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ABSTRACT

APPRENTICES AND CLASS CULTURE: THE CASE OF APPAREL AND METALWORKING WORKERS IN ISTANBUL

Akyol, Ayla Ezgi

M.S., Department of Political Science and Public Administration
Supervisor: Assoc. Prof. Dr. Necmi Erdoğan

September 2014, 185 pages

The focus of the thesis is to discuss class culture on the basis of the apprentices working in apparel and metalworking sectors by analyzing the structural and ideological aspects that affect the formation and non-formation of class culture. Basing on the field research conducted with 21 apprentices working in two sectors via semi-structured interviews, the thesis analyzes class contradiction between the apprentices that have different labor processes and the aspects both providing and corroding the basis for class consciousness while trying to understand what kind of cultural references support that process. The study traces the relations through which class identity is constituted. The thesis argues that patronalist relations as an element of artisan and mater-apprentice relationship basing on small sized enterprises obstructs the formation of class consciousness defied within the framework class interest as well as the solidarity and unionization among the workers. The prevailing class hierarchies turn to be consent via the future expectations of the apprentices in terms of professional education and setting up their own enterprise. Apprentices in two sectors differ from each other in terms of the perception of work and class experience in the meaning of the experience of flexible working conditions because of different labour-capital intensity. Despite such differences, the thesis argues that class identity is constituted basing on the deprivation of respectability via class confrontations in parallel with the exclusion of lower classes from educational,
cultural and symbolic fields as a result of impoverishment and dispossession processes in late capitalism.
Keywords: Class Culture, Apprentices, Labour Process, Apparel Sector, Metalworking Sector.
ÖZ

ÇIRAKLAR VE SINIF KÜLTÜRÜ: İSTANBUL HAZIR GİYİM VE TORNA SEKTÖRÜ İŞÇİLERİ ÖRNEĞİ

Akyol, Ayla Ezgi

Yüksek Lisans, Siyaset Bilimi ve Kamu Yönetimi Bölümü
Tez Yöneticisi: Doç. Dr. Necmi Erdoğan

Eylül 2014, 185 sayfa

Bu tez, hazır giyim ve torna sektörlerinde çalışan çıraklarda sınıf kültürü tartışmayı hedeflemekte, bu amaçla çıraklarda sınıf bilinci oluşmasına ve oluşmamasına etki eden yapışal ve ideolojik faktörleri incelemeye çalışmaktadır. Hazır giyim ve torna sektörlerinde çalışan, 21 çırakla yapılan yarı yapılandırılmış mülakatlardan oluşan saha araştırmasına dayanarak, farklı emek süreçlerinin işlediği bu iki sektördeki çıraklar arasında sınıf çelişkinin, sınıf bilincinin nasıl ortaya çıktığı ve nasıl etkisizleştirildiği, bu sırada hangi kültürel referanslardan beslendiği analiz edilmeye çalışılmaktadır. Bu açıdan tez, sınıf kültürünün bir parçası olan sınıfal prejudit, hangi ilişki biçimlerinde görülebileceği sorusuna cevap aramaktadır. Usta-çırak ilişkisine referansla kurulan, daha çok küçük işletme kültürünün zanaat tarzı sınıf ilişkisinin bir unsuru olan paternalist ilişkilerin sınıf çıkarı kavramından hareketle tanımlanabilecek bir sınıf bilincinin oluşması önunde engel olduğu; dayanışma, sendikalinin gelişmesini engellediği; çıraklar açısından meslek öğrenme ve kendi işinin patronu olma gibi gelecek referanslı süreçlerle mevcut sınıf hiyerarşilerinin rizaya dönüştürüldüğü iddia edilmektedir. Bununla birlikte, hazır giyim ve torna sektörlerinde çalışan çırakların, sektörlerin emek-sermaye yoğunluğu bakımından farklılaşması ve bu nedenle farklı esneklik biçimlerini tecrübe etmesi nedeniyle sınıf deneyimlerinin ve iş algılarının
birbirinden farklı olduğu; fakat bu farklılığa rağmen geç kapitalizmde daha da belirgin hale gelen yoksullaşma ve mülksüzleşme sonucu alt sınıfların eğitsel, kültürel, simbolik alanlardan gittikçe daha fazla dışlanmalarına paralel olarak sınıf çıkarı kavramına referansla olmasa da sınıf konumlarına ve ilişkilerine referansla kurulan; daha çok üretim alanı dışındaği sınıf karşılışmaları esnasında ve saygınlıktan yoksunluk olarak tecrübe edilen bir sınıf aidiyetinin ortaya çıktığı görülmektedir.
Anahtar Kelimeler: Sınıf Kültürü, Sınıf Konumu, Sınıf İlişkileri, Sınıf Bilinci, Çıráklar, Esnekleşme
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CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

1.1. Objective of Study

Apprenticeship has a long tradition in the economic history of Turkey and refers to a pre-capitalist and craft type class relation between master and apprentice which was previously prevalent in the guild system in Ottoman society. In this sense, apprenticeship represents a stage for learning job on the way of having own business rather than earning life, which the latter could be associated with capitalist relations of production. Although development of capitalist production relations have changed these pre-capitalist production relations and transformed the relationship between master and apprentice to employer-employee relations, the form of these class relations and meaning which is constituted via learning job and having own business are saved in commonsense of the society due to continuity of petit production within capitalist society in both rural and urban space related to factors of late expropriation, late industrialization and inadequate capital accumulation.

This issue prevents development of the individuality and impersonal contractual relations which are the basic of the bourgeois democracy and constituents of class consciousness in Marxist sense and reproduces the class relations depending on the non-contractual, familial, paternalist relations. Having own business, in this way resisting to proletarianization, becomes legitimate and practicable. In this context, apprenticeship and master-apprentice relationship complicate the development of class culture among working class. In other words, as Marx indicates related to proletariat, having nothing to lose but their chains could not be translated to perception of workers within these relations.

In addition to having own business, moving up the social ladder by having education emerges as another important factor prevalent in commonsense of the society which complicates the development of class culture. Orientating their children to formal educational institutions, in this way keeping them from proletarianization, constitutes
one of the main motivations for working class families. The critical point is that such
an issue could be structurally possible within Turkish education system until the late
capitalist era.

The main characteristic of the contemporary capitalism is explained as *accumulation
by dispossession* (Harvey, 2004). This process implies an increase of the rate of wage
laborers with regard to dispossession and impoverishment, clarification of social
inequalities and class differentiations as well as enlarging composition of labor
market. This issue refers to proletarianization of the segment of the society who
previously stands outside of the market system. In relation to this, more and more
children and women have participated to labor market. According to the report of
DİSK-AR on child labor which was published in 2013, the number of the employed
children is 893,000. In addition to this, the number of the apprentices employed has
increased from 158,000 to 322,000 between 2006 and 2012.\(^1\)

In this context, apprenticeship not only represent learning job on the way of having
own business, but also has become an obligation for the children of the people from
lower class strata. In addition to this, educational apparatus has lost its characteristic
of moving up the social ladder for these children due to its commodification and
submission to needs of capital. Children of the people from lower class strata are
excluded from educational field because the families who are dispossessed and
impoverished have difficulties to finance the educational expenditures; on the other
hand, education does not represent keeping from proletarianization in the late
capitalist era.

From the side of the businessmen and employers, apprentice labor has become
important in recent years with regard to the need of qualified intermediate workers.
Accordingly, vocational education has been promoted by the government and some
businessmen since 2000s, with the slogan of *Meslek lisesi memleket meselesi*.\(^2\) In the
matter of training qualified workers, not only grand companies and trade associations


\(^2\) It means that vocational education is crucial for the development of the country.
have accelerated the process of foundations of apprenticeship training centers and vocational high schools but also participation in these centers and schools has been encouraged by the reforms made in the education policies of government and by the projects of local governments. Finally, 4+4+4 educational reform has paved the way for the involvement of many children from lower classes in non-formal educational institutions where they could both have vocational education and work in a workplace at the same time.

However, rising importance of apprentice labor does not only refer to the need for qualified labor but also the need for cheap labor which becomes an important issue in parallel to increase of international competition in the late capitalist era. From this perspective, child employment also becomes a part of policies which aim flexibilization of labor market and reduces of labor cost. Child workers who are situated at the bottom of the labor market hierarchy are preferred by employers since they provide low cost labor force. In this way, they experience uninsured and precarious forms of employment.

The critical point is that proletarianization of children occurs through apprenticeship within pre-capitalist class relations and mostly through small-sized enterprises which are becoming more and more prevalent in accordance with downsizing tendency of the enterprises and subcontracting in the late capitalist era that include informal, non-contractual, arbitrary and paternalist relations. In other words, while they become more and more a part of the working class, they reproduce pre-capitalist class relations. This issue makes the conditions of formation of class culture among children and young workers questionable.

This study aims to discuss the possibilities and difficulties in development of class culture among apprentices. In relation to this concern, it is aimed to seek an answer to certain questions. Which structural and cultural factors contribute to or hinder the formation of class culture, how they experience class antagonism, class hierarchies and how they react to these hierarchies? What kind of ideological instruments plays a role in the neutralization or clarification of class antagonism? Which historical references accompany these ideological instruments? As historically constituted class
relations of Turkey that has late industrialized social a formation mostly depend on informal, paternalist, non-contractual, de facto relations, setting businesses has increased as a dominant tendency among lower classes since the first periods of working class formation. In terms of such a social formation in which class antagonism, struggle, class solidarity and unionization have developed in a weak manner, how and with which motivations has class culture could be emerged among apprentices? When it is considered that capital has gained control on labor, replaced secured forms of employment by flexible, precarious and irregular forms of employment in parallel to generalization of subcontracting and downsizing of enterprises, how the pre-capitalist class relations function in the hegemony of late capitalism?

1.2. Methodology

For this study, the cases of apparel and metalworking sectors are chosen. The main reason of this choice is that these sectors constitute the key sectors of the manufacturing industry in Turkey in different aspects. The apparel sector is labor-intensive sector although unskilled, semi-skilled labor force is dominant in the sector and it is one of the biggest sectors in terms of employed population. According to 2012 data of Social Security Institution, 1.5 million off the record workers and 451,164 registered workers work in the apparel sector. On the other hand, metalworking sector is a capital-intensive sector. Although it includes small proportion of employed population (according to annual report of Social Security Institution, in 2012 the number of the employers who work in the metalworking industry is 157,293), it is one of the most important sectors in terms of workers’ degree of skill and level of adaptation of technology in production.

These two sectors represent two important dynamics of the manufacturing industry of Turkey and a study, which will be made on these cases, could present the general structure of the manufacturing industry. In addition to this, these two cases draw different pictures in terms of forms labor intensity, forms of flexibility, types of labor

---

3 Retrieved from the textile report of 2013 prepared by Ministry of Science, Industry and Technology.

4 http://www.sgk.gov.tr/wps/portal/tr/kurumsal/istatistikler/sgk_istatistik_yilliklari
regimes, subcontracting practices and organization of workplace. For this reason, it is predicted that these two cases will reveal different results in terms of class culture, class experiences and class perception.

In both sectors various scales of workplaces, formal and informal working conditions and different forms of exploitation could be observed. Thus, it may be possible to compare these two sectors with regard to these different conditions and in this way explain how these different concrete working conditions influence the class culture of apprentices, experiencing class antagonism, the perception of class positions, the perception about superior classes, future expectations and the degree of conflict and consent.

Moreover, these two sectors have a common ground since both indicate the characteristics of the accumulation regime of the late capitalist era. In both sectors, apprentice labor becomes functional in terms of the needs of capital as skilled and cheap labor becomes important within the scope of flexible production and employment policies. From this perspective, these sectors give opportunity to discuss the two different aspects of apprentice labor. While skilled labor could be discussed in the metalworking sector, cheap labor could be discussed related to the apparel sector.

On the other hand, this study which focuses on these two cases does not present data on the class culture among apprentices who work in other sectors. It is known that a great proportion of apprentices are employed in service sector which has quite different dynamics from that of industry and should be dealt in detail with different questions. Therefore, it should be indicated that the issue of this study is finding some common and distinctive points in a same ground. In this sense, manufacturing industry is preferred with the aim of providing a common ground.

Within the frame of this study, a field research which consists of semi-structured indepth interviews with 21 apprentices who work in the apparel and metalworking sectors was conducted. Interviews were made with 10 apprentices who work in the metalworking industry. Among these apprentices, 6 of them work in Ümraniye İMES Industrial Area, and 4 of them are working in Kartal Çavuşoğlu Industrial
Area. On the other hand, interviews were made with 11 apprentices who work in the apparel industry. Since production areas of apparel are more dispersed contrary to the metalworking production, interviewees are chosen from distinct areas. With this respect, interviews were made with 3 apprentices in Bağcılar, 4 apprentices in Çağlayan, and 3 apprentices in Sultanbeyli.

It is paid attention to choose interviewees from both small and large sized enterprises rather than concentrating on a specific field because size of the enterprise becomes an important factor in the labor processes. Organization of workplace determines the manner of control mechanisms, class relations and differentiates perception of work, perception of boss and future expectations. For this reason, size of enterprise is taken as one of the main objective criterions of the class culture. Among the apprentices who work in the metalworking sector, 3 of them work in large-sized enterprises and others work in small-sized enterprises. On the other hand, since nearly all of the workplaces of apparel sector is consisted of small-sized enterprises, formal-informal differentiation is taken as criterion for this sector. In this context, among the apprentices who work in the apparel sector, 4 of them work at formal enterprises and 6 work at informal enterprises.

Interviews are made in several places. Among the interviews which were made with the apprentices who work in the metalworking sector, 4 were made in the district where they live while 6 were made in the apprenticeship training center. On the other hand, since the apprentices who work in the apparel sector are not generally registered in an apprenticeship training center related to their non-covered employment, among the interviews which were made with the apprentices who work in the apparel sector, 8 were made in the workplace, 2 were made in apprenticeship training center while 1 were made in the home. During these interviews, also 4 employers in the apparel sector were interviewed. Giving place to their speech was found important within the frame of the study.

Interviews with workers were conducted individually and lasted between 30-120 minutes and were tape recorded for transcribe their experiences and ideas by their own words. Very much attention is paid for being free from employers, teachers and
family members during the interview. However, in some interviews, other apprentices who are colleagues or classmates are included in the interview. In many case, their discussions between each other become more efficient regarding clarification of the common experiences.

The questions directed to apprentices are collected under those topics: demographic information about apprentices, working conditions and perception of working relations, perception of work, class consciousness, ideas about unionizing, resistance practices, perceptions and feelings about the work, the boss, the rich and the educated people, future expectation, cultural consumption and leisure time activities. In this way, it is aimed to understand on the one hand structural processes, in other words, material and objective conditions. In this context, class structure and the class position should be discussed from the point of labor regimes in connection with concrete experiences of apprentices in the production process. On the other hand, the realm of perceptions, consciousness, feelings, consent and conflict, in other words, subjective processes which prompt the apprentices to resist or keep them from transforming their conditions, more relevantly, how and under which conditions they think and act against their objective conditions.

1.3. Working Class Literature

In the working class literature, one of the missing issues is the relationship between class and youth. In recent years, some works have been done which consider youth culture (Gençlik Halleri, Hakan Yücel (2013), Apacı Gençlik Kitabı, Ömer Miraç Yaman (2013)). However, these works examine the youth as an identity and do not deal with its relationship with working class. On the other hand, some works deal with the issue within economic categories from the approach of child labor. This approach problematizes child labor by referring to human right perspective by defining the issue within the general concept of childhood (Akpmar, 2006). The main problem of this approach is negation of social inequality and class differentiation behind the question. In addition to this, this approach takes the category of childness as unique, homogeneous category. Some other works focuses on the increase in the rate of employed children and research area with quantitative data. The problem of
this approach which could be seen also in some of the works on poverty is negation of the fact that children are the subjects of the production process who could think, act and experience. This study aims to contribute to working class literature by constituting relationship between the category of youth and the category of social class by referring to their daily life experiences and class relations that they enter into.

In Turkey, many works from different fields conducted on working class are available. Within the framework of this study, most of them were benefited. However, most of these works concentrate on the organized segments of the working class and depend on quantitative data about the production and employment, and on labor legislation. From this perspective, working class history is mainly associated with the history of industrialization and unionization. Unorganized segments of the working class, daily life practices and perceptions of workers are mostly missing issues in the working class literature. Nevertheless, it may be claimed that some works which concentrate on the daily life practices including speeches of the workers have been done after the second half of 2000s, especially after the Tekel workers’ resistance.

In the working class literature, the works which focus on the history of working class movement by referring to various periods in the economic and politic history of Turkey have become beneficial for the comprehension of macro context of the working class history and industrialization; and macro changes in working class struggle; in this way, have given general ideas about the dynamics of development of the class culture. (Koç (2010), Güzel (1984), Sencer (1969), Akkaya (2010), Makal (2007), Boratav (2005)). Differently from other classical works, Boratav make an analysis on the class locations in “1980’li Yıllarda Toplumsal Sınıflar ve Bölüüşüm”. However, these works have not dealt with class relations and class culture in Turkey.

In addition to these works, it is possible to encounter certain micro historical labor studies which criticize such a macro-historical perception and develop a bottom-up approach on working class. These works concentrate on the formation of working class in the process of the capitalist development between late Ottoman and the early
republic period (Quataert & Zürcher, 2007), Atabaki & Ahmad (2010)). The basic contribution of these works is revealing some class experiences which are ignored in macro perspective. Hakan Koçak’s work on Paşabahçe glass workers could be associated to such works. In his work, he discusses class formation process of glass workers in social history perspective. In addition to this, Birelma’s (2014) work on the class mobilization in three factories focuses on the experience of unionization. By giving the place to the speeches of organized workers he contributes to social historical works on the working class.

One of the main works, which has taken place in this study is Anadolu’da Küresel Fabrika’nın Doğuşu, Yeni İşçilik Örüntülerinin Sosyolojisi (MetinÖzüğurlu, 2008). In this work, Özüğurlu deals with the emergence of global factory and in parallel to this, the emergence of the new proletarian wave by referring to the current case of the textile sector in Denizli. He argues that the new proletariat which is related to the concept of global capital has taken the place of craft-type proletariat which emerged through domestic industry in 1940s. This work is very important as it includes both theoretical discussions about class and constitution process of linkage between local dynamics and global dynamics.

On the other hand, the works which focus on the urban petit production and employment relations in the small-sized enterprises represent an important aspect of the working class literature. Ayhan Aktar argues that capitalist relations of production are more prevalent in the small-sized enterprises rather than in pre-capitalist craft relations. Unlike craft production, the production is based on commodity in the small-sized enterprises. In his work, he deals with subcontracting types in the small sized enterprises by referring to backward and onward linkage with parent companies. The work of Aktar is included in the study for explaining the outsourcing and sub-industry differentiation between the apparel and metalworking industries in terms of subcontracting types. In addition to this, Arif Geniş states that the working class literature should consider the class relations in the small-sized enterprises since the majority of the working population is employed by such enterprises. He deals with class locations of petit producers and presents a large data
about socio-economical conditions of the workers who work in the OSTİM Industrial Zone. Nadir Suğur (1995), in his study on the same case, discusses the subcontracting, flexibility and employment relations in the small-sized enterprises. He argues that small-sized enterprise is a dominant enterprise culture in Turkey. He deals with the employment relationships which depend on paternalism and fraternalism between employer and journeymen and apprentices. Dubetsky (1976) in his study on Aktepe discusses about the culture which depends on kinship and primordial relationships in the small-sized enterprises from the view of employers.

The works on the subcontracting practices and labor regimes in the late capitalist era constitute another aspect of the working class literature (Yücesan (2008), Müftüoğlu (2000), Akdemir (2007)). These works deal with irregular, precarious working condition of the working class in the late capitalist era by referring to the various cases. Yücesan draws attention to new types of work and argues that prevalence of subcontracting practices brings prevalence of despotic labor regimes. These works have contributed to understand the objective structural process behind formation and non-formation of class culture.

The works which have been mostly used in the study are concentrating on daily life practice of the working class ((Erdoğan (2007), Durak (2011), Coşkun (2013), Birelma (2014)). Among these works, Coşkun focuses specifically on class culture among textile and mineworkers. He considers class not only within economic category but he discusses class in terms of development of class identity. He deals with the dynamics which reveal class culture by regarding class relations, daily life resistances and relationships between workers. Yasin Durak discusses the class relations with respect to their linkage to ideological political hegemony. In his work on Konya Industrial Zone, he seeks the ideological influence of the religion in the class relations. The book of Erdoğan and his colleagues on the urban poor is also one of the most important works due to the fact that it focuses on the perception and feelings of the poor about the social hierarchies and their manifestations in daily encounters. Gül Özyeğin (2005) and Aksu Bora (2011) have made important contributions to working class literature by referring to the connections between
gender and class. In this study, the works of these authors are not included since gender is not discussed within the study. This issue should be dealt in more detail in another work in terms of culture of working class youths.

1.4. Theoretical Framework

In this study, “class culture” constitutes the main concept and the concept of class is used in the Marxist sense. Marxist theoreticians have discussed the category of class with regard to the agent-structure dualism. Class, on the one hand, refers to a structural, obligatory category of capitalist relations of production; on the other hand, it is defined as a subject of history which struggles to transform the existing relations of production. The main question is whether a category of class which precedes class struggle can be defined, in other words, is class a structural or a constructed entity in the historical process? In Marx’s own conception it is possible to observe a dialectic relationship between the two perspectives. The statement in the Eighteenth Brumaire of Louis Bonaparte overcomes this dualism: “Men make their own history, but they do not make it just as they please; they do not make it under circumstances chosen by themselves, but under circumstances directly encountered, given and transmitted from the past.” (2008:10)

The existence of an empirical reality which is constituted of people from the same social class who act and think in a specific way, thus defining class as a given category of the capitalist mode of production is the issue. On the other hand, the capitalist mode of production has been born into a specific society and social classes develop within the dynamics, as Marx states, “transmitted from the past”. From this perspective, class refers to an historical being as well as a structural category. In this sense, Burawoy’s emphasis is important: “General concepts can be specified in order to develop theories of particular societies. There are no general theories; only general concepts and particular theories” (1982, 13-14).

Chakrabarty expresses a similar point in a more particular way, in his first statement of Rethinking Working Class History: “There cannot be any capitalist production without working class. But there can be, as Marxists have often pointed out in the recent past, capitalism that subsumes pre-capitalist relationships.” (2000:1). From
this perspective, the manner of capitalist development and proletarianization in a sense refers to historical specificity.

This theoretical approach becomes important for the late industrialized social formations like Turkey and refers to the basic discussions related to class culture. Although capitalism develops in these societies as a result of the law of uneven and combined development, it develops in a specific way regarding specific property structure and manner of production relations. Although it transforms the pre-capitalist relations of production in the process of commodity production, it does not necessarily transform completely the pre-capitalist class relations. From this perspective, the question of Chakrabary gains importance: “what happens, then, when we have a working class born into a culture characterized by the persistence of pre-capitalist relationships or by the absence of notions of “citizenship”, “individualism,” “equality before the law” and so on?” (ibid, xiii). Similar question could be asked for Turkey. In the case of the lack of hegemonic bourgeois culture in which impersonal, contractual, rational relations do not become hegemonic in the bourgeois civil society, could it be mentioned about a working class as a transformative subject?

Therefore, the main discussion is freedom of labor, in relation to this, how class interest, class consciousness, class struggle will emerge within this particularity. In other words, how will class gain a transformative character under unfree labor circumstances?

For Marx, freedom of labor reveals the working class as a subject of history. Indeed, the worker becomes conscious about his class interests in the production of commodity. For Marx, submission to capital results in the emergence of free labor related to the expropriation of workers, so-called “having nothing to lose but their chains”. Such expropriation not only implies deprivation from the property rights on the means of production but also loss of control on the work and production process; and loss of quality, skill and particularity in labor. In other words, labor becomes free labor by way of its transformation to a simple commodity and the alienation, and reification of the worker to his productive activity.
From this perspective, freedom of labor could be associated with the mechanization process and factory production. In the factory system, as a result of the subordination to machines, labor becomes invisible. Marx explains this issue as “the separation of the intellectual faculties from manual labor” (Marx, 1976). With relation to the factory Marx says: “the wearisome routine of endless drudgery in which the same mechanical process is ever repeated”, thus differentiating the factory from manufacture and handicrafts:

In handicrafts and manufacture, the worker makes use of a tool; in the factory, the machine makes use of him... In manufacture the workers are the parts of a living mechanism. In the factory we have a lifeless mechanism, which is independent of the workers, who are incorporated into it as its living appendages. (1976: 548)

Moreover, freedom of labor becomes possible with the resolution of all pre-capitalist forms of dependence, which include both personal dependency and dependence to work. Marx explains the characteristics of craft labor, which differs from capitalist labor:

Every workman had to be versed in a whole round of tasks, had to be able to make everything that was to be made with his tools. The limited intercourse and the weak ties between the individual towns, the lack of population and the narrow needs did not allow of a more advanced division of labour, and therefore every man who wished to become a master had to be proficient in the whole of his craft. Medieval craftsmen therefore had an interest in their special work and in proficiency in it, which was capable of rising to a limited artistic sense. For this very reason, however, every medieval craftsman was completely absorbed in his work, to which he had a complacent servile relationship, and in which he was involved to a far greater extent than the modern worker, whose work is a matter of indifference to him.(1998:74)

In Marx’s expression, the main difference between the medieval craftsman and the modern worker is explained as absorption in work, which at the same time prevents the emergence of the freedom of labor. In this way, Marx, in a sense, emphasizes the contradiction between free labor which represents abstracted, simple, generalized
labor by depending on capital and skilled labor which depends on work and is identified with particular and concrete labor.

