contemporary Ghana and Western Africa*, Accra: Sub-Saharan Publishers.
- Osaе, C. (2005) 'Economic Effects of Commercial Pineapple Farming on Farm Employees and Communities in Awutu-Efutu-Senya District', MA Development Studies dissertation, Accra: ISSER., University of Ghana.
- Oxfam (2004) *Trading Away Our Rights: Women Working in Global Supply Chains*, Oxford: Oxfam International.
- Pelger, L. and P. Knorringa (2007) 'Integrating Labour Issues in Global Value Chain Analysis: Exploring Implications for Labour Research and Unions', in Schmidt, V., *Trade Union Responses to Globalisation*, Geneva: ILO.
- Republic of Ghana (2005) Growth and Poverty Reduction Strategy (GPRS II) 2006-2009, Accra: Ghana National Development Planning Commission.
- Sabates-Wheeler, R. and M. Waite (2003) 'Migration and Social Protection: A Concept Paper', Working Paper 12, Brighton: Migration DRC, University of Sussex.
- Sessay, M. A. (2006) *The Expansion of a Pineapple Plantation in Ghana*, North Cyprus: Eastern Mediterranean University.
- Skeldon, R. (1997) *Migration and Development: A Global Perspective*, Harlow: Addison Wesley Longman.
- Smith, S., D. Auret, et al. (2003) 'Ethical Trade in African Horticulture: Gender Rights and Participation', Report for Multi-stakeholder Workshop, Brighton: IDS.
- Smith, S. and S. Barrientos (2005) 'Fair Trade and Ethical Trade: Are There Moves Towards Convergence?' *Sustainable Development*, 13: 190-198.

- Takane, T. (2004) 'Smallholders and Nontraditional Exports under Economic Liberalization: The Case of Pineapples in Ghana', *African Study Monographs*, 25(1).
- Vorley, B. (2004) 'Food Inc., Corporate Concentration from Farm to Consumer', London: UK Food Group.
- World Bank (2008) World Development Report, Washington D.C.: World Bank.
- Yeboah, G. (2005a) 'The Farmapine Model: A Cooperative Marketing and Market Based Development Approach in Sub-Saharan Africa', *Choices: The Magazine on Food, Farm and Resource Issues*, 20(1).