In his argument related to freedom of labor, Marx constitutes a relationship between deskilling, mechanization, dissolution of pre-capitalist relations and class-consciousness. Therefore, it might be mentioned that skill and personal dependency has a negative impact on class-consciousness by providing qualification, in a sense, status to labor. Skill which refers to the particularity of labor prevents a complete subordination of labor to capital through providing a status to labor, in this way, it prevents class consciousness among workers through dependence on work. From this perspective, in social formations in which “capitalism subsumes pre-capitalist relations” and personal dependence is part of class relations, dependence on work continues through skill and class antagonism and class consciousness may not emerge as rational class interests.

Similar issue emerges in the case of apprenticeship which implies personal dependence to master and also to work itself. Apprenticeship refers to the process of learning skills. In this sense, labor does not become generalized and abstracted but protects its particularity. This issue emerges a problem of freedom of labor that will result in the class consciousness based on rational class interest. This issue does not only related to dependence to work but also dependence to master for setting own business in the future. Such issue derives from a different perception than the perception of “having noting to lose but their chains”. Culture becomes important within this context. Chakrabarty argues the same points for the Indian Working Class:

This culture did not always act in the best “economic” interest of the industry…their notions of authority, their modes of protest, the problems of their organizations, and the weakness of their solidarity, all reveal, on inspection, the existence of a pre-bourgeois culture and consciousness that in combination with and acting through the so-called economic and political factors impaired their capacity to act as a class. This is what eventually leads us to emphasize the importance, in Marx’s discussion of labor-capital relationship, of his assumption regarding a hegemonic bourgeois culture. (2000:12)
In this sense, the culture refers to social laws, as Marx states, “transmitted from the past”. Hall explains this issue by referring to the concept of “historical reservoir” which means pre-constituted field of possibilities (Hall, 2003). From this perspective, when capitalist relations of production enter into a society encounter with its historically constituted cultural laws and develop within and against these laws. Such understanding is available in Gramsci’s conceptualization. Gramsci names these cultural laws as “popular philosophy” which resemble to “stratified deposit” containing “stone age elements and principles of a more advanced science, prejudices from all past phases of history at the local level and intuitions of a future philosophy which will be that of a human race united the world over.” (Gramsci, 2000:326)

From this perspective, class structures and class locations will not be sufficient to understand formation and non-formation of class. Culture has an effect on the formation of class relations as antagonistic relations and on the translation of class antagonism to class interest. For this reason, class agency could be sought in “belonging”. This viewpoint departs from the Thompson’s approach of class:

Classes arise because men and, women, in determinate productive relations, identify their antagonistic interests, and come to struggle, to think, and to value in class ways: thus the process of class formation is a process of self-making, although under conditions which are “given” (1978:106-107)

Hoggart in his study on working class culture, he defines class: “They feel rather that they are “working class” in the things they admire and dislike, in belonging (Hoggart, 1970:20). In this way, class is associated with “distinctive “way of life” of the class, meanings, values and ideas embodied in institutions, in social relations, in system of beliefs, in customs, in the uses of objects and material life” (Hall, 2003: 10). Similarly, Lockwood defines traditional proletariat which has sentiment of belonging to a work-dominated collectivity through having distinctive occupational culture in which workmates are also leisure time companions, often neighbors of each other (1977:17-18).From this perspective, class emerges through differentiating from other; and class differentiation presents itself as cultural differentiation.
Therefore, cultural field becomes a field of class struggle which unifies working class against the other class.

Such a conception that codifies classes as “them” and “us” (Hoggart, 1970) is constituted also by objectivity. In this sense, Bourdieu’s concept of “habitus” becomes important in terms of establishing relation between subjective dispositions and objective necessities. For Bourdieu (1993), preferences, dispositions are determined by the space of possibilities of the agents in the fields. Class rises by the capability of position taking in the fields, in other words, force of agents in participating to the fields. From this perspective, subjectivity is limited through the objectivity. It may be claimed, with Bourdieus’s words, objectivity of subjective. Classes are structured through exclusion from these fields. These fields could be cultural as well as economic, for this reason, winning in the field necessitate various type of capital (economic, cultural, social and symbolic). Deprivation from the economic capital brings deprivation from all the other types of capital. In this sense, class contradictions could be emerged related to various fields and due to the deprivation of various types of capital.

In this context, “respect” may become the issue of class contradictions related to deprivation from the symbolic and cultural capital, in this way, exclusion from the symbolic field. “Respectability” may become expression of social inequalities manifested in the behaviors of the people in the course of encounters and may translate itself to class contradiction in the experiences. Sayer states:

Class matters to us not only because of differences in material wealth and economic security, but also because it affects our access to things, relationships, experiences and practices which we have reason to value, and hence our chances of living a fulfilling life. At the same time it affects how others value us and respond to us, which in turn affects our sense of self-worth. We are evaluative beings, continually monitoring and assessing our behavior and that of others, needing their approval and respect, but in contemporary society this takes place in the context of inequalities such as those of class, gender and ‘race’ which affect both what we are able to do and how we are judged. Condescension, deference, shame, guilt, envy, resentment, arrogance, contempt, fear and mistrust, or
simply mutual incomprehension and avoidance, typify relations between people of different classes (2005:1).

In this sense, class positions emerge from the class locations; however, they are performed in the class relations. Class positions reveal, as Sennett says, in the eyes of others and of themselves and dignity by the images it projects of why people belong to high or low classes. (1977: 171).

In the study, all these theoretical approaches will be used to discuss class culture among apprentices.

1.5. Outline of the Chapters

This thesis consists of five chapters. Chapter 1 includes objective of the study, the problematic of the thesis and basic questions, theoretical framework, methodology and relevant literature in Turkey.

Chapter 2 tries to deal with the general issues which are discussed in terms of class culture in Turkey. In this context, it is focused on industrialization, expropriation, workerization, urbanization and unionization processes in various periods of the Turkish history. In this way, it is aimed to seek the historical and structural dynamics which hinder or contribute to formation of class culture.

Chapter 3 focuses on the flexible production and employment in the late capitalist era. It is tried to understand the different types of flexibilization in the apparel and metalworking sectors in terms of differentiation of subcontracting practices, forms of employment and labor regimes. In relation to these issues, it is investigated the differences in the perceptions of apprentices about their jobs.

Chapter 4 mainly considers the subjective process like making sense, perceptions, experiences and dreams which contribute to conflict and consent among apprentices. It is dealt with making sense of the production and relations of production. In relation to this, perception of apprentices about the workplace, the boss, working relations, resistance and solidarity practices are discussed. In addition to this, it is considered how class hierarchies are experienced and perceived among apprentices.
by referring to their words on the rich and educated population. Besides, it is investigated the future expectations and leisure time activities of apprentices to understand to what extent apprentices are belong to a distinguished class culture.

In Chapter 5, it is aimed to do a general assessment about class culture and apprentices by considering both objective conditions and their subjective expressions.
CHAPTER 2

WORKING CLASS AND WORKING CLASS CULTURE IN TURKEY

In Turkey, discussions about the class culture among workers concentrate on the aspects concerning capitalist development and the role of the state. The main emphasis on this issue is specificity of capitalist development. Capitalist mode of production developed in Turkey within the framework of uneven and combined development of capitalism, and therefore, capitalist relations of production have progressed. However, it may be stated that these relations have primarily been developed by pre-capitalist relations and powerful state control. Such a specificity does not refer to a particular characteristic of Turkey; however, this could be attributed to all other peripheral countries which experience dependent capitalist development, and relevantly, late industrialization (Özuğurlu, 2008). Such an issue, which reveals a different picture from the classical type of capitalist development, also refers to different paths of formation of class culture. The classical path includes the processes of expropriation, industrialization, urbanization, proletarianization and unionization. These processes which contribute to the formation of working class culture, and produce class relations based on antagonism have not been developed in linear form in Turkey; but rather occurred within pre-capitalist relations which coexist with capitalist relations.

In this chapter, it is aimed to discuss the structural and historical factors and processes, which hinder or contribute to class culture and its possible effects on the class relations in the late period of capitalism in Turkey. To understand this issue, the processes mentioned above will deal with (industrialization, expropriation, urbanization, working class and class organization) in regard to various periods in the history of Turkey.
2.1. Formation of Working Class and the Basic Issues in Class Culture in the Process of Capitalist Development in Turkey

Considering the class culture in Turkey, it is commonly argued that class culture has not fully developed yet. One of the main discussions is property structure in the Ottoman Empire and the prevalence of petit production. Keyder (2009) mentions about the similarity of Ottoman property system with that of Byzantine, which depends on central state control on the land property and transference of land use to independent peasants. This issue on the one hand, plays a role in the retardation of the expropriation and of the transformation of rural population to wage laborers; on the other hand has contributed to perceive social relations as more egalitarian relations, by preventing differentiation between classes.

The retardation of the expropriation brings out emergence of working class as semi-proletarian in the beginning of the capitalist development and causes a widespread perception which associates working in a factory temporarily and with additional activity which could be done alongside of peasantry (Koç (2010), Akkaya (2010)). Therefore, it may be stated that the Ottoman property system has a characteristic which prevents complete subordination of labor to capital. This issue plays a negative role in the emergence of working class as free labor, in that it delays proletarianization. Akkaya mentions about the over-employment in factories since workers could leave the job arbitrarily when they do not need to work especially in the harvest season.

In addition to this, even if the expropriation process had been completed, it would still have been difficult to transform the rural population to wage laborers since domestic production cannot provide adequate capital accumulation as well as the constitution of grand production plants which would attract expropriated population. Dominance of foreign capital and the strict state control on the productive forces come to the fore as the main reasons of this issue. The control of the state over the guild system, which organizes urban production, has prevented a possible differentiation among petit producers. By maintaining competition among the guild members, the state has played a negative role in the transformation of certain masters into capitalists or into wage laborers. Regarding this matter, it is stated that the guild
system cannot be disbanded within its own dynamics since state policies aim to sustain guild system (Koç, 2010) and this situation generates an opportunity of resistance for urban petit producers (Özuğurlu, 1995).

On the other hand, in spite of the state policies which aim to retain the legal status of the guild system, dominance of foreign capital on the internal market has caused dissolution of the guild system. Foreign capital has weakened domestic production which can be observed in the small workshops. Since urban petit producers could not compete with Western goods, they have begun to leave their traditional occupations (Ibid). This issue has prevented urban petit producers from emerging as independent national bourgeoisie which could play a role in bourgeois revolution. The social group which can be identified as bourgeois class was composed of commercial entrepreneurs from non-Muslim population who functions as compradors of foreign capital (Boratav, 2009).

Dominance of foreign capital on the internal market has a negative impact on the industrialization process on account of the fact that it increases the dependency on external market of industrial goods. Since domestic production could not compete with foreign goods, commerce has become more preferable for private entrepreneurs (Ibid). This situation on the one hand gives the state a central role in the industrialization process (Özuğurlu, 1995), on the other hand, causes a tendency in labor-intensive and low-value-added sectors like textile rather than capital-intensive sectors which provide more capital accumulation. The main consequence of this process is concentration of domestic production mostly on state factories and dominance of self-employment in urban space and continuity of petit production in rural locations.

Koç states that rural depopulation was not significant until the 1950s. 75.8% of the population lived in villages and townships according to the census taken in 1927. He mentions about the fact that this rate did not change significantly until the 1950s.
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5Free Commerce Agreement of 1838 and constitution of Duyun-u Umumiye Administration have facilitated foreign capital investment in the Ottoman Empire by decreasing import duties. (Özuğurlu, 1995)
When urban production is taken as a basis, he states that the rate of wage laborers is less than the rates of self-employment and unpaid family workers. According to quantitative data of the census of manufacturing taken in 1921, in the cities outside of metropolises such as İstanbul, İzmir, Adana, Bursa the number of workers per enterprise was 2.53 according to the census of manufacturing in 1921. In 1927, %36 of the total enterprises belonged to the self-employed people and %36 belonged to employers who employed less than three workers. %8 of the enterprises included only employers and unpaid family workers. Therefore, 80% of the enterprises could be included in the scope of small-sized enterprises. This situation shows the prevalence of the small-sized workshops which are not managed by capitalists but by merchants and craftsmen, and in which simple reproduction is significant rather than expanded reproduction (Koç, 2010: 96).

It may be argued that working class is born into the structure referred above. Notions related to class struggle like consciousness, organization and solidarity are influenced by these historical and structural processes.

### 2.1.1. The Problems in Unionization

The general argument related to this period is the weakness of the working class struggle. The issues mentioned above play a negative role in the formation of the working class and working class culture. First of all, it is predominantly stated that continuity of rural petit production has negative influence on the subordination to capital, in this way it delays proletarianization. Workers who work in the factories have strong relations with rural area. Since they do not regard working in these enterprises as permanent activity, they stay away from unionizing (Akkaya, 2010).

Moreover, this semi-proletarian population could not meet the needs of qualified labor of industry. For this reason, qualified labor is supplied by the foreign and non-muslim population. It is stated that this issue has caused a fragmentation within the working class due to the wage differentiation between muslim and non-muslim workers and has had a negative impact on the constitution of class solidarity between workers. (Koç (2010), Akkaya (2010), Güzel (1984)).
Secondly, prevalence of self-employment and being a small business boss, which is the prevalent issue of urban petit production had a negative effect on the formation of social classes since it plays a negative role in experiencing class differentiation and class antagonism between apprentices and masters. Güzel draws attention to paternalist and protectionist relationships in the guild system and emphasizes that these relations prevent class-consciousness among the workers. These connections mean social security for workers and provide solidarity between masters and apprentices rather than between workers (Güzel, 2007). This social security is provided through learning about special occupations and having own businesses with the help of the master. Exchange of class positions in such a way and the necessity to be close to the small master in order to achieve this aim play negative role in the class consciousness. The apprentices and journeymen have to respect their masters for setting up their own businesses (Vatter, 2007). Koç states that having own business was a possibility which could be put into practice until 1940s. This issue on the one hand constitutes the reason, which lies under the hope of having own business among apprentices and journeymen (Koç, 2010); on the other hand provides the continuity of paternalist and solidarist relations between master and apprentices; inserts these relations into the capitalist relations and shapes class culture in accordance with these relations.

Relevant to this issue, it is pointed out that training and subvention of qualified workers among muslim workers in the early years of the republic, regarding the decrease in the number of qualified workforce after non-muslim population had left the country due to wars and population exchange, did not create the expected result. According to the annual report of industry, it is stated that these workers preferred to use their qualification in setting up their own businesses rather than progressing in grand factories (Koç, 2010). Therefore, it may be claimed that self-employment is a reason of general class disposition within the working class. This disposition shows that workers do not submit to proletarianization but seek alternatives. The continuity of their rural ties and the opportunity of self-employment building upon the pre-existent property and production system emerge as alternatives to being proletariat. In this sense, they could find an opportunity to avoid of the subordination of capitalist relations which discipline the labor and constitute class hierarchies.
Thirdly, as stated above, since private entrepreneurs gravitate to commercial investment owing to the fact that industrial investment is not beneficial for the short-term interest of entrepreneurs because of the dominance of the foreign capital, the state takes the primary role in industrial development. For this reason, industrial proletariat has emerged in the state factories, which were firstly established in Tanzimat Period for meeting the needs of the state, in particular, the needs of army (Koç (2010), Akkaya (2010), Quatert (2007), Güzel (1984), Özuğurlu (1995)). It is stated that the reason behind this role of the state is the obedient attitude of the Turkish working class, which identifies the state as the father figure (Akkaya, 2010). It is argued that this issue prevents the emergence of class consciousness by neutralizing class antagonism and hindering the collaboration in free labor. Concentration on both policy making and on employment responsibilities within the state is also a critical point since it plays a significant role in the invisibility of the formal separation between economy and politics in the constitution of social relations.

Concerning this issue, Koç gives the example of state practices about the involuntary, obligatory working in the late period of the Ottoman Empire. Such an issue, on the one hand, intercepts the process of penetration of minds through bourgeois notions like negotiation, contract, into class relations; on the other hand, serves to constitution of ideological hegemony of “classless, unprivileged, integrated society” which dominates early republic era of Turkey.

All these structures and relations mentioned above hamper experiencing class antagonism in daily lives and shape commonsense in people and thus, influence class culture, class struggle and level of organization. As for the organizations and actions during the emergence of the working class, there are two main issues which are underlined and which has great significance for class culture. Firstly, the population who has craft tradition plays important role in the formation of worker organizations. From this perspective, non-muslim population who had strong artisanal relations led to worker actions (Özuğurlu, 1995). Secondly, it is referred that workers in the guild system could not present a remarkable example of worker actions. It is more possible to see these actions in the sectors which have different work procedures from guild
system like mining industry and forestry (Güzel, 1984). Therefore, secession of the non-muslim population from the country as a result of population exchanges and wars meant the loss of the most organized and qualified part of the working class. This issue brings that the class culture, which began to emerge through strikes and actions and organized in the trade unions and socialist organizations after 1908 could not be transferred to subsequent periods. It could be claimed that this situation contributes to the silence of the working class within the years between 1925 and 1945 and increases the prevalence of corporatist policies in the early period of the republic, based on the discourse of “classless, unprivileged, integrated society”. In this period, strikes and organizations based on class differentiation were forbidden; instead of this, organizations which aim reconciliation between social classes and keep the class movement under control were constituted. People’s Houses and union of merchants could be evaluated within such organizations. In this way, continuity of solidarist culture between employer and employee has been enabled.

2.2. Acceleration of Proletarianization and Class Culture

It may be stated that class culture and unionization have found the opportunity of development in the process of rapid urbanization after 1945. The period after 1945 is important regarding both development of working class and bourgeois class. Ayşe Buğra (2008) refers that the period after the Second World War, especially Democratic Party period, is the turning point in the emergence of businessmen regarding implementation of liberal economic policies and support of private business. In her study on the businessmen, she states that most of the grand corporations and prominent businessmen of today like Koç, Sabancı and Eczacıbaşı have emerged in this period. The critical point is that enrichment of these businessmen is not related to development of rural capital or manufacturing. The
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6Labor historians state that strikes of the weaving workers of Damascus represent an exception. According to the microhistorical study of Vattery, we can mention about the fact that constitution of employer-employee relations between master and apprentices in the beginning of the 19th century contributed to the occurrence of class antagonism. Vatter argues that these strikes took place because of the decrease of the wages due to the capitalization of the relationship between masters and workers which also brought out less possibility of journeymen and apprentices having their own businesses. (For further information, see: Vattery (2007) in Osmanlı’dan Cumhuriyet Türkiye’sine İşçiler 1839-1950.)
social origin of the businessman is mostly officer or merchant rather than landowning or artisan. At this point, Buğra argues that instead of dissolution of rural structure or craftsmanship, seizure of the properties of non-muslim population which are expropriated after Wealth Tax (*Varlık Vergisi*) and constitution of familiar relationships with government officials contributed to the emergence of Turkish businessmen. The emergence of businessmen is critical regarding constitution of the urban rich, which could play a role in clarifying class differentiation.

This period is important in terms of development of the working class due to increase in expropriation and proletarianization. Özuğurlu names the proletarianization, which begin in this period and last until 1980s as traditional craft type proletarianization (Özuğulu, 2008). Differently from other periods, in this period, proletarianization increased by depending on internal dynamics. Agricultural mechanization and import substitution industrialization constitute the basic internal dynamics in proletarianization.

It is referred two sub-periods between 1945 and 1975. The first sub-period 1945-1960 refers to start of dissolution of agriculture due to mechanization but could not directly result in industrialization because of the populist policies of Democratic Party Government. In this period, agricultural mechanization accelerated the mass migration to the cities and brought in urbanization. However, the level of industrialization did not have the capacity of proletarianization of all immigrants. As noted in the previous section, accumulation of capital was not adequate to absorb expropriated population in grand industrial plants. Thus, such an issue created the problem of balance between industrialization and urbanization. At this point, urban petit production or petit service, in other words, continuity of the forms of self-employment became the main choice for most of the newcomers of the city. Related to this issue Boratav says this urban petit producers constitute a “buffer group” composed of unwaged and unsalaried population which refers to a mixture of the petit bourgeoisie and the lumpen proletariat in sociological sense (Boratav, 2009: 115). In the process of proletarianization, informal sector becomes an important area.
Such intermediary form which emerged in the urbanization process and, in which unpaid family workers were significant, functioned within the informal structure not only in terms of economic activity, but also in terms of settlement. The need of accommodation of new arrivals emerged the phenomenon of the *gecekondu* and organized an informal daily life in the periphery of the cities. The phenomenon of migration also revealed a group of urban entrepreneurs who enrich from the construction sector as a result of the boom in the demand of accommodation; and new arrivals are employed in these constructions in subsequent periods. Therefore, it become possible to mention about the emergence of informal form of richness, different from that of the businessmen stated above, provided by built dwellings and gained steady income, instead of investing in industry (Karpal, 1976) and benefit from the informal sector. In addition to this, emergence of the proletariat composed of new arrivals could be seen in these informal spaces.

Such an issue has significant consequences on the shaping of class culture. Migration process in a sense does not result in workerization directly but brings the continuity of the petit production and small-sized enterprise, which refers to prevalence of the petit bourgeois culture, instead of working class culture. Continuity of the self-employment constitutes an alternative to participating in the proletariat and in this way provides the continuity of the pre-existent disposition of working class in setting up own business. This situation also causes performing paternalist, fraternalist, non-contractual, impersonal class relations which are significant in the small-sized enterprises (Suğur, 1995). On the other hand, space has emerged as a factor which plays a role in the formation of class culture. New arrivals have constituted relatively homogeneous communities in socio-economic and cultural sense.

Urban petit production is explained with the terms of informal, marginal, unorganized, temporary working or irregular working (Ayata, 1987). However, it is difficult to mentioned about a static form but rather a changeable form which is reshaped regarding changes in state policies and the level of industrialization. Related to this issue it is stated that the population which come to the city with the first migration wave after 1945 established the marginal, subsistence sector of the economy; however find an opportunity to develop and move out of the marginal
sector into small enterprises in the formal economy due to expansion of state credit to private business in the period of the Democratic Party (Peker, 1996). Their place in the marginal sector is occupied by new migrants (Ibid). Especially after 1960, these small sized enterprises are supported in accordance to import substitution policies to bring developmental character to these enterprises. For this aim, Organized Industrial Zones are established in the outskirts of the cities. Supporting of small-sized enterprises has caused differentiation within subcontracting practices between central works and peripheral works (Şenyapılı, 1980) as well as between formal and informal works. This issue will have more significant conclusions after 1980s.

The period between 1960-1975 refers to significance of industrial development through implementation of import substitution industrialization. Industrial policies in this process aimed to develop industry by protecting domestic entrepreneurs. This issue has provoked industrial investment within entrepreneurs. Commercial entrepreneurs begin to deal with also manufacturing, in this way, gain a developmental character. In this process, in addition to labor-intensive industries, it is begun to specialize on capital-intensive industries (Boratav, 2009) In this way, accumulation of capital increases, and this situation facilitates absorption of new arrivals in the grand industrial plants. These industrial plants mostly consist of State Economic Enterprises. Therefore, in spite of the relative development in the industrialization, this process has not resulted in development of private entrepreneurs. State still plays the main role in the industrialization process.

However, it could be stated that this process is important in terms of formation of class culture in terms of acceleration of workerization, development of unionization, and constitution of proletarian neighborhoods. Indeed, the period between 1945-1975 “class culture” has become commonly used concept for many countries in discussing the class relations. This period so-called Golden Age of Capitalism is important in terms of emergence of class identity through institutionalization and homogenization of the working class. This process is crucial regarding class culture related to acquiring social rights like unionization and collective bargaining; and with Burawoy’s (1982) conceptualization, refers to constitutionalization of labor through establishment contractual, formal and impersonal relations between employers and
workers. Related to this period, it may be claimed that class actions, which depend on rational class interest become prevalent.

In parallel to this, in Turkey, after a long silence, this period refers to the first attempts for unionization of the working class through reemergence of trade unions. In this period, the first trade unions were founded in 1946 and unionized under Confederation of TURK-IS in 1952. (Koç, 2010) However, the right of unionization is not required by class struggle, but emerged related to post war policies. The period between 1960-1975 refers to more concrete development of class actions and unionization. After the trade union act of 1963, the right of unionization has been extended to all wage laborers (Güzel, 1996). As a result of this, the number of the unionized worker has increased from 295,710 to 3,328,633 between 1963 and 1975. In this period it may be considered that class movement has gained more irreconcilable form. In 1967 a group of trade union members constituted DISK (Confederation of Revolutionary Trade Unions of Turkey) by criticizing reconciliatory policies of TURK-IS. In addition to this, between 1963 and 1971, 603 strikes are organized (Güzel, 1996: 209). The strikes and class actions are important class experiences in the history of the working class.

Nevertheless, for the social formation of Turkey, it may be claimed that the issues which hinder the formation of class culture have continued in this period for Turkey. Firstly, workerization has increased but still been insufficient and majority of workers still have rural ties. The rate of self-employed and unpaid family workers was 76% in 1965 and this rate has been reduced to 68% in 1975. On the other hand, the rate of workerization has increased from 22,4% to 31% between 1965 and 1975 (Koç, 2019:184). This issue shows that the rate of petit bourgeois still higher than workers. In this period, job market has been still limited for all expropriated population. For this reason, many people have moved to European countries like Germany and appropriated income generating properties in Turkey (Koç, 2010).

In addition to this, education system which becomes important regarding industrial development in this process, has an important role in the non-formation of class consciousness. In this period, by opening to all segments of society, educational field
could cover class differentiations. Koç argues that the majority of working class believe that they can move up the social ladder through education and states that workers invest in their children’s education. Even, he mentions about the trade union activities which include collecting donation for providing education for workers’ children (Koç, 2010).

In the period 1945-1975, vocational education is also becomes important regarding industrialization. For training skilled workers, vocational high schools are opened in the formal educational institutions. In addition to this, apprenticeship training schools are opened within the State Economic Enterprises (Akpınar, 2006). However, it could be claimed that this process does not result in clarification of class differences. Indeed such a clarification will be significant after 1980 in the process of neoliberal transformation. In Turkey, still formal education prevails non-formal education. Non-formal education is not preferable for lower classes as well as for the majority of the society. In advanced capitalist countries, the rate of formal education is 35% and non-formal education is 65%; however, in Turkey, this rate is reversed (Sönmez, 2008).

2.3. Flexibilization of Labor Market and Class Culture

After 1980, import substitution policies have been replaced by economic liberalization regarding transition to export-oriented capitalism and articulation to international competition. The period after 1980 refers to a strong relation between state and capital within the frame of neoliberal transformation. The state has given up his role in the development, but submits more directly to needs of capital (Yücesan&Özdemir, 2008). In this context, after the 24 January 1980 decisions, real wages have been reduced, trade union movement has been liquidated, right of unionization has been restricted. This process which includes non-contractual, temporary, precarious, irregular working conditions refers to de-constitutionalization of labor (Yücesan, 2008).

In this process, proletarianization and impoverishment have increased. Koç argues that the rate of wage laborers has increased from 33,3% to 43,5% between 1980 and 2000. In addition to this, the number of self employed population has increased from
4.3 million to 5.2 million in the same process. Such issue shows that the period after 1980 refers primarily dissolution of rural petit production and their predominantly proletarianization, and inclusion by informal sectors.

Related to this argument, it is referred that Turkey’s articulation to international competition is realized mainly by promotion of pre-existing small and medium sized enterprises, which have an important place in Turkey’s industrialization process and by their direct linkage to domestic and foreign capital through subcontracts. Hence, the number of small-sized enterprises has not been reduced after 1980s, but rather more depended to domestic or foreign capital (Geniş, 2004). In domestic market, large-sized enterprises and firms have transferred certain parts of their production to small-sized enterprises through subcontracts (Pınarcıoğlu, 2000) to extend their competitiveness capacity. This issue will be dealt in detail regarding the emergence of the global factory and global commodity chains in the next chapter.

The prevalence of small sized enterprises and subcontracting practice has reshaped class relations and working conditions. Subcontracting in a sense make dominant the pre-existent small-sized enterprise culture and employment relations within these enterprises. This culture which depends on informal, personal, paternalist, non-contractual class relations has played a role in the constitution of hegemony of the flexible labor policies, in this way, contributed to dominance of capital on labor. Such hegemony also benefits from hope of setting own business which is included in pre-existent class culture. Related to this issue, Nevra Akdemir states that some foremen who worked previously in a factory become the employers of subcontracting firms (2006:148). In this sense, it may be claimed that legitimacy of the existent working conditions is sustained by historical references.

In this process, capital has reinforced its control on labor through flexibilization of the labor market in accordance to the needs of capital, and prevalence of subcontracting practices regarding fragmentation of the production process and downsizing of enterprises. In this way, working class has predominantly lost social rights. In spite of the Actions of Spring between 1989 and 1991, these social rights could not be gained back.
This period has referred flexibilization and re-regulation of the labor market, in this way, clarification of class positions and hierarchies. As stated above, after 1980, state policies have more and more submitted to the needs of capital. In this context, educational policies in this period have been prepared on behalf of the need of capital and contributed to clarification of class positions.

2.3.1 Education and Flexibilization

After 1980s, affiliation between education and capital could be seen regarding the acceleration of technology and use of knowledge in the production and marketing process in the late capitalist era. Related to this issue, Mandel states:

> The hallmark of this growth of scientific intellectual labour — elicited by the cumulative growth of scientific knowledge, research and development, and ultimately determined by accelerated technological innovation — is the, massive reunification of intellectual and productive activity, and the entry of intellectual labor into the sphere of production. Since this reintroduction of intellectual labor into the process of production corresponds to the immediate needs of the late capitalist technology, the education of intellectual workers must likewise be strictly subordinated to these needs (Mandel, 1998:260)

Such an affiliation is tried to put into practice with “lifelong learning” projects in 2000s with constitution partnership between university and industry. This means that educated population has to spread permanent effort on gaining more competence in accordance with the effort on providing more surplus and they have to compete with each other for surviving in the face of strict elimination system. This issue on the one hand has caused precarization among educated people, on the other hand brings the exclusion of lower classes from the educational field regarding increase of the cost of educational investment due to commodification of education.

Transformation in education system has clarified positions in the labor market, with Gramsci’s terminology, crystallized estates (Gramsci, 1971). While formal education has become an opportunity, which has been got by middle and upper classes’ children, vocational education has become preference for lower classes’ children. (Köse, 1999).
Submission to needs of capital has provoked new type of distinction different from previous white-collar-blue-collar distinction. Distinction occurs in each category itself. Gamze Y. Özdemir (2010) argues that subcontracting and precarious working conditions have been developed by including white-collar workers as well as blue-collar. In this context, it may be mentioned about a differentiation between the workers at the center and the workers at the periphery among white-collar workers. Similarly, universities at the metropolis differentiate from the universities at the periphery in terms of class compositions.

It may be argued that a similar distinction is available among blue-collar workers. Such distinction appears between qualified intermediate staff, skilled workers, semi-skilled workers and unskilled workers. From the beginning of 2000s need of skilled intermediate staff are mostly expressed by grand capitalists of Turkey around the slogan of “Meslek Lisesi Memleket Meselesi”. Skill in a sense provides guaranteed job for a life (Bulut, 2007).

In sum, acceleration of technology, on the one hand has increased the need for new skills, on the other hand has caused deskilling of previously skilled workers, as Braverman states, and re-regularized labor market hierarchy. It may be observed that the education system is regularized hierarchically in accordance with the hierarchy in labor market compositions. Unskilled workers and graduates from peripheral universities are positioned at the bottom since they are condemned to be unemployed, or work in low-status job in very arbitrary working conditions. Skilled workers and graduates from central universities are positioned in higher stages of the hierarchy in labor market. This issue will also be dealt within the frame of apparel and metalworking sectors in the next chapter.

2.4. Concluding Remarks

In this chapter, it is dealt with the proletarianization, urbanization, industrialization, development of trade unions. These periods could be determined by referring to three main corner stones in the proletarianization process. From this perspective, the first period contains the formation of the working class. This period involves the time span between the Tanzimat period and early republic era; the second period refers to
expropriation in the rural area, immigration to cities; and development of the workerization and unionization; and finally the third period involves liquidation of organized labor and putting the flexible, precarious labor regimes into practice.

In a general sense, it could be stated that capitalist relations of production is developed in Turkey within the pre-capitalist relations not by dissolving completely pre-existent structures and relations. In relation to this, class culture is developed mostly referring to pre-existent class relations. The main reason of this issue is late industrialization, in parallel to this, late expropriation and late workerization (rate of the self-employed population prevails the rate of wage laborers until recent years) by way of the continuity of petit production in both urban and rural space.

Such an issue has caused a complicated form which has become more apparent in the period between 1945 and 1975. In this process, on the one hand, it could be seen the emergence of grand capitalists, and formal proletariat which are mostly employed in the State Economic Enterprises. From this perspective, this process refers to constitutionalization of labor regarding recognition of social rights. On the other hand, in the same process, emergence of the small bosses and contractors and informal forms of labor in the outskirts of the metropolis could be regarded.

After 1980s, petit production system has more and more dissolved in the rural space and the rate of the wage laborer has dramatically increased. However, urban petit production has not dissolved but have gained more place in the market through subcontracting due to fragmentation of production. This issue has brought that flexible employment policies could be practiced through informal class relations within subcontract firms with reference to paternalist, fraternalist relations which could be identified with the culture of small sized enterprises.

Another important issue in this process is re-regulation of the labor market, and prevalence of precarious and temporary forms of employment. This issue refers to another division in labor market based on competence and skill differently from the pre-existent division based on white-collar-blue collar differentiation due to the fact that education has lost its feature which provides opportunity to move up social ladders. In this way, on the one hand precarity has brought different segments of
society together; on the other hand constituted new forms of differentiation in the labor market.
CHAPTER 3
FLEXIBILITY IN THE APPAREL AND METALWORKING INDUSTRIES
AND APPRENTICE EMPLOYMENT

Flexibilization refers to a process in which the capital gains control on labor force by restructuring actual wages and job security and by blocking the capacity of unionizing. This process has brought the new proletarian wave into light; which is different from the previous form of proletarianization, in a sense, it refers to proletarianization through dispossession depending on the crisis of primitive accumulation (Özüğurlu, 2008). With this respect, many social groups, which previously stayed out of the labor market, have begun to participate in the working class. In this process, women and children who are under the age of 18 have become more and more a component of the labor market by taking part at the bottom of the labor market hierarchy. Flexibilization gathered many people from different qualifications under same proletarian conditions. From this perspective, a situation of convergence between wage-laborers could be mentioned. However, on the other hand, there could be an observation such as a differentiation in the labor process and employment regimes regarding different flexibilization practices in labor-intensive and capital-intensive sectors. This issue brings out a kind of differentiation regarding working conditions, working relations, relevantly, class experiences, perception of class antagonism and resistance practices. In this chapter, this differentiation will be dealt with, in terms of different production structure, employment regimes and labor process in the case of apparel and metalworking industries by also mentioning about apprentices’ and employers’ experiences.

3.1. Theoretical Background of Flexibilization in the Late Capitalism.

Production structure has been determined by two main processes in the late capitalist era. The first one is flexible spatiality of the capital which is related to the corrosion of the national boundaries and the global organization of the capitalist production; in parallel to this, as a late industrializing country, Turkey’s unequal articulation within international competition. The second one is the change in domestic production structure regarding decentralization of the production and it is explained as flexible
specialization, which refers to the process increasing adaptation of technology to the production process, in parallel to this, to the significance of lean production, skilled labor, specialization through small-sized enterprises.

Global Commodity Chains Approach conceptualized by Wallerstein and Hopkins; and developed by Gereffi and Korzeniewicz presents a ground to understand global organization of production in export-oriented capitalism. Gereffi indicates: “in today’s global factory, the production of a single commodity often spans many countries, with each nation performing tasks in which it has a cost advantage” (Gereffi, 1994:1). From this perspective, industrially advanced countries at the core concentrate on the technology-intensive sectors while the late industrializing countries center upon the labor-intensive sectors. With this respect, the former which is the driving force behind the competition, uses the advantage of proprietary technology, product differentiation, brand reputation, customer relationships, and constant industrial upgrading (cited in Gereffi, 1994) while the latter uses the advantage of low-cost labor force.

Global commodity chains are dominated by transnational corporations and are conducted in two forms. The first is producer-driven commodity chains, for which transnational corporations play central role in controlling the production system (including its backward and forward linkage) of capital-and technology-intensive industries like automobiles, computers, aircraft, and electrical machinery (Gereffi, 1994: 97). In these industries, production is realized by different number of countries from various level of development and commonly by subcontractors that have international linkage especially in the most labor-intensive production process.

The second is buyer-driven commodity chains, which refers to large retailers, brand-named merchandisers, and trading companies that play a role in setting up decentralized production networks in a variety of exporting countries, especially located in the Third World. (ibid:97) This form of commodity chain has become common in labor-intensive, consumer goods industries such as garment, footwear, toys, consumer electronics, housewares, and wide range of handcrafted items. In the buyer-driven chains, the branded companies are not manufacturers, but
merchandizers. They generally do not have factories, since they only design and market products. Independent Third World factories or firms in which contract manufacturing is prevalent make production of finished goods. However these factories/firms are not components or parts of branded companies, but have independent characteristics. Within this division of labor, the core company only manage these production and trade networks and make sure all pieces of the business come together as an integrated whole (ibid:99).

According to Global Commodity Chains Approach, these two kinds of commodity chains refer not only to two different structure of production but also to two different experiences of flexibility, two different state policies. The countries in the buyer-driven commodity chains specialize on labor-intensive sectors, for this reason, especially in the period of economic crisis, cost reducing policies aim to reduce labor cost through flexibilization of labor market (Öncü, Köse, 2000:78). In these countries, the state is not involved in production, but the role of the state at the point of production tends to be facilitative (Gereffi, 1994:101). On the other hand, the countries in producer-driven chains specialize on capital and technology to overcome the crisis through flexibilization of production, not by reducing labor costs but by increasing productivity (Öncü, Köse, 2000:78). In this these countries state play an interventionist role to support capital-intensive sectors (Gereffi,1994: 100).

The second main issue which is discussed related to the change of production structure in late capitalist era is flexible specialization, conceptualized by Piore and Sabel, has become important especially for the countries in producer-driven chains (Öncü, Köse, 2000). It has been emerged as a way of overcoming the economic crisis for certain advanced capitalist countries by specializing on differentiated, technology-intensive goods. Flexible specialization involves lean production system and economy of scope instead of economy of scale that is effective in mass production. Piore and Sabel (1984) refer to adaptation of new production techniques; especially adaptation of new computer controlled production technology to production process for increasing productivity and overcoming the pressure of competition which manifests itself as price reduction. In this way, it is aimed to reduce the margin of error, benefit labor force in full-capacity and reduce the
necessary time for production. Flexible specialization has made skilled labor a necessity as a result of “re-emergence of craft production” to produce differentiated commodities and to master in complex machines. Such model was realized in Germany, Japan and Scandinavia is provided by small-sized enterprises. In this process, small-sized enterprises has become operational since they are more adaptable to differentiated demands and could more easily specialize on the areas that they are capable to compete due to decentralization of production.

Piore and Sabel indicate that taylorist form that depends on distinction between conception and execution has changed through computer-added manufacturing system that brings workers’ intellectual participation in the work process, in this way, revitalized their roles. From this perspective, this change increases human control over production process and machinery is again subordinated to the operator (Piore, Sabel, 1984). In parallel to this, job security is provided by firms for inducement of workers to acquire the specific skills associated with new technology, leading to the reorganization of industrial relations and the redistributions of rights within factories. As a result of this, it is claimed that managerial control identified with fordist type of control is substituted by scientific management which refers to decentralization of power and authority within workplace and increase in autonomy of workers. Lipietz (1997) explains this issue with the concepts of responsible autonomy and negotiated involvement. He indicates:

encouragement of ‘responsible autonomy’ on the part of the workers, and leads to a superior organizational principle, particularly when putting new technologies into operation, or for ‘just-in-time’ methods of managing the production cycle, which presumes the use of all the knowledge of the workforce and their willing cooperation with supervisors and engineers (Lipietz, 1997:4).

This management aims to incorporate wage-laborers into firm by protecting them a certain extent through long-term labor contract, relatively higher wages. “Responsible autonomy” is introduced as an alternative to labor-oriented flexibilization mechanisms, by giving the worker the opportunity of negotiation on the surplus value. In this way, it is implied to different path regarding labor policy. In such form of flexibilization, instead of the policies which put the direct pressure on
labor by reducing real wages and increasing precarization, it is aimed to build cohesion within workplace between managers, employers and workers.

To sum up, it is mentioned that the dual strategy of flexibilization to stay alive under the circumstance of increasing international competition. The first is flexibilization of labor markets, which aims to reduce labor cost. This form named as American type of flexibilization is identified with countries in buyer-driven chains, and applied by these countries as a defensive strategy to overcome the economic crisis (Lipietz, 1997). The second is flexibilization of production structure which refers to the adaptation of technology, improvement skilled labor and flexibilization of control and management methods to increase productivity. This form of flexibilization named as “Japanization” is identified with certain advanced countries in producer-driven chains and applied by these countries as offensive strategy in the conditions of crisis.

Both global commodity chains and flexible specialization approaches emphasize homogeneous tendencies in production structure of different countries and present general models of articulation to international competition in the late capitalist era. Global Commodity Chains Approach departs from the homogeneous conceptualization of periphery and identifies these countries as if they specialize on labor-intensive sectors, situated in bottom of the buyer-driven chains and use the advantage of low-cost labor force and apply the labor market oriented flexibilization policies. In spite of the effectiveness of the argument; in the late capitalist era, advantage of low-cost labor force is not an absolute advantage as such in the previous imperialist era; but the comparative advantage regarding combination of the factors (technology and labor) that differ in terms of countries and sectors (Lipietz, 1997). Late capitalized countries participate to both commodity chains even though they participate in unequal way, by taking role in the most labor-intensive part of the production process. Therefore, country-based center-periphery differentiation should be defined in terms of sectors. From this perspective, while capital-intensive sectors like metalworking, machine sectors are at the center; labor-intensive sectors like textile and apparel industries are situated at the periphery; and the degree and manner of development of the sectors at the center is related to the degree of development of
the country. Dominant flexibilization type could be either labor market oriented or productivity oriented when it comes to different sectors.

On the other hand, flexible specialization approach by focusing mainly on an advanced capitalist country, presents a growth model based on post-fordist form of production that refers to lean production, over specialization, reinforcement of small-sized enterprises, enskilling labor and its gaining autonomy within workplace. However, when the domestic production structure in especially late capitalized countries is considered, more heterogeneous picture appears that refers not to single form-of post-fordism, but different types of post-fordisms. Regarding unequal-combined development of capitalism, post-fordism could go along with Fordism, primitive Fordism or peripheral Fordism in a same country, in different sectors. Countries could adapt themselves to different adjustment models regarding their specific conditions, even they could create hybrid model within these choices (Çelik, 2003:3).

Post-fordism does not refer to general production form but could be included in fordist mass-production by adaptation of lean production to a part of the production process (Tomaney, 1994). In relation to this, adaptation of technology to production process do not necessarily aim the economy of scope which refers to specialization in differentiated goods, but computer-aided technology could be used for increasing the productivity in economy of scale. In addition to this, specialization is not a general characteristics of the firms, however, degree of specialization differentiates regarding to technology capacity of the sector and the country’s own capacity in adaptation of technology to production process. In parallel to this, although small sized enterprises have become more functional in flexible production in this process, their articulation to commodity chains and positions in global factory differentiates in terms of countries and sectors. Especially in the peripheral, semi-peripheral countries, small sized enterprises which have low competition ability, function as suppliers to grand companies, and play a role in the most labor-intensive part of the production process, could not provide sufficient growth and specialization as expected.
In the same manner, enskilling, “re-emergence of craft labor”, in the late capitalist era is one of the most debatable issues. Such claim could be regarded as overstated and generalized. Most of the time, enskilling process has gone along with deskilling process. As Braverman (1975) states, technical change creates demand for new kinds of competence which might enskill particular groups of workers, but emergence of new technology manufacturing machines causes deskilling of semi-skilled laborers. In addition to this, the role of skilled labor is limited with certain part of the production process and with certain sectors regarding sector’s degree of adaptation of technology and manner of using it. Therefore, instead of total enskilling or deskilling of labor, it could be mentioned of fragmentation of labor force regarding skill which differentiates labor regimes, builds hierarchy between workers at the center who mainly work in capital, technology-intensive sectors and who represent skilled labor, and the workers at the periphery who work in labor-intensive sectors composed of unskilled workers.

In addition to this, it is questionable to what extent enskilling process results in autonomy of the worker and the decentralization of power and authority. This issue overlooks the ultimate aim, the aim of profit, behind control and management systems by constituting direct linkage between skilled labor and autonomy. Computer-aided manufacturing mainly used for maximum saturation and coordination of labor time (Murray, 1983:88, cited in Ash (1994)) For the benefit of this aim, skilled labor could be subordinated to managerial control instead of scientific management, even regarding country’s manner of capitalization, the level of accumulation of capital and the regulations of class relations, pre-existing control mechanism could play a role in the forms of management. This issue will be discussed in detail in subsequent parts in the context of Turkey.

In short, although it could be mentioned about general changes in terms of global organization of capitalism and the increasing international competition -emergence of the global factory and flexibization-, different countries and sectors have adapted themselves to these changes in different manners. Therefore, the global capitalism has built polarization regarding organization of production structure and the forms of employment in different countries and sectors.
3.2. Subcontracting Types in the Apparel and Metalworking Industries in Turkey

As stated in the previous chapter, incorporation of Turkey in the international competition is realized mainly by promotion of pre-existing small and medium sized enterprises, which have an important place in Turkey’s industrialization process and their direct linkage to domestic and foreign capital through subcontracts.

Small-sized enterprises take on the production process by constituting networks with large-sized enterprises. However, as stated above, relationship between small-sized and large-sized enterprises and subcontract types differentiates between labor-intensive and capital-intensive sectors regarding differentiation of production structure. These relationships, which are called as “subcontracting” in common usage, differentiate in apparel and metalworking industries.

In apparel industry, the form of subcontracting is defined as outsourcing, while in metalworking these relations are called as sub-industry. These two forms refer to working for own account. From this perspective, both outsourcing and sub-industry practices in the sectors should be distinguished from the “internal subcontracting” practices which refer to direct linkage to parent company and functioning as its sub-company. According to data of Ankara Chamber of Industry, 25% of the production and added value of manufacturing industry is provided by outsourcing, %78 of the exported apparel goods are produced by small-sized garment workshops. On the other hand, in the metalworking sector %70 of the intermediate and final goods are produced by the sub-industry (cited by Koç, 2001).

As a labor intensive sector, in the apparel industry, the relationship between large and small enterprises is established within the frame of buyer-driven commodity chains. In this sector, branded companies are not manufacturers but only merchandisers, which transfer the manufacturing process to the independent outsourcers. Related this issue, Yıldırım Koç (2001) gives the example of Tiffany-Tomato Company which is one of the most important branded companies and retail store chains of Turkey in 1990s. He states that in 1995, this company had 150 stores, however, did not have own manufacturing plant. Tiffany-Tomato branded products
were produced by more than 200 outsourcer workshops which are situated in İstanbul, Adana, Bursa, Gaziantep and İzmir (Koç, 2001:9).

Transference of production process in apparel industry is provided with short-term contracts. Therefore, the relationship between branded company and outsourcers is not a long-term regular relation, but temporal and irregular. This characteristic differentiates outsourcing from sub-industry, which is defined as production of a part of a component of the production, and mostly seen in metalworking industry. In contrast to sub-industry, outsourcers in apparel industry are only responsible in specific production process. Kaytaz explains this type of subcontracting as “capacity-oriented” subcontracting (Kaytaz, 1994:147). From this perspective, companies transfer a specific part of the production process because of their insufficient capacity. For this reason, such subcontracting practice becomes temporary rather than developmental.

Outsourcers in apparel industry are independent manufacturers since they are not included by the parent companies. From this perspective, outsourcing refers to external subcontracting practice which is different from the internal-subcontracting which refers to production as sub-supply company. However, they are dependent to the price control mechanism of the parent company. The main reason of this dependence could be explained as lose of control on the complete production process due to the limitation of production with specific process. In this context, relationship between branded companies and outsourcers is defined as dependent and hierarchical relationship (Müftüoğlu, 2000).

These characteristics of outsourcing make it competitive by nature. It could be claimed that apparel industry is composed of a great number of workshops which compete with each other for taking the job from the parent companies. As outsourcers in apparel industry could not be specialized at least on a part or a component of the product, they could not offer a qualification to overcome the pressure of competition. Instead of this, they reduce the prices to take job. Such issue emerges as a main obstacle in front of the growth of enterprises. In the interviews, which are made within the framework of this study, some employers interviewed in
apparel industry mostly complain about the “price-cutting”, and stated that many enterprises have gone bankrupt since they cannot bear the cost. Submission to competition prevents specialization and development of workshop. For this reason, reduction of cost during the production has become the main necessity for outsourcers.

However, being-labor intensive sector give the outsourcer the opportunity to begin work with small capital. According to an employer, setting up a small workplace is very easy in this sector: “if you have two thousand liras, you can buy four machines, they are sufficient for doing business”. In this way, it could be mentioned existence of circulation regarding workshops in the apparel industry. Opportunity of setting up a workshop increases the number of workshop which engages in competition, this situation causes reduction of prices and ruins certain workshops by causing their bankruptcies. Employers who are interviewed frequently argue the fact that apparel industry is very stressful and recruiting is very difficult. They say that they cannot gain profit properly since workshops which newly enter the market undercharge. For this reason, they frequently could not pay wages to workers. About this situation, an employer talks about that some employers sometimes could ask their workers for a loan of money. Therefore it should be stated that accumulation of capital is a permanent problem for the workshops in the apparel industry.

Moreover, such structure of production pushes workshops to be invisible, informal enterprises. Through invisibility and informality, employers could abuse legal obligations like tax liability and evade insurance costs. In addition to this, when they could not to pay workers’ wages and other expenses, workers could not stake a claim on enterprise through legal means. An employer states that in the case of bankruptcy, they vanish and reconstitute their enterprises with different names.

On the other hand, as a capital-intensive sector, metalworking industry is composed of a large number of formal small and medium sized enterprises, which come together in organized industrial zones and limited number of factories.

In this sector, the relationship between small-medium-sized enterprises and foreign company or domestic factory shows similarity with the structure in producer-driven
commodity chains. In this sector, parent companies (foreign or domestic) play central role in controlling production system, and in many case transfer the production of a part or component of the products to subcontractors (Kaytaz, 1994). For this reason, subcontracting practice in metalworking industry could be defined as “sub-industry”. Aktar (1990) uses the concept of sub-industry for defining the independent relationship between the parent company and the subcontractor. In this sector, production is transferred to small-sized enterprises with long-term contracts. Therefore, it could be claimed that the relationship between the parent company and the small-sized enterprise depends on a more regular and permanent relationship.

Subcontracting practice in metalworking industry depends on “specialization-oriented subcontracting” (Kaytaz, 1994:147). Especially, with flexible specialization, small-sized enterprises adapt technology to production process and with decentralization of production structure they could find an opportunity to specialize in a part or component of a product. Being small-sized enterprises, they could adapt themselves to changing needs of the market. Especially, in machine industry, computer controlled production technology is included by small-sized enterprises. This issue on the one hand increases the productivity, on the other hand protect these enterprises from the pressure of competition which manifests itself as price-cutting. The subcontracting practice in metalworking is more developmental, but less competitive. In metalworking industry, small sized enterprises compete with each other for taking job from parent company, which could be either foreign company or domestic factory, but are not dependent to them. In contrast to the informal subcontractor companies in apparel industry, small sized enterprises in metal industry can control the prices. Thus, in this sector, competition has not produced destructive impacts on employers. Having control on the whole production process, employers could establish more egalitarian relationships with the parent companies. This issue provides them with independence against the parent companies and gives the opportunity of accumulation of capital.

In the interviews, in contrast to the employers of apparel industry, apprentices’ narrative about the employers in metalworking industry mostly includes success stories. Apprentices state that entering into the market is more difficult. Since
metalworking industry is a capital-intensive sector, employers generally set up a workshop with partners. It is frequently said that an employer enters into the market with a single machine but later drums up business especially through the networks with foreign companies and investing in more qualified machines.

External subcontracting practices in these two sectors causes systematic need for job. In this context, precarity is prevalent in these subcontracting practices. Pressure of competition, in the small sized enterprises which work for own account is more significant than internal subcontracting practices that ensures a steady demand for the firm and alleviates problems arising from its marketing (Evcimen, Kaytaz, Cınar, 1991:131). That issue would be the main determinant the employment regimes in the small sized enterprises in these two sectors.

All in all, it is seen that flexibilization process is experienced in the capital-intensive sectors at the center less oppressively than the labor-intensive sectors at the periphery. When it comes to small-sized enterprises, degree of specialization and competitiveness and form of relationship established with large companies shape the flexibility type. Then, what kind of an effect does this differentiation have on the employees? In the next section, employment regimes will be mentioned with regard to these two sectors.

3.3 Forms of Employment in the Apparel and Metalworking Industries and Apprentice Labor

As stated before, flexible employment refers to the general labor policy in the late capitalist era, especially used in the context of American type of flexibilization as defensive strategy to reduce labor costs. Especially the late capitalized countries which specialize in labor-intensive sectors and use the advantage of low cost labor force have adopted such labor-market-oriented strategy to gain a position in the international competition. Labor-market-oriented flexibilization includes readjustment within four terms: wage flexibility which refers to the adaptability of wages to change in demands; employment flexibility which means the facility in hiring and firing and a kind of reduce in employment security and protection; job flexibility that provides changeability of the job structure of employees within a firm;
Skill flexibility which implies to adjustment of workers’ skill easily. (Standing, 2011:6).

In parallel to the argument stated in the previous part, related to differentiation in production structure, the employment regime differentiates between labor-intensive and capital-intensive sectors and between different subcontracting practices. For this reason, the characteristics of the labor market flexibility mentioned above are implemented in different sectors with different intensity. In labor-intensive sectors, since the labor is the main source of the sectors and competition has destructive effects due to low specialization rate; reduction of labor cost becomes the principal strategy. In these sectors, reducing labor cost is provided mainly through wage flexibility, employment flexibility and by flexible working hours. Implying to quantitative restriction, this type of labor flexibility is called as “numerical flexibility” (Atkinson, 1984) or “external flexibility” (Lipietz, 1997) and refers to strategies to increase absolute surplus in Marxist terminology.

On the other hand, capital-intensive sectors specialize in production-oriented flexibility strategies, which depend on increase of productivity through specialization and skilled labor as such in Japanese type flexibilization. In this context, in capital-intensive sectors, it could be seen that a strategy for increasing the productivity of labor through adapting advanced machines, enskilling and multiskilling labor and applying new management methods rather than reducing labor cost. In parallel to this, in these sectors, flexibilization strategies based on job flexibility and skill flexibility tend to be more significant. Referring to qualitative improvement, such flexibility is named as “functional flexibility” (Atkinson, 1984) or “internal flexibility” (Lipietz, 1997) which includes reorganization of jobs and workers within the firm to increase productivity. This type of flexibility indicates the strategy for increasing relative surplus.

3.3.1. Employment in the Apparel Industry and Apprentice Labor

As a labor-intensive sector, in apparel industry, the basic employment policy depends on acquiring cheap labor force. In this sector, three main strategies can be mentioned, which reduce labor cost: non-covered employment, employing workers
from the most disadvantageous part of the labor market, benefitting from the social networks.

In Turkey, according to 2012 data of Social Security Institution, 1.5 million off the record workers and 451,164 registered workers work in apparel sector. Unregistered employment serves to reduce labor-cost by giving employers the opportunity of evading the cost of insurance and employment flexibility. In addition to this, in the sector, cheap labor is acquired from the most disadvantageous part of the labor market, which mainly constitutes unregistered part of the employed population. In this sector, women, children and Kurdish population constitutes the majority of employed population. According to data of Union of DİSK Tekstil, 180,000-200,000 children are employed in 2003 in the textile industry (cited by Yücesan, 2008:152). Another significant point regarding the reduction of labor cost is employment of family members, fellow townsmen or those in the close social environment. During the interviews, it is remarked that workers are mainly composed of employer’s social environment; either people from the extended family or from his district. Within these relations, religious and ethnic networks could play important role in employment. Related this issue, in the interviews, it is said that Kurdish employers for the most part employ from the Kurdish population especially from Syrian Kurds, who immigrate to Turkey in the recent times. Since the production structure does not necessitate skilled labor, the employer could easily benefit from these linkages in the context of cost-reduction.

As stated before, in this sector, the production structure depends on short-term, competitive outsourcing practices. This issue brings irregular and arbitrary working conditions in the sector. First of all, employment flexibility and precarity becomes a structural problem. Employers could fire employers in accordance with the reduction of demand in the market. Due to the competitive structure of production, employers could not recruit regularly, and they could not ensure the continuity of the work. Thus, workers and apprentices are frequently faced with dismissal. In the interviews, it is stated that workers and apprentices experience dismissal for a month or more per a year. For this reason, certain apprentices define their work as “seasonal work”, and

---

7Retrieved from the textile report of 2013 prepared by Ministry of Science, Industry and Technology
state that in the period of seasonal unemployment, they search for temporal jobs until the beginning of the new season. In the case of dismissal, especially in small workplaces, workers could not pursue legal proceeding. Unregistered workers, mainly composed of children and women are deprived of this opportunity because of their invisibility in legal sense. However, registered workers face with the same problem. In the interviews, it is stated that employers often abuse the insurance contracts of registered workers by terminating and/or renewing them in order to escape from the liability of severance pay. And therefore, workers could not claim compensation in the case of dismissal. This issue enables employers to fire employees.

Secondly, when they could enter in a job from the parent company, they are obliged to finish it as soon as possible. This causes flexible working hours. All interviewees who work in the apparel industry state that they do obligatory overtime and sometimes they work till the next morning when their employer takes a job. In the apparel industry, the average work time is 12 to 14 hours. This duration could be extended arbitrarily under the necessary conditions.

Another important issue in the sector is wage flexibility. As stated before, due to the competitive nature of the sector, employers reduce the prices. From the interviews, it is understood that the pressure of the competition is burdened upon workers. In many cases, workers and apprentices have difficulty in receiving their salaries on time and sometimes employers could not pay workers’ wages and become indebted to workers.

In this sector, apprentice labor is preferred due to the necessity of cheap labor. Since child workers are situated at the bottom of the labor market hierarchy, and mostly work informally; employers could implement more flexible wage system and evade insurance costs by employing children Yücesan (2008). In these industries, children under the age of 18, commonly work in the sector as apprentices or more widely known as ortacı (errand-boy). However, informal employment pulls down their age to start working. For this reason, in the sector, a juvenile who is 15-17 years old has already mastered in machine. Within the 10 interviewees who are at the age of 15-17,
only two were working as errand-boy. Many of them have worked for two or more years in the sector and experienced in job. Even some of them mention that they began to train younger errand-boys.

On the other hand, age limit for starting work is designated as 15 years according to legal regulations. Children who are 15-18 years old could work in various sectors (for the heavy and dangerous works, age limit is defined as 16 years). However, their position is not defined as worker. They are legally accepted as “students” according to the Law of Apprenticeship and Vocational Education, and their employment is defined within the frame of vocational training (Akpınar, 2006) In this context, apprentices have theoretical education one day per week in Apprenticeship Training Centers, and on other days they work in a workplace. Meanwhile, apprentices are insured by state, not by the employer until 18 years old. However, this insurance only includes health insurance for work accidents and excludes job security and pension liability. In addition to this, such regulation of insurance could be implemented only in the workplaces in which apprentices are formally employed. Apprentices could work as registered workers in the formal workplaces in which relatively much more employees are employed and production is more continuous. However, when the production process of apparel industry is considered, these workplaces represent an exceptional position. In this sector, as it is stated above, subcontracting and irregular, unsecured, discontinuous working conditions represent general situation. Within the apprentices interviewed, six apprentices stated that they work uninsured. Other apprentices who work in a formal workplaces have mentioned that they have apprenticeship insurance, however, their employer do not permit them to go apprenticeship training center once a week since the work could not be accomplished in time.

3.3.2. Employment in the Metalworking Industry and Apprentice Labor

According to annual report of Social Security Institution, in 2012 the number of the employers who work in the metalworking industry is 157,293. In the metalworking industry, workers are mainly composed of qualified part of the labor market since

8http://www.sgk.gov.tr/wps/portal/tr/kurumsal/istatistikler/sgk_istatistik_yilliklari
skilled labor is a necessity for using advanced manufacturing machines. In this sector, formal workplaces are more significant especially in the machine industry than apparel sector. Since many sub-sectors of the metalworking sector are included in the scope of heavy and dangerous job, insured employment has become more prevalent policy. In addition to this, since sub-contracting practice depends on long-term contract and the degree of specialization is relatively high comparing to apparel industry, job continuity and wage stability could be mentioned. In this sector, employers prefer to recruit skilled workers that they could employ for long-term period. However, when metalworking sector is considered together with diversity in scales of enterprises, more heterogeneous structure emerges regarding employment strategy. In parallel to downsizing of scale of workplace, employment strategies depend on more informal relations.

In small sized workplaces, employment of family members, fellow townsmen or those in the close social environment is more frequently seen. Due to low level of capital accumulation compared to factories, flexibility strategies could include reducing of labor cost; for this reason employers could prefer employees from their social environments. In both İMES and Çavuşoğlu Industrial Zone, it can be clearly seen that employers of small sized enterprises mostly employ at least a member of their extended families. Socio-economical conditions of the employers, their families and those in the close social environment are not extremely discriminated against the employees. This issue makes employer’s participation in working process with his family possible.

In these small workplaces, necessity of skilled labor could appear in parallel to advancing in manufacturing machines on the basis of the firm. In the face of this necessity, employers prefer to train themselves or their own employees to use these machines, instead of employing new operator. This situation improves the quality of work and skill flexibility in these workplaces. With a word of the apprentice who work in this sector, “everybody do every work” within workplace. This issue, on the one hand enlarges the definition of job. Workers and apprentices change their occupation during the day. On the other hand, they become multi-skilled workers to perform various tasks within workplaces. This issue emphasizes the low level of
division of labor in the production process, and in parallel to this, significance of job and skill flexibility in small-sized enterprises. During interviews, many apprentices working in this sector states that they need to master in Computer Numerical Control (CNC) machine after they learn milling machine. This computer-added manufacturing technology that increase productivity through diminishing the margin of error and providing just-in time production, is adopted also by many small lathe workshops and necessitates multiskilling of workers who may use both pre-existing and new machines.

In large-sized enterprises and factories, employment strategy depends on more formal, rational procedures in accordance with the concrete needs of the firm. In the interviews, it is stated that conditions of recruitment in these workplaces is more difficult than recruitment in small-sized enterprises. Many apprentices state that these workplaces decide to recruit workers after job interviews, and in many case, the worker who apply for a job needs to present references and certificate of expertise to be accepted for the job.

This issue shows the prevalence of skill-based employment strategy in the factory. However, production structure in the factories is far from providing multi-skilling and job flexibility. In the factories division of labor is more significant and tasks are clearly fragmented within workplace between employers, managers, chiefs and workers. Additionally, informal and non-rigid working relations which bring job and skill flexibility as such in small-sized enterprises are not prevalent in the factories. Unlike employers in small-enterprises who are included in production or control process, employers in the factory generally do not encounter with workers even in the process of job interview. In many case, managers are directly responsible for hiring workers.

In metalworking sectors, large-sized enterprises and factories, which have relatively large capacity of competitiveness, could offer the most advantageous employment opportunity. In these enterprises, what is provided are higher salaries, the regular wage payment, the job security, the work safety and more regular working hours. The work safety and the regularity of working hours emerge as significant
characteristics. During the interviews, it is stated that in the factories, doing overtime is optional for the workers and working hours are not extended arbitrarily.

On the other hand, small sized-enterprises in accordance with their degree of specialization and the level of technological adaptation could provide relatively higher salaries, regular wage payment and relatively high job security. However, since these workplaces function as suppliers and correlate with factories or large-sized companies with subcontracts; they are dependent to another firm regarding deadline. This issue brings working hours flexibility in small-sized enterprises. For this reason, in these workplaces, from time to time arbitrary, obligatory overtime could be implemented. In addition to this, small-sized enterprises are more sensitive to fluctuations in the market, for this reason in the case of economic crisis, they could go downsizing more easily. This issue plays a role in the employment flexibility in small-sized enterprises.

In metalworking industry, the employment of apprentices could not be related only with the necessity of cheap labor. Unlike the apparel industry, in the metalworking sector, apprentices are employed for training. Therefore, the apprentice employment refers to policy of enskilling labor force as a future-directed investment. In this point, the state support for employers could be mentioned during the employment of apprentices. As stated before, the state takes the charge of the insurance of apprentices until 18 years old. Therefore, employers could be exempted from the assurance cost of apprentices for the exchange of enskilling them.

This issue is discussed by referring to debate of re-emergence of craft labor and explained with inclusion of intellectual labor to production process with the adaptation of the computer-added manufacturing technology in accordance with flexible specialization. It is debatable to what extent skills in the late capitalist era have the feature of craft labor that refers to having complete control on the production process. However, it is seen that craft is more included in employment policies especially in certain sectors within the frame of skill based labor flexibility.

Differentiation in production structures and the forms of employment brings differentiation in the labor regimes in daily life and differentiation of the perception...
of work and the working relations within apprentices. In this way, production area emerges as an ideological-political space in which different forms of resistance, deference and reconciliation appear; coercion and consent is constituted. In the next part, different labor regimes in apparel and metalworking sectors will be dealt with, by referring to the experiences and perceptions of apprentices.

3.3. Labor Regimes in Metalworking and Apparel Industries

All the presented arguments about the differentiation of apparel and metalworking sector regarding production structure and forms of employment make possible to discuss two forms of labor regimes related to these two sectors: despotic labor regime and hegemonic despotism.9

3.3.1. Despotism versus Hegemony and Control Mechanisms in the Apparel and Metalworking Sectors

In the apparel sector, it is seen a despotic labor regime which the coercion is much more significant compared to consent in the production process. On the other hand, labor regime in metalworking sector could be defined as hegemonic despotism which refers to deformation of hegemonic factory regimes with destruction of factors which establish hegemony in the production process and protect the labor like trade-union, unlimited job security, social security by way of flexible employment in parallel to disappearance of state intervention10; nevertheless, which consent is still more apparent comparing to coercion due to the revitalization of workers’ role in the workplace through job and skill flexibility and adaptation of Japanese management technics.

9Despotic labor regime finds its sources in early capitalist era that workers had no security and sought protection against the tyranny of capital and refers to prevalence of coercion over consent in the production process. On the other hand, hegemonic labor regime is identified with the period that labor is protected through state intervention and legal regulations, which shows itself in the production process as factory regime, and in which consent is more significant comparing to coercion. (Burawoy, 1983) Hegemonic labor regimes identified with Fordism and welfare state is replaced by hegemonic despotism in the late capitalist era in parallel to disappearance of state intervention.

10Before 1980, State Economic Enterprises represented hegemonic factory regimes.
One of the basic approaches associates despotic labor regimes with subcontracting practices without considering the differences between them. However, labor regimes differentiate according to sectorial differences. On the other hand, such differentiation could be observed between small-sized enterprises and factories within the same sector. In addition to these, despotic and hegemonic labor regimes could be experienced differently in different countries in accordance with the patterns of proletarianization (Burawoy, 1983).

In the apparel sector, despotic labor regime is related to informal and competitive production structure, unsecured and precarious working conditions and in parallel to this, arbitrary working relations and disciplinary methods, which associates coercion. On the other hand, in metalworking sector, skill-based job security, relatively high wages, regular payment, more definite working relations constitute the factors which lie behind hegemony. These factors which constitute hegemony are prevalent to some extent for small-sized suppliers too. As stated before, low degree of competition, high degree of specialization, long-term contracting, technological adaptability and capital-intensity in the sector have made way for the emergence of conditions for the constitution of hegemony.

However, new management methods of the late capitalist era, which are identified with hegemonic despotism, have been practiced differently in small sized suppliers and grand factories. As stated before, related to late capitalism, revitalization of workers’ role in the workplace, the decentralization of power and authority, the substitution of managerial control methods -which refers to separation between execution and control process and identified with the strict division of labor of Fordism- with Japanese control mechanisms are mentioned (Piore, Sabel, 1984). This new form of management is designed to constitute hegemony in the production area with reconstitution of compromise between employer and employee through participation of workers to decide on ways of making progress and controlling mechanisms with the methods of human resources management under the name of “responsible autonomy”, “negotiated involvement” of the worker (Yücesan, Özdemir, 2008). The approach which associates this new control mechanism with the autonomy of workers is criticized since it does not bring any independence to
worker but on the contrary, increase control on labor time for diminishing wasted time in the production. Nevertheless, it should be stated that this method does not become prevalent in all its aspects in different countries and different sectors. In the case of Turkey, it is stated that Japanese type of management methods like Kaizen are included in the production process of factories. (Özuğurlu, 2008) Through this method, what is aimed to put into practice is lean production, just-in time production according to zero-defect principle, for this purpose, development of coordination between different parts of the production and teamwork within workers. However, this method does not terminate managerial control, which depends on division of the labor within workplace; and hierarchy between managers, chiefs, foremen and workers. From this perspective, in these workplaces it could not be claimed autonomy and participation of workers that control the process. For this reason, in these workplaces, as stated before, job and skill flexibilization is not developed as expected. A more interesting issue is that the autonomy of worker, which emerges regarding job and skill flexibilization, is developed in the small-sized workplaces that simple control method is prevalent. A study, which includes field research about the operators of computer-added manufacturing machines, states that degree of autonomy of these workers, and level of their participation in decision-making process are much higher in the small-sized enterprises which function as suppliers; as the division of the labor is less significant in these workplaces and living labor is more wasted in using machines (Menteş, 1998). Therefore, simple control methods which are prevalent in small-sized subcontractors could be the way of establishment of despotic labor regimes by functioning as means of coercion as such in the apparel sector; but at the same time could be constituent of hegemonic despotism and consent within workplace. This issue constitutes one of the main motives behind the differentiation of class consciousness. This issue will be discussed in the second chapter with regard to the class perception of apprentices.

In parallel to these, as Burawoy (1983) indicates, control methods in the workplace are strictly linked to patterns of proletarianization in a country. From this perspective extra-economic coercion could be inherent in both despotic and hegemonic labor regimes especially in the late capitalized countries. In the case of Turkey, paternalist relations that continue especially in the small-sized enterprises and simple control
methods which could be identified with entrepreneurial workplaces of early capitalist era (Edwards, 1979) could be articulated as both despotic and hegemonic labor regimes in the late capitalism. Barchesi formulate this issue as “an articulation of all historically known previous structures of control of labor, slavery, serfdom, small independent commodity production and reciprocity” (Barchiesi, 2006:5).

3.3.2 Labor Regimes and Perception of Work: Experiences of Apprentices

Differentiation in labor process and control mechanisms reveals different experiences in the daily life, which translate to different images and meanings related to work and occupation.

During the interviews, all the apprentices who mention about the apparel industry used the expression of “textile environment (tekstil ortami)”. “Textile environment” refers to an image constituted by the specific labor regime within the sector. This expression mainly refers to abused and arbitrary working relations and lack of respectability in the sector. On the other hand, in metal industry, especially in large-sized enterprises and factories, working relations are more disciplined. Apprentices who work in metalworking sector have emphasized that their work is a respectable work. Yalçın, who works in large-sized enterprise, mentions that working in the apparel sector is not difficult but stressful and says: “Our work is more qualified. Everyone works on the basis of mutual respect. You don’t need to deal with everyone. If someone attempts to lay hand on you, that means that he wants to get the bullet”. Apprentices indicate that even in small-sized enterprise working relations are subject to some rules contrary to the apparel sector. For example, in cases of conflicts between workers, even between workers and foremen, employees could be punished and may result in dismissal in case of recurrences. On the other hand, such regulation cannot be seen in the apparel sector. Expressions of Kubilay who started to work in the apparel sector and later transferred to the metalworking sector defines the difference between two sectors:

Therefore, hegemony and despotism appear as images on quality of work. The critical point is that this image is constituted by reference to people relationships and control the process instead of the concrete irregular working conditions like informal working, long working hours and precarity. Precarity, as stated before, is one of the most significant characteristics of the apparel sector and give the labor regime a despotic character. However, apprentices who work in this sector do not express this issue as pressure. Labor circulation, which is a common fact in this sector, is taken for granted. Job switch is an ordinary case of their daily lives. Apprentices continuously exchange jobs either because of the abuse of the employer or because of the bankruptcy of the workplace. All interviewees have been experienced more than one workplace during their working life. One of the main reasons of this indifference could be the continuity of the job not in the workplace but in the whole sector. Apprentices are not concerned about unemployment since they believe that labor is a never-ending necessity in this sector. Although many enterprises are closed because of bankruptcy, new ones perpetually come onto the market. Thus, when an employer goes bankrupt, they think that they can start to work in another enterprise. In the same manner, when the season ends, they think they can find another job in other sectors through their networks. Networks and age advantage could be other important reasons of the negligence of precarity.

Emir says: “I am never unemployed. I can find another job. I have a friend. He works in stocktaking. I can work in there”. Similar to this, Rasim mentions that he can start a job near his uncle who has a computer maintenance shop; and he finds this

---

11 There is a very huge difference between textile and lathe work industries. When you work in textile, you are always under pressure. People continuously warn you or want something from you. You cannot loaf for a while. You are snowed under with work. But lathe is not like this. You can work comfortably. Masters tell us especially not to hurry up. They tell us to do the job well. But it is not like that in textile. There is an intense work pressure. Moreover if we do something wrong, they get angry with us.
situation beneficial since he could become skillful at another job. On the other hand, Nihat emphasizes that he is young and he could work in all works even in heavy works. Therefore, it could be stated that apprentices perceive precarity differently from white-collar workers. In contrast to white-collar workers’ perception of precarity that brings corrosion of character and future anxiety (Erdoğan, 2011), apprentices do not formulate precarity as a problem since firstly they are not responsible for earning their living cost but contributing to their family budgets, secondly, they do not experience the pressure of the status unlike white-collar workers due to being manual workers. In the workplace, they are at the bottom of the working hierarchy since they are under age and not yet qualified enough. They are frequently confronted with certain abuse such as being scolded or physical violence. For this reason, they believe that they find a job in any case as long as they accept these conditions. From this perspective, precarity has not been appeared as lose of job security, but emerges as a structural reason of obligation of working that is immanent to their class position coming from their socially lower class position.

In parallel to this, in the interviews, apprentices who work in apparel industry do not problematize their uninsured working conditions and accept them as an indispensable conditions since they have not come from the age of legal obligation and could overcome this problem by benefiting from the insurance of their parents. However, since male apprentices will not have been benefited from their parents’ insurance after the age of 18 -in contrast to women who can benefit from parents’ or husband’s insurance- they are more sensitive for insecurity in the future. For working conditions in the future they underline the necessity of insured employment. Rasim says:

Şu an yaşım ufak, şu an olmaz zaten. Annem babam sigortalı. 18 yaşından sonra sigortasız zaten çalışmam. En düşük maaşı versin ama sigorta yapsın. Sigortanın çok faydası var. Ameliyat olacaksın mesela 20 milyarsa 5 milyar vereceksin.\(^\text{12}\)

\(^\text{12}\)Now I am underage. I cannot be insured now. My parents are insured. After the age of 18, I won’t work without insurance. If necessary, he may pay minimum wage; but he must provide me with insurance. Insurance is very beneficial for health. For example, you will have an operation, you will pay 5 billion instead of 20 billion.
It is understood that apprentices maintain indifferent attitudes toward present working conditions since they could delay the problems and suggest certain tactics to manage the pressure of despotic labor regime in the sector. Working relations, in other words, relationship of apprentices with workers, foremen and employers and arbitrary attitudes within these relationships emerge as main problems. This issue takes us to regard control mechanisms.

As stated before, control mechanisms in both sectors are shaped around the aim of reducing cost which is a necessity for increase of surplus value, not only by increasing absolute surplus value through putting flexible working hours, but also by increasing relative surplus value. As a labor-intensive sector, in apparel sector, control methods function for the increase of the labor performance on a work day to increase relative surplus value. On the other hand, since metal sector is a capital-intensive sector, increase of relative surplus value is related to the improvement of manufacturing machines and changes in production models.

In the apparel sector, the performance of labor depends on the increase of speed. The speed is the key element in the production process of apparel sector. All control and discipline mechanisms are constituted around the notion of speed. Apprentices more deeply experience such mechanisms since they are at the bottom of the work hierarchy. For maximization of production, apprentices are forced to be quick; exposed to being severe discipline mechanisms. This issue, which is a characteristic of despotic labor regime influences conflict and consent process.

Çok üstümüze geliyorlardı, yemek paydoslarında çalışiyorlardı bizi, çay saatlerinde çalışiyorlardı. İşler çok yoğundu da. Hiç durmayın diyolardı, çalıșın. Biz de mebeur kalıyordu çalışmaya. Artık ayakta duracak halımız bile kaldığımızda çoğu zaman. Cumartesi paari sürekli çalışıyordu. Tatilimiz yoktu o yüzden bıraktık.\(^{13}\)

\(^{13}\) They were jawing at us, making us work at lunch breaks, tea hours. Work was very busy. They were saying do not stop, continue work. We were compelled to work. Most of the time we were feeling really very fatigue. Even Saturday and Sunday we were continuously working. We quitted because we had no holidays.
In the workplaces relatively large-scaled, in other words, in the workplaces in which production is continuous and constant, workers are forced to produce definite number of commodity and maximize it. Fatma mentions that she produces approximately 1500 parts of good from morning to noon and says: “When we reach a number, they want more. If we reduce the number, they are shouting at us.”

Apprentices in apparel industry, which are under the oppression speed, indeed encounter with arbitrary behaviors in their working relations. Arzu mentions that textile environment is very stressful in that everyone mistreats each other. Rasim mentions some of these behaviors which he encountered in his previous workplace:

Orada rahat rahat lavaboya bile giremiyordum korkuyordum yani. Çocuğun biri girdi diye çocuğa tokat attı. Bana öyle bir şey yapamaz da yine de bağırıyordu. O kadar milletin içine rezil olmak istemedim.14

Apprentices mention that many job is better than textile. From their perspective, textile signifies uniform and non-stop working practice. Nearly all of them agree that working conditions in service sector is better than their working conditions:

Garsonluk bence tekstilden iyi. Burda boş durmanın imkanı yok. Durmadan çalışırsın ama orada öyle değil. Müşteri geldi mi bakacaksun müşteri yoksa oturucaksın.15

In contrast to the apparel sector, job quality is more important than quickness in metalworking sector. In this sector, not speed of workers but speed of production is important especially in large-sized enterprises, for this reason, advancing in manufacturing machine becomes more important.

Control and discipline methods in metalworking sector differ from those in apparel sector. In the apparel sector, the main control mechanism is surveillance. Arzu mentions that her employer continually watches them during the work and she tells,

14 We were afraid so we could not even go to the toilet there. He slapped one of the boys because of going to toilet. He would not do such thing to me but he would shout at me. I did not want to be ashamed among people.

15 Waitiring is better than textile. You do not have any free time here. You work continuously here but it is not the case there. You work when customer comes, if there is no customer you do not worry.
“We could not work properly because he stares so carefully”. Similar to this, Dilan states that there is a camera in the workplace, which watches them during the production. She says, “We are troubled with cameras, but we cannot say anything” and mentions that she is reprimanded since she had responded to a workmate who had asked her about the time. Generally apprentices are reprimanded in the cases of doing anything but the work.

There is a difference between labor intensive-capital intensive sectors regarding the objects of surveillance. In metalworking sector, cameras have different meanings. Apprentices in this sector say that they do not mind the camera because it is not used for controlling their performance. It is used, first of all for the protection of machines and some valuable materials in workplace against theft attempts. Oğuzhan mentions that the cameras are used in IMES for the first time after some workers had stolen some materials and sold them to gain a profit. All these expressions convey the relationship between labor regimes and class.

3.4. Concluding Remarks

All the arguments presented in this section constitute structural processes, in other words, material and objective conditions, which prompt apprentices to think and act in determined way, determine the manner and the degree of conflict and consent through daily life experiences.

Since these two sectors submit to different labor regimes, different production structure and have different labor compositions, class antagonism is experienced in different ways; with this respect, the perceptions about the boss, about the general superior classes and perception about self-positions and future planning vary among apprentices who work in these two different sectors. In the apparel sector, the boss is usually not seen as a boss, which represents a higher class position, since he/she comes from a lower class position and has difficulty in standing in the sector and usually goes bankrupt, he/she sometimes could not pay the wages of apprentices. In brief, apprentices in the sector do not identify employers of subcontractor companies with a socially higher position. For this reason in the apparel sector, “class” positions could not be definite and received by apprentices in production process. However,
when this issue is examined from a relational perspective, these employers represent higher position which define also the lower position of apprentices, when coercion, violence and abuse in production processes are taken into consideration. Therefore, in the apparel sector, extra-economic coercion is more significant in the working relations.

On the other hand, in the metalworking sector, coercion is replaced by consent to a considerable extent because of the respectability of the work, the regularity of the working relations; the skill based job security and insured job opportunity. Apprentices in the metalworking sector, experience their class position relatively more significantly in the production process. Although many employers come from lower positions in this sector especially in the case of small-sized enterprises, they no longer represent lower position. As for the size of workplace, employers do not work with workers in contrast to the employers in apparel sector; especially in the factories, in many cases apprentices and workers do not encounter with their boss, but encounter with foremen, chiefs and directors. In large-sized enterprises, employers do not deal with employees even in the process of employment. In general, chiefs are responsible for recruitment and solving problems between employees. Foremen are responsible to control and organize workers during production processes. However, all employees, workers, chiefs, foremen, masters have to obey determined rules. Such hierarchical organization of production tends to clarify class positions of apprentices within the production area by creating definite working relations.

However, these structural processes do not completely determine perceptions and subjective processes of apprentices. Indeed, ideological cultural processes could make the contradictions, which depend on the exploitation and class differentiation in the production area, invisible. On the other hand, apprentices could use certain tactics in order to overcome the contradictions. In the next section this issue will be discussed in more detail.
CHAPTER 4
CLASS CULTURE AMONG APPRENTICES IN THE LATE CAPITALIST ERA

In the previous chapter, it is indicated that small-size enterprises are encouraged and forms of employment and working conditions are flexibilized parallel to rising international competition in the late capitalist era. In relation to this, subcontracting practices become prevalent especially in late industrialized countries. All these processes as stated before, refer to gaining control and the dominance of capital on labor through different forms of labor regimes in different sectors. These economic changes refer to the essence of the new historical bloc constituted by not only economic but also ideological and political ways. In the general sense, the ideology of late capitalism could be understood as neutralization of class antagonisms by way of both coercion and consent. Indeed, small size enterprises are encouraged in this process by neo-right governments not only since they serve in reducing costs for transnational corporations, but also serve to depoliticize class by making its unionization difficult; and make class powerless in the face of flexibilization policies. The critical point is that this new historical bloc could be established through being translated to ideological-cultural codes of the society. In other words, structural labor processes become hegemonic by their articulation within the commonsense of the people, in particular, the working class. From this perspective, the question is how the constitution of the new historical bloc benefits from the pre-existent class culture of societies, and in what aspects it coincides with the historical reservoir of the working class. As a late capitalized social formation, in Turkey, notions like right, citizenship, contract which refer to bourgeois democracy are not imbedded; in relation to this, class relations have emerged as de facto relations under the dominance of paternalist relations; owning a business is the dominant disposition within the lower classes; and as a result of this, concepts like antagonism, struggle, solidarity, unionization are debatable and complicated issues, How could the relationship between structural changes and historically constituted class culture be understood? From this perspective, could we speak of a mutual determination? In the case of apprentices, when their multiple positions, not only as workers, but also as
pupils is considered what kind of class relations and class hierarchies emerge? How and where is the class antagonism experienced; and how do the apprentices perceive and respond to it? Ultimately, what could be said about class culture among apprentices? This chapter aims to seek the answers of these questions by referring to the experiences, preferences and insights of apprentices.

4.1. Making sense of Production Space and Production Relations

The space of production emerges as an area that forms class identity and class positions. Organization of the production space and the relationships established within this area play the main role in the formation and non-formation of class consciousness and in shaping class culture. In this part, this space and relationships established within this area will be dealt with.

4.1.1. Ateliers versus factories: resistance to class consciousness through absorption in work

Organization of workplace emerges as an important factor, which plays a role in the formation and non-formation of class culture. In this context, working within a factory system which functions in accordance with definite rules and a definite working hierarchy differs from working in an atelier, which refers to more irregular and arbitrary working conditions and indefinite relations. Apprentices in the apparel sector have very limited knowledge about the factory system since they are mainly employed in small-sized outsourcing enterprises. For this reason, they take their irregular working conditions and arbitrary working relations for granted since they do not have a chance to choose their workplace. Indeed, in this sector the despotic character of the labor regime, in a sense, derives from the fact that the working conditions have no alternative. On the other hand, in the metalworking sector, both factories and small sized workplaces employ apprentices for training. Therefore, apprentices in the metalworking sector have more chance to choose their workplace and an opportunity to compare the factory with an atelier. In this sector therefore, the subjective processes that constitute consent can be understood.
Related to the organization of the workplace, Kubilay who works in a small-sized workshop in the metalworking sector talks about the difference between the factory and an atelier:

Factories are seen as regular, formal workplaces where work safety is protected, and which function appropriate to pre-determined rules. However, from the perspective of apprentices working in the metalworking sector, subordination to capitalist discipline and time emerges as a main problem. Although apprentices complain about overtime, which they sometimes are obliged to do surprisingly at the last moment in small-sized workplaces, they mention that they do not prefer workplaces in which they are taken under discipline, and in which working hours and breaks are regular. Oğuzhan who works in a small sized firm says:


---

16 Factories are perfect. They are so strict on the issues such as social security, health. For example, while working at milling cutter they say us to wear glasses; however if we do not wear nobody asks. In factories officers come for control. Their control is more strict, they control the work conditions, how workers work, if they obey the rules or not. But in our normal workshops, I have been working for two years, there have been no controls.
Yasin mentions the same characteristics of a factory:

Bana kuralı iş sıkıcı geliyo. Şimdi 15 dakika paydos istiyolar ama bizim orda 25-30 dakkayı buluyo bizim paydoslarımız. O yüzden 15 dakkaba sıkıcı geliyo. O yüzden çalışmak istemiyoruz. Yani daha çok rahat olmak istiyoruz. Şu anki gibi.18

Many apprentices in the metalworking sector state that they get permission and time outs more easily without subordinating to a definite time schedule, and that they solve their problems not according to pre-determined rules but according to personal relations with their master or employer in small-sized workplaces. Apprentices perceive these non-regularized working conditions and working relations as an area of freedom. Apprentices mostly prefer working in small-sized workplaces and frequently express that they look for a “comfortable” workplace in which they can constitute personal relationships free from strict discipline, instead of the disciplinary, impersonal and definite relationships of the factory system. For this reason, although the factory provides standard working hours, work safety and regular wage payment for apprentices, they prefer small-sized workplaces because of the flexibility and violability of rules. Kubilay talks about why he does not prefer a factory:


17 In the factory you cannot say let me go somewhere and sleep but in a workshop you can. For instance, when you finish your work and clean your stand and you have some hour for the break you can rest. In the factory you have to work till the break. In there tea break is at 10:00 however in a workshop you can have tea break whenever you want. In the factory there is lunch break at 12.00 and one more tea break at 15:00. After three we work till six. From six to eight we have overtime.

18 I find regular jobs boring. Their break time lasts 15 minutes. But in our workplace, we have breaks that lasts 25-30 minutes. For this reason, I don’t want to work in such boring places. I want to be more comfortable as now.
In *Capital* Marx (1992) points out similar matters while he discusses the factory regime. Marx defines the factory system as automaton, in which workers are subordinated to machines and in which *barrack-like discipline* is dominant. The general tendency of apprentices is to refuse such discipline; and, as Marx says, the “lifeless mechanism” of the factory system, which reifies and alienates them to their work. Apprentices refuse to be gears of a machine that transform them to simple commodities by making them invisible in the production process. They prefer small-sized workplaces since these workplaces, in a sense, give the opportunity of the reappearance of visibility and the particularity of labor.

In relation to this, Oğuzhan, who works in a small-sized workplace, says that he is always at the forefront. Since he is proficient in his work, his master looks for him whenever he needs something. For him, although working in a factory facilitates shirking work, he does not prefer the factory, since it makes all workers similar to each other, substitutable, unqualified and invisible in the production process. Yalçın who works in a factory expresses this invisibility. From his point of view, working in a factory provides comfort since he can be invisible and shirk work much more easily. For Yalçın, since hundreds of workers are working in factories, nobody is concerned about him, but for this reason, nobody teaches him the job. Therefore such invisibility in the factory system becomes both invisibility of apprentices themselves and their labor in the production process.

In factories, all workers and also apprentices are substitutable. In small-sized workplaces, apprentices become more visible and their labor is less substitutable since these workplaces employ very limited workers. For this reason, in many cases, small-sized workplaces become the places where the job is learned. A basic perception among apprentices is that the job is learned in an atelier not in a factory.

---

19 It would not be good. Why? In factories people work with the same motivation and discipline. There is not such a relax work environment. In a normal workshop, not in a factory, there is more relax environment. You can sometimes find the chance to chat with masters, to go and return somewhere. Nobody stands over you at work. In the factory, there is a clearcut discipline. Everybody has to do the same job. You cannot even raise your head. In a sense, factory is similar to textile.
Oğuzhan says: “in a factory nobody teaches you the job. They only use you as an errand boy. You have to learn the job by yourself. But, it is not so in an atelier. The master has to school you to use the machine. Why? Because the number of workers is limited and you have to finish the job in time”. Parallel to this, Yasin mentions that he is one of the two workers who use the CNC machine in his workplace.

In this way, small-sized ateliers emerge as an alternative to factory regimes by giving the opportunity of learning skills, therefore enabling a status, visibility to labor and preventing commodification and reification processes. Visibility of labor brings the visibility of apprentices by making them the “subject” of their work. Recognition of apprentices as subjects, according to Sayer’s expression, creates a sense of “self-worth” among apprentices (Sayer, 2005).

However, this recognition brings about the question of freedom of labor and class consciousness among apprentices. Skill presumes dependence to work instead of capital; and by providing qualification, in a sense, it gives status to labor through its valorization. The valorization of workers themselves, prevents their complete subordination to capital, thus, prevents freedom of labor. In this way, their subjectification results in their subjection.

This issue in a sense implies the characteristics of craft labor in terms of absorption in work as Marx defines. It is claimed that in late capitalism specialization and qualification in one part of the production process regarding the emergence of new technologies, has brought the re-emergence of craft labor (Piore, Sabel: 1984). With the interviews in mind, it is remarkable that artisanal logic is functional regarding the perception of work and the manner of class relations. Since the decentralization of production and technological adaptation give the small enterprises the opportunity of development by way of high rated jobs and skill flexibility, learning a job and specializing in different machines could provide apprentices a possibility of valorization of their labor which they could use as a trump in the face of capitalist exploitation. In many cases, in these workplaces, apprentices have not problematized the irregularity of working hours and the wage payment system, because they perceive these conditions as transitory conditions which will finish after they learn
the job. They tend to think that they will become a master or will have their own business when the learning process is completed. The idea of learning job, which gives apprentices a property, and provides a key for a privileged position is adopted by apprentices in order to escape from the capitalist pressures experienced by the working class. This issue serves to non-belonging to the working class position and insensibility to the common interests of class, thus preventing the development of class-consciousness among apprentices.

It could be stated that this disposition of apprentices bears the trace of the pre-existent class culture in Turkey. As a late capitalized social formation in which proletarianization is retarded and petit production has a strong tradition both in the villages and in the cities due to the insufficient accumulation of capital and late dispossession; owning a business through setting up a shop has been possible within the production structure of Turkey. Such notions have also become effective in the dispositions and perceptions of the working class. In this way, class culture is determined both by the perception that departs from the possibility of being your own boss and changing class positions, and by the class relations which are regularized according to informal, non-contractual relationships.

It may be claimed that this culture, which manifests itself in the dispositions of apprentices who prefer small-sized enterprises, aim to learn the job, want to be visible in the workplace, refuse the disciplinary, impersonal working relations thus resist to the working class position, corresponds to the logic of late capitalism which benefits from the continuity of de facto, non-contractual, flexible working conditions and working relations. In this perspective, it could be stated that, in a sense, hegemony of the new historical bloc is realized through the articulation of the pre-existing culture to new times.

4.1.2. Paternalist Relationships between Employers and Apprentices

Another aspect of this culture is the effectiveness of close, familial relationships between bosses, masters and workers. These relations are the manifestations of the simple control mechanism, which is prevalent in the small-sized enterprises and refers to a more direct form of authority. Simple control mechanism, in other words
entrepreneurial control, refers to unsophisticated, informal and unstructured control in which exercise of power is concentrated in the capitalist’s hands. This personal power that could be erratic and arbitrary, depends on personal ties, and paradoxically produces equal power relations among workers (Edwards, 1979). Since all workers are powerless with regard to the capitalist, and authority is not fragmentized between managers, chiefs, foremen etc., class hierarchies are less perceived. In such a control mechanism, all workers can develop direct relationships with the capitalist.

These relations enlarge the role of the capitalist; in this way, the boss becomes not only possessor of the means of production, but also protector and guide of the workers in the production area. In the case of apprenticeship these relations become more significant. Since apprentices are not only workers, but also pupils, they are completely brought under the control of the boss and masters. This issue causes establishment of familial relationships between apprentices and the boss or master, which can be erratic, arbitrary but at the same time more humane and negotiable. Such a relationship, in a sense, refers to the artisanal class relations within capitalist relations of production which depend on, as Thompson emphasizes, psychological closeness between employer-master and apprentice (Thompson, 1966). This implies the significance of vertically constituted relations between the boss and apprentices, rather than horizontally constituted relations between workers.

In the interviews, it is understood that apprentices prefer workplaces in which they can constitute familial relationships with masters and bosses. Such a disposition is prevalent for the apprentices from both sectors and derives from two main reasons. The first is that familial relationships in the workplace prevent dehumanization of the working process which is one of the characteristics of capitalist relations of production. Apprentices tend to refuse this characteristic of capitalist production which includes rationalization of working relations and parallel to this, alienation to other workers, transformation to mere productive bodies, in a sense, becoming gears of the machine. In the metalworking sector, as stated before, the factory system is identified with such dehumanized, impersonal and rational relationships. Apprentices, in many cases, find these relations “boring” and “serious” and present small-sized ateliers as “funny, hilarious and comfortable” workplaces since they
could develop close relationships in the workplace. On the other hand, in the apparel sector, although these paternalist relations bring erratic and arbitrary control on the apprentices, such relations are preferred since they provide a negotiation area for apprentices. By developing personal relations many apprentices in small sized workshops are able to break the rules. For example, they may get permission in the course of working hours if necessary, or stop work whenever they want in order to rest for a while. Breaking the rules does not constitute a problem for bosses, since they may compensate by implementing exceptional overtime in necessary conditions or by delaying the wages.

Paternalist, close, familial relationships become employers and apprentices’ way of making do with each other. Paternalist relations emerge as an important control mechanism in the everyday life of the apprentices. However, the critical point is that these relations that can be evaluated as strategies of the employers, who aim to establish non-regular working conditions, coincide with the tactics of the apprentices. Apprentices try to overcome flexible labor processes, which can be arbitrary, erratic and non-contractual, by using the same relations. According to De Certeau’s conceptualization, in a sense, they try to escape these labor processes without leaving them (De Certeau, 1984). In the interviews, apprentices say that they prefer to work with a boss whom they know before. In this way, they think that they can overcome the pressure of working conditions. Nihat who works in his uncle’s enterprise says:


Similarly, Emir underlines the mutualism between employers and apprentices:


20 It is better to work a familiar place. In an outsider place there is suppression. We are in comfort here. In an outsider you cannot have permission. When I say mother calls me I have to go my uncle allows but there they won’t.
In the previous chapter, it is stated that employers in small sized enterprises employ workers from their social environment to reduce labor cost. In these statements, it is seen that apprentices prefer to work with those from their social environment to subvert the strategies of employers mostly by abusing working hours. Durak in his study on Konya Organized Industrial Zone talks about the same issue. He states that workers prefer working with a boss whom they know before, and such familiar relationships provide informal security to workers (2011:73).

Another reason why apprentices prefer close, familial relations in the workplace is the neutralization of class hierarchies through these relations. In the simple control mechanism, in which these relations are more significant as stated above, all workers can establish a direct relationship with the boss. Therefore, although exercise of power is concentrated in the hands of the capitalist, workers share an equal position in the face of the boss. Workers solve their problems directly with the boss. On the other hand, in the case of managerial control, which is more significant in the factory system, the power and the authority of the boss are fragmented between managers, chiefs and foremen. Paradoxically this issue results in the manifestation and intensification of the power of the boss. In many cases, workers cannot encounter their bosses. Under the strict working hierarchy, class differentiation becomes more apparent. This situation is understood from the way the apprentices address their bosses. While apprentices appeal to their boss by saying “master” or “brother” in the small-sized enterprises, in the factories they mention their boss as “sir”.

Apprentices give consent to personal relationships since they do not want to experience class differentiation and strict class hierarchy in the workplace. Personal

---

21Nobody says to my phone talks here, but in another place they can warn. We are friends, we have made lots of favor for Burhan brother; of him for us also. In the evening, he fires us and we insist to work and continuing to work. When he has urgent works, we did work hard and when he could not pay we did not say anything and so he covers for us. Because when I do job, I can learn and when he earns, I earn.
relations between employers and workers neutralize such differentiations and hierarchies, thus becoming a way for the neutralization of class antagonisms. In the interviews, apprentices mention that they can constitute familial relationships with bosses in different ways. Rasim says:

Ben şahsen abiyi patron olarak görmiyorum. O da beni elemanı olarak görmez. Biz zaten abi kardeş gibiyiz. Beni evine de davet eder.\footnote{I don’t see the brother as a boss. He also does not see me as an employee. We are like brothers. He invites me to his home.}

On the other hand, employers benefit from these relations through gaining “loyalty” of workers and oppressing the organization of class opposition. For this reason, personal relationships which are strong in small-sized enterprises, function at least in terms of discourse in grand factories. In the small-sized enterprises employers -in the factories foremen or chiefs- usually use a discourse that emphasizes “we are a family”. This discourse facilitates the naturalization of class inequalities and legitimates exploitation in the production process implicated by flexible and arbitrary working conditions.

Related to this issue, Oğuzhan says that he appeals to his boss by saying “brother” and mentions that he went to the wedding of his boss’ brother. In the same manner, Yusuf says that his boss brings pastry to the workers every morning. Yasin says that his boss behaves friendly and he can make jokes with his boss. Apprentices who work in the IMES industrial zone mention that football tournaments in which bosses and workers play football together against other enterprises are organized. In this way a perception of unity within the workplace versus other workplaces is formed. In any case, personal ties between apprentices and bosses serve for the reconciliation between classes instead of a unity within one class. Similar examples are present in the study of Dubetsky on kinship in the small factory organization in Aktepe. He talks about the bosses as follows:

They showed a personal concern with their private and family lives and assisted them financially and otherwise when necessary. Almost all the workers stated that the patrons showed a genuine interest in their private lives. Many also felt
that they were genuine friends of the patrons. The patrons often spent free time or lunch breaks with the workers, and associated with some of them after work hours (1976: 446).

This study which is done in 1976 shows that the familial relationships existing in the workplaces have a strong tradition and that they function as a factor which prevents class-consciousness, since they account for the negation of the labor-capital contradiction and hide the antagonisms between boss and worker.

In the interviews, it is understood that paternalist relations established through referring to the commonsense of the workers turn into more powerful relations. Employers and masters can become a moral and political guide of apprentices through these close paternalist relations. This issue is mainly prevalent in small-sized enterprises of both sectors. Apprentices in the apparel sector, who work in Sultanbeyli, generally mention that their employers and foremen orientate them to religious activities and during the work day, give religious counsels and sometimes bring in an imam from a mosque to talk about religious duties. They mention that they are very content with their foreman and employer since they are able to constitute a familiarity on religious grounds. Coşkun, in his study on textile workers, drives attention to the same issue. He states that employers frequently talk with religious references within the workplace in the course of the control process (2013:100). This moral guiding brings along voluntariness in apprentices and this voluntariness is translated to class relations as reconciliation. Employers and foremen generally do not limit their authority with the production area, but also control lifestyle, viewpoints and behaviors of the apprentices. Sabuha says that she wore tight pants previously, but changed her clothing after the advices of the foremen. Similarly, in the metalworking sector, in the IMES industrial zone, participating in the Friday prayer becomes a de facto obligation for apprentices. Employers also do not employ an apprentice who wears an earring and has long hair. This issue shows the multifaceted authority on the apprentices.

These paternalist relations can emerge as a form of solidarity between apprentices and bosses. Such an issue is observed mostly in the apprentices of the apparel sector who work in Çağlayan and Bağcılar with regard to engagement in the Kurdish
movement. In this area, it could be stated that both apprentices and bosses subordinate to external moral and political guides. In the interviews, it is said that representatives of the Kurdish movement sometimes intervene to both the relationship between employers, and the relationship between workers and employers especially in the case of conflicts. This issue brings cohesion between bosses and apprentices around a common viewpoint and a common struggle of emancipation which differs from class-based emancipation.

Emir who works in the apparel sector defines himself as a “free worker” and defines his boss as a “revolutionary boss” claiming that there is solidarity between himself and his boss with regard to political identity.


This political solidarity displaces class positions according to his perception:

Şu anda ben Burhan abiyi tanımlasam patron demem arkadaşım derim abim derim patron diyemem.24

Similarly Sultan talks about her political closeness to the Peace and Democracy Party (BDP) and indicates that if her boss had not been Kurdish like her, she could not have talked about anything but wages. She says: “if Kurdish party goes well, I get better”. In this way, she ignores the arbitrary behavior of her employer in the workplace and does not perceive this behavior as class differentiation. She says the following:


23It is better to have a Kurdish boss. For example, I can speak him in Kurdish. We both support BDP. Politically if we were to support different parties we can discuss. For this reason it is better. There is solidarity among us.

24To define Burhan Brother I cannot say boss, I would say friend, uncle or brother but not boss.
etmem yani. Bana bağırması lazım yani. Çünkü işimi yanlış yaparsam bağırır tabi.25

On the other hand, Dilan mentions that since his boss speaks Kurdish, he could help Rojavian people by employing them in his enterprise, in this way, providing solidarity among Kurdish workers.

All these statements show that patronalist relations depend on mutual-consent. These relations give the right of direct control and the implementation of oppressive working conditions like low wages, long working hours by the employers. In this way they increase exploitation and decrease opposition. On the other hand, these familiar relations develop a sense of belonging to the job and the workplace for the workers. Out of this issue emerges a typology of “deferential worker” as in Lockwood’s conceptualization, who understands class hierarchies as natural hierarchies; and perceives the relationship between employer and worker as personal and particularistic (Lockwood, 1975).

4.1.3. Class Solidarity and Struggle among Apprentices

Within patronalist relationships, concepts of right, class solidarity and class struggle emerge as ambiguous facts. These class concepts are not perceived with reference to their universal meaning but are constituted in a particular form, in many cases in comparison to others. The notion of right emerges in comparison to other workers, other workplaces, other bosses etc. In general sense, the notion of “right” is expressed when “difference” emerges. Metin says that all workers who work in workplaces situated near their workplace work until noon, while he works until the evening on Saturday. Similarly Dilan uses the concept of right for addressing the inequality among workers in getting permission from the employer. Another use of the concept of right emerges when Rıza talks about overtime wages, which are lower than other workplaces.

This common situation implies that the concept of right has emerged as a moral fact and benefit from a belief in justice, which is not structurally determined but rather

---

25 He may shout if he wants. Why should I get sad? In the end, he is my brother however he behaves. I do not disrespect him. He should shout at me when I work bad.
culturally constituted and which reveals a form of critique of discrimination, differentiation etc., observed in the behavior of the employer.

As stated before, paternalist relationships and flexible working relations in the small-sized enterprises play role in preventing class-consciousness by naturalizing class contradictions. However, when violence prevails to persuasion and consent, and when arbitrariness functions completely against apprentices, a contradiction between employers and apprentices emerges within the workplace. This issue is mostly observed in the apparel sector due the despotic character of the labor regime. Violence in the workplace occurs at the control process in which class antagonisms and class positions are mostly experienced. Behaviors which damage the self-respect of apprentices during the control process emerge as the main contradiction. Thus, the concept of injustice in the perception of apprentices is constituted.

Apprentices frequently experience injustice in different ways. However, in the metalworking sector, in which consent prevails over coercion, apprentices generally express that they do not experience injustice. As stated in the previous chapter, the main reason of this perception is the “respectability” of the sector when compared to the apparel sector with regard to more secure working conditions, less arbitrary work relations and their hopes of changing their conditions in the future.

Apprentices deem themselves more necessary in the production process and pressure on the performance of labor is less significant in this sector. From the perspective of these apprentices, having a job and skills emerge as factors which constitute self-respect. They feel themselves more powerful in the face of the boss compared to the apparel workers.

The general problem in the metalworking sector emerges in the case of work accidents. Apprentices in the metalworking sector mention that they frequently have minor work accidents. Since they generally have apprenticeship insurance, employers generally do not confront a legal problem. Only one apprentice, Rıza, mentioned that he had a serious work accident in a period of uninsured working, and got an incapacity report for two months. He said that his employer paid money to his family in order to discourage them from filing legal action, and since the employer is
their fellow, his family did not insist on legal procedures. Close relationships with the employer play an important role in this cohesion. However, no matter how the apprentices establish close relations with their employers, it may be claimed that work accidents and unsafety in small-sized subcontractors do not transform into class antagonisms. At this point, Durak argues that work accidents emerge as a field at which the hegemony of the boss is ruptured (2011:106). However, in the interviews, a very different disposition among apprentices is observed in contrast to the claim of Durak. In the case of work accidents, the boss can reconstitute his hegemony mostly through shifting the blame on to apprentices and persuading the families by giving money.

In many cases, apprentices do not know what to do in case of an accident. For this reason, the boss could intervene in all the processes after the accidents, in the hospitals, legal procedures etc.. Employers blame workers because of the work accident, and explain the reason of accidents as inattention of workers. In many cases, apprentices perform the discourse of the employers. Work accidents are generally not perceived as injustice. Apprentices who had work accidents say that these accidents derived from their fault and inattention. In some cases, discriminative and criminative discourse against the poor plays a role in the blaming of apprentices in the case of an accident. Kubilay mentions a previous apprentice in his workplace who had a work accident and says: “reportedly, he was a shady character and used drugs during work, so the boss fired him after the accident”. Therefore, the discourse of the employer can gain a manipulative character apprentices cannot defend themselves against, and become hegemonic even in the perception of apprentices.

In contrast to apprentices in the metalworking sector, apprentices in the apparel sector mention many experiences that they formulate as injustice. Apprentices use the concept of “injustice” in case they encounter with an arbitrary behavior in terms of using verbal or physical violence even if they have no fault. Nihat talks about his experience of injustice:

İlk iki günde daha acemiydim. Adam şunu getir diyor. Ben neyi getireyim bilmiyorum. Etrafa bakıyorum ne alacağını bilmiyorum. Dersin o şudur bu şudur ondan laf atıyordu
In another example, Rasim tells his experience in a workplace which he has newly entered at the end of the season:


Similarly Emir argues that he left his previous workplace, because the master scolded him because his friends came to the workplace to visit him.

Apprentices frequently imply that they feel anger when their masters or bosses scold them unjustly. According to apprentices, bosses and masters have the right to shout when they make a mistake. Injustice appears when they shout arbitrarily. Related to this issue Metin says:

Suç benimse bana bağırabilir. Ama suç benim değilse bana bağırıramaz.28

In the interviews, it is understood that arbitrary behaviors addressed to all workers in order to increase the speed of production do not annoy apprentices, but are rather accepted as a natural characteristic of the “textile environment” as stated before. The main problem emerges when these behaviors are exhibited on an individual basis, for example when the boss, or master scolds an apprentice in the presence of other workers. These behaviors, by creating the feeling of abasement bring shame and decrease the self-respect of apprentices, resulting in the emergence of a perception

26 I was a beginner in the first two days. Guy says bring this to me and I do not understand what to bring. I look around but I did not know what to bring. Instead of describing me he shouted at me and so I started to swear and than quilted damning.

27 This workplace closed for one month and a half. I started in another workplace. I worked there three days, then, I left. I couldn’t do. That was terrible workplace. First day master start to shout. He didn’t show me the method sequence. I do it as I know. That’s why he shouted at me. He slapped to my face. That’s why I left there.

28 If I am wrong, he can shout at me, but If I am not, he can’t
related to class hierarchies. From this perspective, self-respect emerges as a class contradiction as Sennett points out, and the struggle for protecting respect and dignity becomes the way of class struggle (Sennett, 1977).

In the face of these arbitrary behaviors damaging self-respect, apprentices react individually and in informal ways. Dilan says that if her boss shouts at herself, she will shout too. In the same manner, Sabuha says:

Ben kendimi korurum hayatta kendimi ezdirmem başkaşına. Haklı olursam.\(^{29}\)

When apprentices encounter with an injustice, they generally leave the job. “I have taken leave of” is a statement frequently expressed by apprentices. As it is stated before, worker circulation is a common issue in the apparel sector. Since apprentices and other workers are deprived from legal instruments of struggle such as trade unions; and since they are working under irregular, uninsured, precarious conditions, leaving the job emerges as an inevitable way for them.

Nihat says that he would not do anything but seek another job, if he encounters with injustice in the workplace. İbrahim similarly says:

Haksızlık olduğu zaman ben işten çıkarırım. Yapabilecek bir şey yok. Yapabileceğim bir şey olsaydı yapardım.\(^{30}\)

In some cases, especially if the boss did not pay wages or used violence, apprentices feel the need to organize. However, they do not collaborate with other workers in the workplaces, but with their close friends or with their families. Emir explains this situation:


\(^{29}\) I protect myself and not let someone suppress me if I am right.

\(^{30}\) If there is injustice I will quit the job. Nothing to do. If there was I would do.

Similar situation is expressed by Sultan:

Beni dövselerdi ben de döverdim. Benim sülalem burda herkes geliirdi. Bütün sülale tekstil işi yap }), 32

From these statements, it is understood that class struggle is practiced outside of legal processes and mechanisms. It is practiced through informal, illegal and casual relations. In the apparel sector, when the boss does not pay wages, workers do not apply to legal representatives, instead of this, it is seen that workers appropriate manufacturing machines and compensate their loss by selling them.

In addition to this, solidarity is not a concept that can be sought in the workplace, but a concept, which can be constituted through other belongings and networks among lower classes, like family and friendships. Apprentices do not rely on their workmates but on their close relationships that share the same class positions. Emir talks about his lack of confidence towards his workmates:


31 They cannot shout at me. Before an apprentice could not say a word because a machine man throws bobbin to his head; but today if a machine man once hits an apprentice, five people would wait for him outside. You have to use violence sometimes. My friends would protect me. They know me, we know each other for a long time. We earn the same, eat together, we hang together. Beforehand me and my brother were working in the textile. There was a master, he said something to my brother and my brother warns him that I can make ten people to come here. After that he became kind to my brother.

32 If they would have beaten me I would have beaten them. My whole family works at textile and all would have come here for me.
Similarly Arzu and Fatma complain about the lack of solidarity by referring to their experience:

"They do not stay behind each other. There is such a thing. They talk here but in front of the boss they do not. This is the case in textile environment. Everyone behaves like this. There was a job I worked earlier. We get together to go to the boss and we went but me and my cousin spoke, nobody said any word except us. Meals were bad and we went him to say this. All of the girls kept quiet and I ask them “did you lost your tongue?” They wanted me to speak and kept quiet. After leaving the boss I said all that you all peached on us."

Many apprentices do not feel that they have a common interest with their workmates. They do not rely on them, and at the same time, they say that they will not struggle together with workmates without questioning. Fatma says: “I would support my friends if she is right, but if she is not, I would not”. Similarly Tahsin says that he would not vouch for another apprentice who works in the same enterprise. According to Yasin, the other apprentice complains about the master, because he does not like working, for this reason he is wrong.

As stated above, instead of class-based solidarity, what is being observed mostly is a solidarity based on specific relationships like being related, being fellows or coming from the same social environment. As stated in the previous part, these relations can be established between employers and workers, however, they can be established

---

33I do not easily communicate with most of the people. I have some selected friends and I like to communicate with them. Because you cannot trust most of the people. You say something to a man and he goes and says it to his boss. The people there were not kind of people I can trust. But my selected friends will even come to here just with my call.

34When there is a problem they do not stand behind. There is not such thing. They talk here but in front of the boss they do not. This is the case in textile environment. Every behaves like this. There was a job I worked earlier. We get together to go to the boss and we went but me and my cousin spoke, nobody said any word except us. Meals were bad and we went him to say this. All of the girls kept quiet and I ask them “did you lost your tongue?” They wanted me to speak and kept quiet. After leaving the boss I said all that you all peached on us.
among workers as well, and these relationships sometimes translate to class solidarity.

Related to these specific relations, Kubilay talks about the solidarity at the workplace between him and his cousin, in contrast to the foreman and to the boss. He says that the other workers are relatives of the boss, and this situation makes unionizing among workers difficult. Arzu states that solidarity at the workplace occurs between fellows. She talks about the fact that she could only rely on her fellows. Similarly, Yasin says that he shares his problems with his friend who works in the same workplace, and whom he has known for many years from the neighborhood. Enver who works in the metalworking sector and whose many workmates are also his cousins talks about a strong solidarity between them against the foremen and the boss. He says that they could pressure the boss for accepting their demands.

Enver mentions their intention of constituting an “organization of rebel against the bosses” (Patronlara İsyana Örgütü) and says that they talked about this issue during breaks, with regard to obligatory overtime and arbitrary working hours, but gave up later.

The structural processes behind the lack of class solidarity and class unity could be explained as a change in labor regimes, in relation to precarization and irregularity of working conditions. These changes become more apparent in the late capitalist era, and oblige workers to be more deferential by increasing subordination of labor to capital. Nihat explains this issue as such:

35If something happens to one of us we are ten people inside. Some time we talked about quitting the job together. That is we will come up before the boss. We or the master. There are at most 30 people there and we are 15 people. Boss cannot fire us; if he does he cannot find workers and he can crash.
This process in a sense destroys known methods of struggle like the trade union. From the interviews, it is understood that the concept of trade union is not familiar to apprentices. Even the apprentices who tend to oppose the boss say that they have not heard this word before. This issue results in the implementation of individual methods and individual relations for solving and negotiating problems related to working conditions.

In the small-sized workshops, such individualism can be materialized with regard to the intensity of close and face-to-face relationships. On the other hand, in the factories, apprentices follow different paths when confronted with injustice. Yalçın and İsmail who work in factories state that they sometimes encounter injustice in their relationship with intermediate staff like foremen, chiefs and managers. The biggest injustice emerges when foremen or chiefs shift the blame onto apprentices in case of a manufacturing defect. Apprentices say that they benefit from the division of labor within the factory for solving this problem. Since there is more than one chief and foreman within the division of labor in the factories, when they have a problem with one, they appeal to another to solve their problems. They argue that they cannot find relations based on solidarity within the workplace. Yalçın says: “Everyone is self-interested. Everyone thinks only about his own interests in the workplace” and states that there is a difference between the sections of the factory in terms of relations based on solidarity. He says that in the production section nobody cares about other workers; but in the montage section, workers stand up for each other.

In the study of Birelma, about the unionization experience of Rovman, it is possible to recognize certain citations from the interview, which tells that there is a strong distrust and competition between workers prior to unionization (2014:222) In this perspective, it could be stated that the lack of trade unions in factories prevents the development of class consciousness and solidarity among workers. Both Yalçın and İsmail indicate that they have heard about trade unions before, but they have not worked in a workplace in which trade unions exist. İsmail defines the trade union as

36 Whatever I talk, it is vain. Nobody would support me. People just look for their interests.
an organization which provides democracy between workers and employers. Yalçın says that in private workplaces such as their workplace, trade unions cannot occur, but he finds trade unions beneficial since they provide negotiation between employers and workers.

These statements show that notions like solidarity and organization occur in the perception of apprentices with regard to personal familiarity which mostly depends on kinship or neighborhood residence. In this context, the neighborhood, which is also composed of people who have similar working conditions and was one of the important components of the working class culture in the past, could still play a role in constituting relationships based on solidarity. Kinship however is a contradictory issue. As a result of rotating poverty class differentiation between relatives can occur, since the early comers to the city become entrepreneurs or small bosses while latecomers become workers. For this reason, while the former becomes a way of constituting solidarity between the boss and the worker, the latter could play a role in class solidarity. In any way, the interviews show that the notions of solidarity and organization are not associated with relationships within the production area and with class interests.

4.2. Making Sense of Class Positions and Differentiations

As is seen in the previous section, factories and workshops are not the basic fields of constitution of class culture. The relationships in these fields in a sense prevent the constitution of a “we sense” among apprentices and workers by either preventing alienation to work and working relations or replacing solidarity between workers by solidarity between workers and employers. Especially, the small-sized enterprises are not the fields which enable making sense of class positions and cannot be translated to a perception of class antagonism. This section, will discuss the areas which could form a “we sense” among apprentices.

4.2.1. Legitimacy of the Boss versus Illegitimacy of the Rich

Certain issues mentioned above, such as the constitution of personal, face-to-face, familial relations; a preference of conciliation instead of conflictual relations
explained as “escaping without leaving”, in a sense, prevent the constitution of class consciousness and class culture by way of neutralizing class antagonisms. Although corrosion of self-respect emerges as a contradiction in the workplace which is experienced mostly in the apparel sector, it cannot be transformed into a class antagonism which could organize collective class struggle. The main reason of this issue is that apprentices associate arbitrary behaviors of the employer with his moral and personal characteristics. They do not define the boss regarding to his position in the relation of production, or in social hierarchies. They define the boss first of all according to personal characteristics, and attitudes against workers. From this perspective, there are good bosses and bad bosses. A good boss is defined as a man who is generous, honest and confidential, who behaves well to workers, and considers their problems. Bad bosses on the other hand, are ‘insensible to workers’ conditions, ungenerous, behave badly to workers, command and control them during the production process. For example Metin says:


Similarly Emir mentions about his previous boss as such:


Emir says that his new boss has moral superiority contrary to his previous boss:

Bi patron olsam Burhan abi nasıl ben de öyle olmak isterim. Paraları da olsa onlar daha zengin olsa Burhan abi daha fakir olsa ben Burhan abinin yolunu seçerim. Çünkü öyle daha iyi

37What is boss? Boss is different. I did not see similar bosses. A good boss intervenes the work without getting angry. Bad one comes and shouts at you directly and says whatever he thinks.

38I was working in an hotel beforehand. Boss was a sod, he was giving orders, he was oppressing the workers. Those people love suppressing people. People in the hotel were like that. They were very rigorous. When there is a mistake, they directly warns.
The critical point is that class relations, in any case, emerge as personal relations, and problems between apprentices and employers are not explained by referring to the labor-capital contradiction but to personal specificities of the employer. In the production process apprentices in the small-sized enterprises do not distinguish the boss from the foreman. Although they sometimes have problems in their relationship with the boss and the foreman, they come to a mutual understanding in the short term. The boss is a legitimate figure in the workplace; he has knowledge about the job, and he is responsible of its continuity and the maintenance of workers’ subsistence. Even in the statement of Kubilay who defines himself as a leftist and revolutionary worker, the boss represents an obligation in the production process.

In many cases, the boss is not regarded as the proprietor of the means of production or an exploiter of surplus. Although apprentices know this issue, they do not problematize and do not relate this issue to a more general inequality or injustice. Apprentices associate class inequality and injustice with the rich, not with the boss.

The legitimacy of the boss derives from two main issues. The first is that especially in the small-sized workshops the boss mostly comes from similar socio-economic conditions as the apprentices. As stated in previous parts, the bosses in this category come from similar socio-economic origins as the apprentices, begin work in their own right and make progress through informal networks. This issue is most

---

39 If I were a boss, I would be just like Burhan. No matter others are richer, I again would choose to be like Burhan because it is better… he does not insult people. If you are unfair to somebody, your gain would be halal.

40 Boss is necessary. In other case everybody plays by ear including the masters because master ask to boss when buying stuff or doing anything else. Even do us. For instance, if we do not have shoes we go and say to boss and then to the master.
apparently seen in the outsourcers of the apparel sector, however, it is valid to some extent even for the proprietors of the factory in the metal working sector.

Patron olmak bence iyi bir şey sonuçta o şeye gelmişsin yani. 
Bi çabayla oraya gelmişsin.41

In the apparel sector, due to the facility of entering into market, workers can more easily become the owner of the workshop. In the interviews, all apprentices in the apparel sector say that their boss was a worker in the past but later set up his own business and tried to survive with difficulty, at many times through the help of family labor. In many cases, apprentices in the apparel sector witness that their boss goes bankrupt and loses his position as the owner of the business. This refers to loss of prestige and authority of the boss, since he loses his higher position in the eyes of the apprentices. Ibrahim tells that he did not get angry with his boss even though he could not get his wage from the boss:


Bankruptcy, which is a common fact in the sector, reduces the boss to an equal class position as the apprentices. For this reason, despite the fact that the authority of the bosses on the workers especially emerges in the control processes, his position is easily changeable. Therefore, from the perspective of apprentices, the bosses cannot be identified with the rich. Nihat who works in his uncle’s workplace emphasizes this perception:

Patronlarımız zengin olsaydı çalışмыazdı. Dayımız zaten. 
Bakardı bize diyorum.43

41 I think being a boss is good thing. At least you have come to position.

42 For exaple, when the machines were taken, it really teared my heart out. The man had nothing. He even sold his house. I didn’t want to do force him while others do. I stooded by him as much as possible.

43 Our bosses would not work if they ere rich. They are our uncles. They would take after us.
On the other hand, apprentices in the metalworking sector identify their bosses with rich people. This perception becomes more significant for the bosses of the factory. This situation is associated with the developmental character of the sector as explained in the previous chapter. Many bosses in the sector are able to expand their business and accumulate capital through investment and foreign networks. However, apprentices believe that the boss represents a well-deserved richness and has gained his position through working. Yalçın who works in a grand factory talks about his boss:

Gençliğinde çalışmış insandır ama. Babalarının zamanında. Onların zamanında iki üç kişi ellereyle yapmışlar. Çok zenginler ama çok da iyi insanlar yani. Allah daha çok versin yani. 44

Coming from the lower strata gives the boss legitimacy in the eyes of the apprentices. In this way, apprentices see a possibility for obtaining the boss’ position in the future. Apprentices generally take the bosses as a model, frequently take on the same ideas as the boss, and justify them when they seek their self-interest.

Another important point is that working together with workers increases the legitimacy of the boss. This situation is mostly observed in the apparel sector and small workshops in the metalworking sector. According to apprentices, the bosses who participate to the production process with workers are more sensitive to workers’ problems. Metin says:


44 They had worked during their youth... time of their fathers. At those times they managed their work together with a few men. They are very rich but they are also very good people. May God give them much more.
This situation makes it possible to ignore class differentiation and gives an impression of equality between boss and apprentices. Arzu expresses this issue by saying: “patronum demiyo, o da bizimle birlikte çalışıyı”.

The second main issue, which legitimates the boss, is that he is perceived in the context of authority in the workplace and with the identity of “employer” who provides jobs for the workers and protects them. Such a perception differentiates the boss from the rich who is perceived in the light of pretentious consumption, which clarifies class differences. Indeed, the authority of the boss derives from his responsibility, and in relation to this, his credit with the workers. This issue refers to the connections behind the paternalist relations between employers and workers. In the case of the apprentices, it is understood that they regard the bosses as responsible not only for wage payment, but also for the whole maintenance of their life. From this perspective, Sennet associates the employer within paternalist relations with the father figure who has great control on the employers, but at the same time has great responsibility for the workers (Sennet, 1980).

In the interviews, apprentices debate this issue in the context of the definition of the boss. İsmail says:


45 The work environment of my first work. There was boss... Coming near to you and joking. Normally they really suppress but I think these people were from Gaziantep. He himself experience too much suppression so he did not suppress. When he was younger he worked in this sector. We know in what conditions apprentices work in Gaziantep. They work in bad conditions. If a boss has a work experience he can understand his employee. But boss without experience wants more. It is better to have a working boss. He also suffers when works.

46 Although he is a boss, he works with us

47 He is a very generous man. When you need money as a loan, he gives you immediately. There was a man like us who debted four billion. He gave the money to him and said that ‘give whenever you want’. He is very good in terms of these issues.
Taking responsibility of the workers not only in the workplace, but also outside of the workplace is accepted as an informal task of the boss. Rasim expresses his feelings and presents his standpoint in the event that the boss did not obey this informal rule.

As can be seen from the arguments made above, the production area does not automatically clarify class antagonisms, constitute class consciousness and contribute to the emergence of class culture. Historically constituted culture of class, in a sense, can resist, manipulate and postpone the emergence of class culture. However, it does imply the inexistence of a class perspective within the culture of the society. It can be said that this perspective is established on the basis of the differentiation between the rich and the poor (Erdoğan, 2004). Class consciousness emerges in the relational form (in relation to “other”), in a sense, in the form of the master-slave dialectic.

Such consciousness, which depends on differentiation, is prevalent for the apprentices of both sectors. In the interview, Enver says: “I am working but they are strolling around”. When it is asked: “who are they?”; he replies: “the rich”. Among nearly all apprentices from both sectors, richness emerges as a category of “otherness” which constitutes their lower positions through emphasizing their difference from it. Dilan explains this issue more clearly:

Biz burda fakir kaldık napalm. O kadar fakir değiliz de... fakir kalyoruz ötekinin yanında. Zenginlerin hizmetçileri var.

48 Because of this, my friend’s father committed suicide. He was dabbled 200 billion to the bank. He begged to his boss to give money as loan. He said that ‘I would work for a month and whatever time you want to pay my debt’. The boss did not give the money. He got angry, went home and hanged himself. He was very sad that day. I even offered to beat the boss with our friends. I really got angry.
Bizim yok mesela. Gel buraya kahve getir falan filan diyolar. Kızıyorum ya.. onlar fakir olsalardı onların yerinde olsalardı..onlar da düşününler. Ben zengin olmak isterim ama ben öyle şey yapmam ben kahvemi kendim yaparım. hatta ben yardım ederim yani.49

Similarly Metin says:

Zengin bi kızla birlikte olmak hiç istemezdim. Bayağı fark olurdu aramızda. Hiç iyi duyugular hissetmedim.50

In the interviews, such difference is constituted mostly through images and behaviors. These images and behaviors are associated with personal characteristics of the rich. Furkan says:

İlk gördüğünde zaten onları anlıyorsun. Marka giyimleri, lüks eşyalar taşımaları falan filan. Türkçe yenmesi batrnyolar yok ingilizce kelime falan kullanıyor. İlla ki bir yerden açık ediyorum. Önler tabi sinir bozucu oluyor. İnsanları alçak... yüksekten bakmak illaki zenginlik... Ne biliyim benim için öyle çoğu kişi için öyle de. Öyle insanlar tabi karşımıza çıktı. Nasıl söyelim mesela olur ya böyle kendinden kibirli, bencil... o şekilde yansıyolar. İş hayattında, mahallelerimde mesela...yanımız arkadaşımızın arkadaşları feländi filändi onlar geliyor. O şekilde illa görüyorsun. Böyle bi görgülerlik... edepsizlik de oluyor tabi.51

Metin explains that the rich constitutes its image by putting a difference between themselves and lower classes:

49We remained poor here, there is nothing to do. We are not that much poor but we are poor compared to other. Riches have servants, we do not. They asked for coffee for instance to their servants. I get angry; if they would have been poor, have been in their place... they should think. I want to be rich but I can make my coffee even I would help.

50I never want to fall in love with a rich girl. There would be a huge difference. I would not feel good.

51You know them at first sight. They wear trademarks, have luxury accessory. For instance they ruin Turkish, they use words in English. It somehow expresses itself. Those are irritating. Overlooking to people is richness. It is as such for me and for lots of people. We of course came across with such people. They are naturally arrogant, egoist; they prefer to be seem like that. In work life, neighbourhoods, from friends of our friends they come and in any case you can come across. There is such solecism and rudeness.
Yabancı gibi davranıyolar. Biz yabaniyiz onlar insan.\textsuperscript{52}

The rich, differently from the boss, is external to the lives of apprentices. Apprentices say that they do not know the rich, but rather encounter with their images. This image is rather negative in the eyes of the apprentices. Putting distance between themselves and the apprentices through behaviors, luxury consumption and images, the rich, in the general sense, represents an illegitimate position. Negative perception of the rich is not limited with apprentices, but finds its sources in the commonsense of the people. This issue is also significant in the study of Necmi Erdoğan. He states that richness, in many cases, is not bad in itself, but becomes bad with regard to the manner of its usage, humiliating behavioral patterns and conspicuous life styles. From this perspective, legitimate and illegitimate richness (Erdoğan, 2007) could be mentioned. Similar to this, in the interviews, apprentices distinguish the good rich from the bad rich. As in the definition of a good boss, the rich who takes responsibility for the poor becomes a good rich. The bad rich is defined as arrogant, spoiled, selfish, and somebody who likes dominating others:


\textsuperscript{52}They behave as we are foreigners. We are wild, they are person.

\textsuperscript{53}To whom we call rich... Those having money and wasting it I think. For instance, if I have money and suppress you and make you do whatever I want; it is richness. There is a different richness sharing his wealth with others and suppressing nobody. This kind of richness is much more good. He has wealth and wants everyone has so he shares. Sakıp SABANCI is different for me. He is worker friendly. His sons also distribute their wealth to needies. He was distributing to the workers because there is a huge gap inbetween.
It should be stated that this perception is not new as well. For example, Sakıp Sabancı who is the popular icon of the 1980s represents a worker friendly, charitable boss (Adaklı, 2001), in a sense he represents the general image of the good rich in the society who deserves to be rich since he has also an authority as employer. It could be stated that such a perception continues today with new images. Acun Ilıcalı emerges as a new image of the good rich. Rasim explains this difference between Acun Ilıcalı and Justin Bieber. He says that he finds Justin Bieber very spoilt and naughty who ridicules and humiliates people, and he mentions the moral superiority of Acun Ilıcalı:


A negative image of the rich can be constituted by referring to the middle class and “White Turk” images which represent an urban modern lifestyle. This image produces multiple differentiations by articulating class differentiation and cultural differentiation. Tahsin who mentions his support to AKP identifies rich people with “modern” people who live in Taksim and Nişantaşı. When the corruption allegations about the government are asked, he emphasizes that enrichment of these modern strata is much more unfair than the government’s. When he defines the rich, he says: “hepsi yolsuz, adamlar hayatlarını yaşıyı”.

In certain interviews, it is seen that religious belief is associated with a lower class habitus. According to Fatma, rich people are deprived from fear of God, and live as if they will not die someday. Religious belief emerges as a reinforcement strategy of the apprentices against the rich. Richness and money signify that some elements

54 I love Acun Ilıcalı. He has helped lots of people. I hear from internet I follow websites. He has helped lots of people for instance buys a house for a man. If I would have been in his place, I would also help to people. For instance I have an ought if I win money from lottery I do some favor for all of the poors. If I would have a chance…
belong to material life. As opposed to investment of the rich in material life, these apprentices propose investment for afterlife. Related to this issue, İbrahim says:


As it is seen, the rich, in general sense refers to an illegitimate figure who produces inequality in the society. However, richness does not refer to the same negative image exactly. Related this issue, Sayer emphasizes: “the subaltern in particular are likely to be torn between envy and rejection of dominant values and associated goods” (2005:161). In the interviews, two main dispositions are remarkable as such. Certain apprentices state that they wish to be rich, change their positions and reach a state of comfort, have luxury automobiles and expensive houses. The apprentices in this category indicate that they wish to take the place of the rich, but if they could be rich they would not behave as bad rich. Related to this issue, Kubilay states that he sometimes imagines himself as in the position of the boss’s son; and wishes to be rich by becoming boss in the future. Rasim says that he prays to win the lottery. Dilan talks about the fact that she wants to marry up with a rich husband to change her class position.

On the other hand, it is possible to mention the existence of apprentices who think that richness brings moral corruption. In this disposition, as Sayer implies, class pride emerges as a moral superiority and compensatory strategy of apprentices in the face of the superior class (ibid:182-183). Nihat says that richness causes moral corruption because of the unfair profit, and unfair consumption. These emerge as important factors which make richness illegitimate and become an issue of class anger:

\textsuperscript{55}There are rich people of course. Believe me I do not aspire and do not want to aspire. There are some riches that even regret the God. There are poors that pray and fast,they are good. But riches disregard everything.

Apprentices subvert the status of the rich by proposing their moral superiority like pride, honesty, modesty and diligence against the advantageous position of the rich. 

Arzu says:

Fakir ve gururu olmak daha güzel. Bence hayatı böyle daha iyi anıyoruz. Zengin oldun mu hiçbir şey yapmazsın. Rahatlık... Hanı kendini daha üstün görünürsün. Diğer insanların göremezsin... zorluk var. İnsan zorluğunu yaşamıca anlar.  

Similarly Emir in his statements emphasizes the importance of making an effort, as opposed to earnings without working:


As it is seen, apprentices generally make sense to class hierarchies and class differentiation not by referring to the production area, but by referring to social hierarchies which manifest themselves in the distinctive behaviors, consumption habits, lifestyles. This perception, which clarifies class positions, derives from

---

56 Children of riches, they spend their father’s money and use their influence. With dad’s money they have a girlfriend. I would not like to be rich. If I would have been rich I would also be ignoble and snob. Mine is better, I turn an honest penny and look after my family, my brother. It si better. They have lots of money but not peace. Peace is better than anything.

57 It is good to be poor and proud. You understand life better with this way. If you are rich you do nothing. Freeness... You can overlook to others. There is difficulty and you understand it when you live

58 No peace. You have everything if you are rich. When you are poor you have to effort to have somethinng and this effort is very nice. You can like efforting and then earning something. But without effort you cannot enjoy what you get.
concrete experiences, but more significantly, from the images related to superior classes, which is situated in the commonsense of the society.

### 4.2.2. Education as Class Differentiation

The educational field emerges as one of the main fields in which class positions become clear. Indeed, apprentices have not participated to working class because they left school. On the contrary, they could not have education, because they are already in lower-class position; in other words, as Bourdieu states, their class position has constituted their exclusion from the educational field:

> …the case of the *classes populaires*, there was under-representation of the most disadvantaged category, that of the semi-skilled workers and unskilled labourers, who are very uniform with regard to the object of the survey, i.e., very uniformly excluded from legitimate culture. (1984:505)

Bourdieu’s analysis is valid for our research. Apprentices are deprived from educational capital and excluded from the educational field, because of their objective socio-economic conditions. During the interviews, it is clearly seen that apprentices are the children of people from lower classes. In many cases, their brothers and sisters also share the same conditions. In this context, it can be claimed that being an apprentice is the result of a necessity of their class positions, not the result of their subjective preference, however, in Bourdieu’s terminology, the “objectivity of the subjective”. In certain interviews, such a necessity is clearly expressed by apprentices. Nihat who works in the apparel sector explains the reason of leaving high school due to obligation:


In the same manner, Sultan says:

---

59I went for two months. My family does necessary conditions. My father left. Someone has to look after family. There is no one so I have to. If we had conditions, it would be different.
In many cases, apprentices prefer to explain the reason of leaving school as a failure in school. They frequently expressed: “I had no luck with school, I wasn’t studying, I was skipping school”. However such issues mostly derive from the belief that they will not gain footing through education. In Bourdieu’s conceptualization, they do not believe that they have competence to win the game in the educational field, in other words, apprentices do not perceive education in “the space of the possibilities”. Kubilay says:


Similarly, Metin mentions his indifference about school and says:

Okulu bıraktığım için hiç pişman olmadım. Çünkü arkadaşlarının çoğu sınıfta kalmış ve bırakmış. Oradan bir yol olmayacaktı.

The expression of “most of my friends failed in class and left school”, which is put into words partly by other apprentices, implies class *habitus* of lower class’ children. Indeed, they have referred to the notion of “we” who share a common fate in the exclusion from the educational field, and do not see education in the space of possibility and show similar dispositions like leaving school. The expressions of Sultan show deprivation from educational capital and confrontation of class position through this deprivation.

---

60There wasn’t an opportunity to go to school. I was going to school at the village, I left and came. We were in bad condition so we came here.

61My grades were not good so going to highschool was meaningless. I could not be more successful so I started in this sector.

62I didn’t regret for leaving school. Because many of my friends left school. That wasn’t my way.
We-feeling is constituted as a result of the negation of lower classes through emphasizing differentiation instead of uniformity within educational field. They become “we” by way of being different from “others”. For this very reason, exclusion from the educational field becomes a motive of class formation at the same time.

On the other hand, although the exclusionist characteristic of education appears as a structural phenomena when thought in Bourdieu’s concept of space of possibility, indeed, such a characteristic is constituted historically. Although it can be said that education is excluded from the field of possibilities of lower class children today, it should be mentioned that there was one period in which this field was relatively open to lower class strata in the past, by giving the possibility of moving up to upper-class position. Similarly, the educational apparatus, which becomes a motive of class differentiation and class formation today, might mask social inequality and create the sense of uniformity. Necmi Erdoğan (2011) explains this process as a radical transformation of the relationship between educational and economic capital after 1980; and states that the educational apparatus has lost its feature of being a factor in class mobilization.

During interviews, it is seen that apprentices perceptibly have experienced exclusion from the educational field from the beginning of their formal education process. As it is stated above, the general expression of the perception of apprentices is “it wouldn’t work anyhow”. Then, how is this belief is imprinted in the reception of apprentices?

Class divisions have firstly appeared in the differentiation of their high schools from the high schools of other strata. Apprentices cannot make it work in their high schools, because they do not find their school capable to compete with “qualified” schools. Such a distinction is realized between general high schools in which lower

---

63 If I had found to chance for going to school I would like to be a teacher, I could educate people but I cannot. We work, we cannot go to school. There were some friends going to school, they also left. They are now working at textile.
class children are included and high schools, which have certain qualities like Anatolian high schools, science high schools, super high schools and private high schools in which middle and upper class children are involved. In many cases, general high schools cannot provide sufficient conditions to succeed in the university entrance exam. Achievement in the exam, in many cases, becomes possible with the help of private teaching institutions. Under these circumstances, children who go to general high schools and who cannot be supported by private teaching institutions implicitly accept impossibility of gaining a footing through education. For this reason, general high schools are not the field in which the principle of hope is functional for apprentices.

“Çok kötü bi okuldu ortam olarak yani çok kötüydü”. The implicit meaning in the expression of Yasin is the inequality of opportunity between high schools, in other words he refers to class differentiation between their environment and the environment of students who go to private high schools, and who see their future in formal education. However, the noticeable aspect of this expression is his looking from the other’s eye. In the interviews, apprentices frequently identified their schools with a very bad circle of friends who have not intended to study; and students who use drugs and always fight with each-other. “Bazılara bakıyorum iyi yapmış gitmişim diyorum. Okula gidenler baya pislige alışmış oluyolar. Uyuşturucu, sigara gibi. Arkadaş ortamında buluşyo onlar. Okusaydım mutlaka olurdum ben de öyle”.

In these expressions, the strategy of reinforcement against youth who have not been working is observed, however this strategy has been presented through the language of the dominant position. In other words, the “we-feeling” which is pre-constituted as a result of the exclusion from the educational field is reconstituted in the form of fragmentation within “we”. This issue means an acceptance of upper-class discourse by apprentices because apprentices repeat concepts like “dirt”, “bad environment” which are used by middle-upper class as part of a criminalization strategy. Badness of environment in school is not associated with inequality and class division in high schools, but with individual failure and moral corruption.

64I observe some friends, I say myself it is better not to go to school. They are involved in dirty stuff. Like drugs, cigarettes. If I had gone to school, I would have been indulged.
Secondly, in addition to inequality between secondary and high schools, apprentices confront class positions through the experiences they have until they leave school. In his expression, Rıza explains the process of leaving school:

Ortaokulu birdikten sonra okulu bıraktım. İmkanlar gerekti bıraktım. Tabi durumlar kötü olunca... mesela okuldan para istiyoları. E tabi bizde de durum kötü olunca para veremeyince zoruma gitti. Ben de onun için bırakmak zorunda kaldım.65

Thus, although apprentices present their reason of leaving school as their preference by discrediting the environment of school, such issues are generally related to a substantial experience of shame, decrease of self-esteem and negation process. Similarly Yalçın mentions: “Dersler o kadar kötü değil de lise çok garip geldi. İnsanlık anlambında hiçbir şey yoktu. Ders anlamında da kimsenin umrunda değil”66. In this expression, he associates his failure with the indifference of school administrators and teachers who ignore him, in a sense, who make him invisible at school.

Apprenticeship training centers are the non-formal educational institutions that apprentices (who work in legal enterprises) go to after they have left formal education. These centers appear as the places in which their class positions are crystalized. Rıza answers the question of whether rich or poor children go to apprenticeship training centers:


65İ dropped out after completing secondary school, because of the conditions. For instance they demand money from the school and we could not meet that money. This was offending me and so I had to drop out.

66Courses were not that much worse but highschool was interesting. There was nothing in the name of humanity. Regarding lessons nobody cares.
These expressions refer to the crystallization of class positions since apprentices know their class positions very well, by differentiating between the rich and the poor and positioning themselves within the poor. On the other hand, apprenticeship training centers appear as a way of changing this position by giving a certificate for setting up their own shop. From one aspect, apprenticeship-training centers take the role of the educational apparatus which functions as an ideological apparatus for lower class children in which these children constitute a relationship with the language of the elite and hegemonic ideology.

In addition to this, these centers have a role on the construction of legitimacy of the dominant class and in the neutralization of class antagonisms. In these centers, except lectures on specialized fields and basic courses like Turkish and maths; apprentices take the course of “education of religious culture and work ethic”. In the content of this course, sayings of the prophet Muhammad on work ethic and rightful due, mutual responsibilities between employer and employee are taught. In this way, formation of a consensus between employer and employee with religious norms, which bring together employer and employee in unique and homogeneous culture is aimed.

67In apprenticeship training center there are largely poor children. There are largely workers. There are poor people like me. Because they admit this, that is they prefer this. They deserve these more than rich people more than educated people.Who does not want to go to school? I want to go…they came here with the will of establishing a job. I would like to go to school. School is only once a week. I look forward to that day. Actually to learn something about life, to experience reading I prefer to go to school.

68The mostly teach maths mass there. Our job depends on maths and your maths develops. My Turkish speaking gets better. Most of the people are coming from foreign countries and speaking different languages so they learn Turkish
On the other hand, apprenticeship training centers play an intermediary role in concrete conflicts between apprentices and employers. As mentioned before, teachers and administrators function also as a controller of abuse in enterprises and the work performance of apprentices. In the interviews certain apprentices stated that they solve their problems with the employer through these authorized officers. One of the main problems of apprentices is work after school. In this situation teachers and administrators make an effort to persuade the employer to obey the rules, and prohibit working on school days. Therefore, it can be claimed that non-formal institutions have a contradictory position in the class-consciousness of apprentices. On the one hand they constitute the concept of rights in the reception of apprentices, in other words, they play a role in the rationalization of the relationship between employer and employee, on the other hand, they increase apprentices’ ideological links to employer through the mystification of this relationship.

During the interviews, which are conducted in apprenticeship training centers, headmasters define their role as reintegrating poor people’s children, who have a criminal tendency, into the society. This definition refers to the participation of lower class children to bourgeois civil society, in other words, to the field of consent. In the next part, it will be seen that such issues become visible in the apprentices separation of themselves from apaches. Nevertheless, incriminating, discriminative discourse of authorized officers, and emphasis on differentiation of apprentices from middle and upper-class children have shown, in any case, their negated position from bourgeois civil society.

Until now, we tried to discuss the process of exclusion of apprentices from the educational field, which clarifies their class positions; and their reception of this position through their experiences and discourses. Another point which should be dealt with is their perception of educational capital and their ideas on the educated population.

In the educational field, constitution of hierarchy, a strict elimination system, precarity and devalorization of diplomas have deformed the former sense of education. On the one hand, education by itself does not imply a way of gaining
prestige and statute anymore, in other words it loses its symbolic meaning. Bourdieu explains this issue as the “inflation of qualification associated with devaluation” (1984:142). On the other hand, it loses its egalitarian context. However, the former sense of education continues to some extent in the perception of apprentices. At this point, rethinking S. Hall’s (1976) definition of culture as a “historical reservoir” which means “pre-constituted field of possibilities” becomes important. In the perception of apprentices a contradictory coexistence of the former and current sense of education can be observed. In the interviews, it is observed that parents bear the previous sense of education. Apprentices frequently said that their family tried to encourage them to continue their education: “my family insisted on continuing my education”, “in fact, they did not want me to work, they wanted me to go to school”, “my mother says that she would beg in the streets, if I had wanted to continue education”, “my father usually compares me with my cousins who go to high school and blames me for leaving school”. This issue, as Sennet emphasizes, is related to a perception within lower classes that associates education with gaining respect (1977:23). Parents generally tend to think that they will gain respect if their children are educated. For this reason, they generally tend to canalize their children to formal educational institutions; at least, they try to compensate for the educational costs of some of their children. Related to this issue, Furkan says:

Onlar çalıș demediler. Onlar sürekli tabi her ailenin çocuğa söylediği gibi “oku oku oku” dediler. “bizim başımızza geldi” dediler. Çünkü onlar da okumamışlar zamanında.69

Similarly Öğuzhan says:

Onlar hep okumamı istedi. Git bi şansını dene, işte olursa olur olmasa olmaz dediler. Olmadı, şimdi benim üzerine yüklenmeye başladılar.70

In many cases, parents depart from the former sense in which education is a chance

69 They did not tell me to work. Like all families they advised me to go to school. Because they did not go to school in their time they are now sorry for that

70 They always wanted me to go to school at least to give an opportunity to school. I did not manage so now they are angry at me.
given to people from all strata and which provides opportunity of class mobilization, defining education in the space of possibilities and explaining exclusion from the educational field with the individual failure of apprentices. This pre-constituted symbolic meaning of education functions in the perception of apprentices. Statements of Furkan reflect such a perception:

Okumak tabi güzel bi şey yani. Ne biliyim bi yerlere gelebilmek farklı olmak insanlardan. Çalışmak tabi kötü bişey. kötü değil. Çalışmak da güzel elinde mesleğin olduğu sürece, ama tabi okuyup bi yerlere gelebilmek daha iyi bi şey. 71

In these statements two main points are remarkable: “being different from others” and “gaining a footing”. “Being different from others” constitutes the main reference of class differentiation and is expressed mainly in the form of comparison with other children who are not working. Rasim mentions his regret of leaving school:

Ne biliyim okuyanları görünce zoruma gidiyo. Bazıları okuyor, ben çalısyom o zoruma gidiyo tabi. Ne biliyim arkadaşlarıyla okulda ne güzel geziyolar tozuyolar. 72

For apprentices, having leisure time refers to the main motive of confrontation with their own class positions; and emerges, in many cases, as a class injury of being different from others, who have a chance to saunter as they wish; and are not obliged to get up very early and work till late hours. Such class injury, which emerges during face-to-face encounters, implies a feeling of inequality between youth who have a chance to delay starting to work and youth who are deprived from these opportunities. Yağçı says:


71Going to school is of course very good. Being different from other people and reaching some status. Working is bad. It is not bad, it is of course good if you have an occupation but going to school and having a status is better.

72Seeing people going to school offends me. Some are going to school and I am working, this offends me. They are playing around with their friends.
Yalçın’s expressions indicate, in one respect, the formation of class through differentiation from others. Class is constituted in this contradiction, in the form of the master-slave dialectic in which the consciousness of the slave is formed with reference to the master. Expressions of “Life is beautiful for you”, “he lives comfortable” “we are not like them” refer to the constitution of their position in contradiction to others. From this point of view, the existence of class-consciousness can be mentioned. From a different viewpoint, transformative class-consciousness cannot be mentioned since apprentices are not conscious about the causality behind this inequality. Apprentices feel the pressure of this inequality mostly in the beginning of their work life, and perceive education as a sign of comfort and as the field of constitution of self-esteem. Apprentices frequently mention that they have regretted leaving school mostly because they are confronted with indignity during their work life. In this context, education becomes the field of class formation, but this time appears as a differentiation regarding to respectability. Kubilay mentions his feelings when he left school:


73Because if someone had gone to school, secondary school, highschool and university. They say you have only one life, that is true. Till 25-26 you deal with them and life is good for you till that time. And after finishing you have a good job. It is not the case for us we start working at 17-18. We have backache. We have. Fatigue, because oof our age we are at the same time excited, we would like to play around. Worklife prevents this. From these aspects, we are very unlucky.

74I sometimes feel sorry about dropping out. I was thinking if I had education I would have not been rebuked. As the time went by and I have became experienced in my job, regret disappeared. There was regret at first times, I was getting fatigue and I was thinking that it would not be the case if I have
In these statements, another remarkable point is the appearance of a new sense of education in the perception of apprentices. As stated above, precarization within the educated population and devalorization of diplomas have deformed the relationship between education and prestige. Higher education implies risk of unemployment since prestigious universities are not accessible for the majority of society. In this context, higher education has lost its symbolic meaning to a great extent. It can be said that this issue is expressed as a strategy of reinforcement for apprentices against educated youth. In other words, apprentices appreciate their positions and jobs in the face of devalorization of the educated population, in parallel to devalorization of diplomas. With a realistic approach, apprentices who do not see their future in education may claim that starting work at an early age is advantageous and investing in education is irrational:


In these statements Enver mentions, in a sense, the compensation of deprivation from educational capital by referring to the precarious conditions the educated people are faced with. Since he represents skilled labor within the labor market, he presents his position as a rational preference. Indeed, in the metalworking sector many apprentices depart from this motivation. The most rational preference within the gone to school. Some say that it is better to work than going to school; even educated people are not in good condition. It is better to have an occupation. Of course welfthy people go to school.

\(^{75}\)How people are lucky than me? There are lots of educated people but they are still unemployed. I am more advantageous compared to them. At an earlier age I learn my job. To get just the diploma man goes to school for a long time. He fails, and repeats but there is no still a secured future for them. And then he enters into lathe work but he is late. Ther are people going to school for a long time till the ages of 30-40. He gives money to finish. If I were to go to school, I would have thought my father. He works hard to make us educated but I am not successful for this reason also I do not want to go to school.
space of possibilities is investing in skill instead of losing time in formal education. We understand this issue from subsequent statements of Enver:


On the other hand, social hierarchies cannot be explained merely with hierarchies within the labor market. In this respect, education has a meaning in the “historical reservoir” of society, and it can be claimed that being educated refers to symbolic capital even though it tends to decrease. Therefore, although apprentices propose their strategies of reinforcement by presenting their advantageous position within the labor market, this position might not create symbolic capital within social hierarchies to the same degree. In social hierarchies, education still has the meaning of gaining prestige and status. In the face of their lower position in the social hierarchy, they propose moral superiority as another kind of reinforcement strategy. However, these reinforcement strategies differ within the apparel and metalworking sector.

For apprentices who work in the metalworking sector, gaining skill and acquiring a secured job can compensate for the deprivation from educational capital. Thus, they can present their strategy of reinforcement against youth who go to school. However, such reinforcement is not valid for apprentices who work in the apparel sector, since they represent unskilled labor and work in insecure conditions. Since working has a respectable meaning for the apprentices who work in the metalworking sector; they generally constitute a moral superiority with their assiduity against the laziness of educated youth. They indicate that they do not encounter frequently with educated youth. Their friends are generally composed of young workers like themselves. Oğuzhan says that he has one or two educated friends, and he states that he would not be outdone if they insult him. He tells that his parents blame him for leaving school and compare him with his cousins who go to the university. In the same manner, Kubilay mentions that his parents support his brother who goes to school by encoding himself as a bad example. In a sense, the symbolic meaning of education is
mainly formed in their close environment. Such issues show that the perception of class differentiation may occur in their environment although this environment shares the same class position with apprentices. Continuity of the symbolic meaning of education within their environment causes negation of educated youth in the perception of apprentices. According to Oğuzhan, educated youth are “doing business sitting down”. He compares himself with his cousin who goes to university:


Similarly Kubilay says:


\[76\]My cousin goes to university not to work. He says that nobody would call me to the workshop so I will be at the school and canmake friends. But he does not think that going there is nonsense. He gives money and wastes his time. He has business licence he can do whatever he wants now. He so-called goes to university. If that man does not work, lying at home he would not like to work but we are not like that we know working, that suppression. That is why we can work in a comfort compared to him. But this friend cannot work, sits around all day and loafs round but does not work. In a workshop in a few days time he would be fired most probably.

\[77\]Brother … There has never been such a case. My brother normally does not like to work. Some time I made him go to IMES but after a week he quited.. He does not like to work, he is at home all the time. He does not go to neighbours or relatives. He is such kind of a person. They go to school. It is nice to go to school. After graduating he can enter anywhere. But I do not have such an opportunity.
The main arguments of Kubilay and Oğuzhan are that the educated youth does not like working and does not experience the difficulty of life. From this point of view, it can be claimed that the social hierarchy is reversed with moral superiority. Erdem, in her field research on the apprentices in the Alibeyköy Apprenticeship Training Center states that apprentices accuse the educated youth for being conformist and charge them as being more effeminate and childish (Erdem, 2008). Similar implications can be seen in the interviews which are conducted for this study. Apprentices can present masculinity which is constituted through working and earning money as a reinforcement strategy as opposed to educated youth.

On the other hand, apprentices who work in the apparel sector cannot compensate their deprivation from educational capital with their advantageous position in the labor market. These apprentices feel deprivation from educational capital more deeply and generally make sense of this deprivation as a result of their class position. Many of these apprentices perceive education not only irrational but also impossible. In addition to this, they evaluate education as a chance which could carry them to higher positions but obligation to work blocks such an opportunity. Rasim mentions this chance:

"Okuyolar işte baya güzel yani. Okuyunca yani. Bitirince her yere girebilir. İstediği her şeyi yapabilir. Ama benim öyle bir şansım yok. Şanssızım yani."

Apprentices who work in the apparel sector feel more deeply the differentiation between the educated youth and themselves. In addition to this, the majority of apprentices who work in the apparel sector do not continue to attend the apprenticeship-training centers since they are not registered formally in their enterprises. For this reason they do not feel themselves within the education system. As discussed above, the apparel sector is perceived as disreputable work for all apprentices. Apprentices in the apparel sector experience precarity and abuse more compared to workers in the metalworking sector. For this reason, they do not assert their prospective arguments as a strategy of reinforcement, like precarity and risk of

---

78 They are going to school. It is so good. They can work wherever they want. They can make whatever they want. But I don’t have such chance. I am unlucky.
unemployment associated with educated people. Certain apprentices propose moral superiority as a strategy of reinforcement. Emir says “Okusaydım belki kızlarla gezerdim, belki esrar içerdim”. As referred before, such statements show a strategy of reinforcement, which is presented to young people who share a similar class position with themselves, constituted not with reference to higher education but with reference to their experiences in the past. As will be discussed in subsequent chapters such issues mainly derive from the lack of a future imagination for apprentices of the apparel sector, and as mentioned above, this reinforcement strategy functions as a separation between apprentices themselves and other children from lower classes.

Perception regarding the university is another subject which differentiates apparel and metalworking apprentices. For apprentices who work in the apparel sector, university is perceived as an opportunity distant from their lives. Many apprentices in this sector continue to open education high schools not in order to go to university, but in order to get a driving license. On the other hand, for the apprentices who work in the metalworking sector, the university becomes a debatable issue and gains a positive meaning with regard to not providing a better future but providing freedom, a comfortable life which allows one to experience the external world and a lively social environment. Öğuzhan talks about his ideas about the university:

Şimdi...üniversite ortamı başka. Sırf yanı şu anki gençlerde, arkadaşlarımızın hepsi ortam için gidiyo üniversiteye, okumak için değil. Yaw biliyon işte karı kız kaynıyo, Her akşam içiyoruz... her ortamda konuşulan budur.Yurta kahyosun mesela hani gece on ikide gel ısten, ısten iki üçte gel yurttaki hocalar hiç bişey demiyo. Yani serbest bırakıyolar. Ama işte evde kal sabaha kadar gelme ısten, ısten dersine hiç gırme devamsızlık diye bi şey yok diyolar.79

Similarly Kubilay says:

Aslında çok iyi yönü vardı. Ortamı falan çok değişik. Güzel bi ortamı var. Öyle hayal ediyorum. Arkadaşlar falan gezme

---

79Now, university environment is different. Youngs, most of our firend go to university for its environment not for education. You know there are girls. We drink all night... these are spoken in all environments. You stay at dormitaro for instance. You come to your room at what time you want. Or if you stay at home if you want do not come till morning; it is not matter.
These statements show that although higher education relatively loses its symbolic meaning as a way of gaining status, it might be seen as a chance since it provides freedom, comfort and a way for constituting a relationship with the external world.

4.2.3. Future Expectations

As seen above, education is not a way on which apprentices pin their hopes. Apprentices cannot see their future in education. In some cases, “prestigious jobs” which could be achieved through education like being a teacher or engineer may be subconscious dreams; however, such dreams cannot become rational future plans for apprentices. In many cases, they state that they would become policemen if they could have an education. In their perception, being a policeman is part of the space of possibilities of apprentices because every year a great number of policemen are employed and it is sufficient to be a high school graduate for applying to this position. For this reason, some apprentices state that they continue to open education high schools in order to try their luck. On the other hand, being a policeman represents a different labor regime, in which they do not have to submit to uniform, monotonous working conditions. Fatma says:

Okusaydım daha çok polis olmak isterdim bugün böyle maceralar, aksiyonlu bir hayat.yani ne bileyim. Hayallerim çok ama olmuyo.81

80Actually it has good sides, environment is very different. Nice. I imagine like that. Friends, staying out, sightseeing. For instance, you go out of the city, you have new friends, new university. I think university as a very different and nice place.I plan to complete open learning and have a diploma and going to university. I heard we had such an opportunity.

81If I had gone to school, I would like to be a policeman. Adventures, life with actions…I have lots of dreams but they are not realized.
On the other hand, being a policeman implies a more secure and well-paid job. Tahsin thinks that his life will be saved if he becomes a policeman:


It must be stated that the class position of apprentices is the main factor, which prevents their competence for the realization of their dreams. Many of them look back regretfully since they cannot have a job that they want, like being a footballer or musician. Their class position prevents their visibility and self-development for these jobs. Therefore, it can be claimed that their future plans are determined and enframed by their material living conditions.

Regarding to planning a future, a difference between the apprentices in the metalworking and apparel sectors may be observed. Apprentices in the apparel sector, as stated before, represent the most disadvantageous part of the labor market. In this sector, apprentices are not seen as students, who are trained for gaining skills, they are seen as a cheap labor force. For this reason, they have less hope to change their conditions in the future. They do not imagine more qualified positions in their jobs. In addition to this, as stated before, apparel is not a secure job even for the employers of subcontractor companies. Many employers continuously make an effort to take jobs from parent companies, and usually go bankrupt. For this reason, setting up your own business is not a motivation for the apprentices in the textile sector. In the interviews, apprentices frequently indicate that they don’t have plans for the future. Precarious working conditions in the apparel sector imply despair not for the

82It would be more comfortable. You are state officer at the same time, no illegality. Here for instance boss can say I will make your insurance, if he does not there emerges problem. If you are state officer he has to make. I want for this reason. For its comfort. It is secure. It is easier to be hired now I guess. Probably 60000 people have been hired in the last 4 years. You became an engineer for instance, you won’t have your own job. But in policeman case, 2000- 3000 tl salary is enough.
present, but for the future. In many cases, deprivation from future plans emerges as a factor, which constitutes their class positions and consciousness. Nihat says:

Gelecek planım yok. Sadece aileme bakmak istiyorum.\(^{83}\)

Hayal mayal toz oldu. Vardi, ama toz oldu. Avukat olmak istiyordum. Okulum da iyidi başlarda ama…\(^{84}\)

Similarly Fatma mentions what she plans for the future:


Similarly Metin cannot see his future in the apparel sector and mentions that someone who lives in Istanbul has to gain 2000-3000 liras monthly for maintaining his life. He tells his future plans:


In the interviews it is seen that setting up your own business, gaining status through

\(^{83}\)No future plans. I only would like to look after my family.

\(^{84}\)I had dreams but all disappeared. I would like to be a lawyer. My grades were good at the beginning…

\(^{85}\)Continue to work. I would like to go to school, still but I cannot. If I had gone to school I would have more plans. I have dreams but they are not realized. I am at 18 but did nothing. You began to say “I wish…” What we were, what we are and what will be… one more day passes, there is little to death, I live with the fear of death.

\(^{86}\)No, I didn’t dream about my life. My plan is going to Diyarbakır. I want to go to the village. Anyway we have a field there, I want to plant it. I couldn’t adapt to Istanbul, to its environment. My hands are tied here, but I am free there. For example, if I go there, I don’t need to work but here I have to.
learning the job, in this way, gaining a footing and moving up the social ladder does not take part in the perception of apprentices. Many of them believe that they will stay in lower positions. However, they think that they can ameliorate their conditions by working and earning money. For many apprentices, buying a house, eluding from house rent is the main motivation for the future.

On the other hand, apprentices in the metalworking sector challenge their class positions and imagine its changeability through gaining skill and setting up their own business. In the metalworking sector, apprentices generally have future plans, which they expect to realize after their military service. Some differences between the future plans of apprentices who work in large-sized enterprises and apprentices who work in small-sized enterprises can be observed. Apprentices who work in large-sized enterprises generally mention that they imagine being a master, finding a good workplace and working long years in the same workplace. Furkan says:


Similarly İsmail:

Usta daha iyi, daha rahat. Bi yer açağı zaman sorumluluğu fazla olur. Elektriği, suyu, vergi, mergi... 

Becoming a master changes the status of apprentices however it does not change their class positions. Yalçın explains this situation: “kaldığın yerde kalırsın”. Apprentices generally imagine leaving their class positions, Yalçın says:

Ben başka bi iş yapmak istiyorum, ne biliyim hani güzel bi iş imkani... güzel yaşayabileceğim bi hayat istiyorum daha doğrusu. Tam bilmiyorum ama ne biliyim güzel yaşamak istediğim bi iş. Evleniceksin, çocukun olucak. Yani kırıncı ödeyeceksin. Şu anda baban ödeyo kırıncı, sen ödemeysen ben

---

87 I prefer to be a master. Because as a master you are relax there. I mean no problem but if you open a new workshop, it requires responsibility and it is not easy to meet that responsibility.

88 Being a master is better than being a boss. When you set your business, you take a big responsibility. Electricity, water, tax etc.
I would like to do a different job, I mean a better job…I want a nice life… getting married, having children. You will pay your rent. Today father pays but in the future you have to pay and how long you will do this job. Fatigue of the body…in this job you mostly have this. You also waste time. That is my only objective. I would ilke to reach a good place. I do not have big dreams, no they are not. I only want to be stand on my legs.

Sure I want. Everybody does. Because no one wants to suffer for anothers whimming. I would like to have my own job and work all day and night, who doesn’t? because its for me. I produce for myself.

Setting up a business is easy for me. Besides, I am young. When I reach 30, I could have my own business if I have machines. But networks are also very important.
Apprentices think that networks are the main factors that provide possibility for setting up your own business. For this reason, apprentices invest in the relations between each other for their future plans. Related to this issue, Kubilay says:

For the apprentices who work in the metalworking sector, setting up their own business is more costly with regard to the expensiveness of the manufacturing machines. However, due to the decentralization of production, one who has a single machine could enter the market. For this reason, apprentices do not think that they will have a great difficulty in setting up their own business. Many of them state that their parents save their earnings in order to make use of in the future. Taking a loan from the bank reveals another way of setting up their own business.

Such a future expectation emerges as an important factor which prevents class consciousness and class opposition and makes the apprentices more deferential in the face of oppression and exploitation within the workplace. On the one hand, the expectation of being a boss in the future feeds the ideology, which legitimates class society; on the other hand it prevents their unionization due to the hope of changing

---

92 We are following to learn the job at work. We often talk to others at apprentice school, with gods sake we can open a place together with partnership. We all have such dreams. We can do it, after we learn the machines better. Maybe begin with one machine as many places do. Big factories start with small steps. People we know around the industry areas can help us. We need to maintain the contact with them and with our school friends who know the job.
their class position. As stated before apprentices perceive their working conditions as transitory conditions, which should be endured until the job is learned. This issue is discussed by Nadir Suğur in his study on OSTİM Industrial Zone:

They feel that they do not have to work in small firms; as they will set up their own business, and therefore, they are not tied to each other. They are disinclined to protect themselves through unionization against negative conditions of the work in the small firm (1995:152).

4.2.4. Leisure Time and Consumption

As stated above, class culture appears as a master-slave dialectic rather than a labor-capital contradiction. For this reason, the “we feeling” among apprentices is not constituted with regard to rational class interests but constituted by referring to the “other” who represents a socially higher position and appears in the class encounters. This part will discuss whether such a “we feeling” could be formulated as a distinguished daily life practice, in other words, whether apprentices have a distinctive sub-culture which could be evaluated as a class culture of lower class youth.

First of all, it must be stated that apprentices’ relationship with cultural products, images, signs and codes strictly depends on their empirical conditions, their necessary daily life practices. Celal who is 19 years old says that he has not been out of Sultanbeyli before for visiting other districts in Istanbul. In the interviews, it is seen that Celal’s situation is not exceptional. Many apprentices generally do not leave their living space, they constitute their relationship with other youth within these spaces who have similar conditions and have similar dispositions. İbrahim says:

Çağlayan dına pek fazla çıkmıyoruz. Arkadaşla izin gününde geziyorum. Onlar da çalışıyor. beraber Gültepe’ye falan çıkıyoruz. 93

93I don’t go out of Caglayan often. We travel with with friends at vacation day. They also work. Sometimes go to gultepe together.
Related to the interaction of apprentices with dominant cultural products, certain restrictions could be mentioned. Firstly, they are deprived from the necessary leisure time and financial opportunities to constitute relationship with their external world. From this perspective, it could be stated that apprentices have less opportunity to consume cultural products than in the past parallel to the intensification of oppression in labor processes. Secondly, they frequently are under the rule of their parents, bosses, masters or various dynamics of their micro-cosmos who control their behaviors and insights to a certain degree.

Indeed deprivation from necessary leisure time emerges as a main restriction by being articulated to hegemonic cultural products and also producing a sub-culture identified with lower class youth. Apprentices spend most of their time in their workplaces and generally cannot find the necessary time to consume cultural products. Metin explains this issue more concretely:


A similar lack of leisure time is more deeply experienced by woman apprentices. In the interviews, it is seen that gender-based discrimination is an important factor regarding to constraints on leisure time. Fatma says:


---

94If you work at 12pm-1am shift, you cant make friendships. Don’t have an environment. Only you have Sundays. I go to Gungoren, hanging around with friends make football matches going to cafes. We talk about our girlfriends. I had many girlfriends but now I don’t have one. With this working too much, you cant have any.
From these statements, it is understood that woman apprentices spend their leisure time by doing housework like house cleaning. In addition to this, during the interview, which is conducted with Fatma at her home, it is seen that she and her family take an extra job which they can do collectively at home in their off day. Fatma and her family are combining parts of sockets as an extra job. She says that other parts of the sockets are made in another house in their neighborhood. This neighborhood is the place in which apparel workers live and take some extra jobs to support themselves. Fatma who works also in the apparel sector, said that she could not imagine and experience anything else apart from textile. Combining parts of the socket is a work similar to the production of apparel, and reaching the quota became her main motivation and lifestyle. In this sense, the penetration of the factory regime to all of life, as Burawoy (1982) explains, restricts the domain of reproduction, in this sense, it restricts their participation to the cultural domain and their encounter with dominant cultural products. Many apprentices indicate that they cannot watch TV series regularly when they come home because of the long working hours.

The second factor, which determines the relationship of apprentices with cultural products, are the necessary financial opportunities for participating to consumer society. All apprentices state that they give their earnings to their parents. These earnings are generally used as contribution to the family budget. Most of the families need this contribution either because of the debts which they have, or for investment in buying a house or wedding expenses. Apprentices are generally conscious about the expenses like bills and house rent, and mention the necessity of economizing. Deprivation from financial opportunities restricts their consumption of cultural products. Sultan says:

\[96\text{Kazandığımı onlara aileme veriyorum. Onlar da eve kiraya veriyor. 550 kira gelmiş, zam yaptı 600 kira geliyor.}\]

\[95\text{Since I work in textile I cant look after myself or the house. I feel bad about it. We don’t have time. We cant go visit our relatives. Sunday is passing with house chorus, tidying the house cleaning the carpets, its already the evening, no resting even at Sundays.}\]
Deprivation from financial opportunity reinforces the control of parents or relatives on the disposition of apprentices. Nihat who came from Batman to Istanbul to work by leaving his home indicates that he has to earn a living for the family:

100 lira yola yemeğe gidiyo. Bir şey almak istemiyorum. Bir şey almak istediğimde dayıma anneme söylüyorum. İhtiyaç, kıyafet onlara karşılıyo.97

Similarly Dilan mentions that she and her family live in a rented house, and says that her earnings are used for paying utility bills. On the other hand, İsmail tells that he and his brother are working to pay the debt of their house.

It is understood that for having a consumption disposition, they need to have minimum prosperity. However, their concrete conditions, which restrict their relationship with cultural products like limited leisure time and financial opportunity, do not resolve this relationship. On the one hand such products penetrate their lives even though they do not leave their living space, in this sense, apprentices may encounter the images of these products even though they cannot possess them. On the other hand, they want to see the world external to their lives and try to participate to this world as long as possible. Kubilay who lives in Sultanbeyli and works in Ümraniye, mentions that he could find the opportunity to travel in the city with his friends three or four times and see some places like Kadıköy, Üsküdar, and Bostancı. Kubilay tells his feelings when he first went to a grand shopping mall:


96 I give my earnings to my family. And they pay the rent with it. The rent raised to 600 from 550.

97 100 liras goes to road and meal. I don’t wanna buy anything. If necessary I tell my mom and uncle and they pay.
From these statements, it is understood that apprentices are not used to leaving their close environment, however, they wish to open up to the external world, to meet with the “macro-cosmos” and encounter cultural products and consumer goods unfamiliar to their lives. On the other hand, this macro-cosmos has more and more penetrated into their lives parallel to the pervasion of commodification throughout all spaces. In this way, going to a grand shopping mall, which meant opening up to the external world once upon a time; has become an ordinary, natural issue even for the periphery of cities. The critical point is that apprentices like these places and try to visit them. Cevahir Shopping Mall, which is situated near Çağlayan textile zone, is a place, which apprentices of this zone visit from time to time. İbrahim who says that he generally does not leave Çağlayan mentions that he goes to this shopping mall to walk around:


Similarly Sultan says:

These statements imply that the consumption of cultural products is practiced mostly through watching. From this perspective, it could be stated that the fetishism of commodity presents itself as a fetishism of the image, in a more alienated form, which makes the apprentices not the consumer of these commodities but a spectator of them.

Even though they cannot consume these commodities, they like to see them. When the reason of this admiration is asked, Ibrahim replies: “sevecek başka bir şey mi kaldı?” 101 His question shows the penetration of the commodity to all spaces through images and through presenting itself as a structural obligation. From this perspective, it could be said that apprentices show interest to images and goods which are identified with the dominant class. However, apprentices do not submit to these images and goods completely. In certain statements it is seen that these signs become the area of difference, in general, the language of class differentiation, class inequality and ultimately an apparent issue of negation in civil society. For Sultan who works in the apparel sector, the notion of a brand is a familiar notion. She says that everything has a brand. However, she emphasizes that only the rich people have an opportunity to buy branded goods. She says:


In this statement, it is seen that Sultan recognizes the ideology hidden in the commodity and she is aware that the brand does not refer to the use-value of commodities; it refers to a status, which cannot be reached by lower classes. When she says, “in the end, having clothes is enough”, she reverses the status of the commodity by revealing the reality behind the commodity. Nevertheless she says that she would wear branded clothes. Since the status of the brand becomes a means of violence against apprentices by encoding them as different, apprentices think that

101 Is there anything else to like?

102 Eventually one clothe is enough and no need for brands. Brands are for rich, not me. If I was rich I would wear brand clothes
they need to buy branded goods in order to be accepted in public space. Such violence is more clearly expressed by Kubilay:

Marka olsu daha kaliteli, daha kullanılşı oluysu. Ömrü daha çok oluysu. Yani normal ucuz markasız bi şeyler hem göze hoş gelmiyo, kullanışlı olmuyu bi de hani arkadaş ortamında falan yani konuşma olayları var markalarla ilgili. Sohbetler ediyorlar falan...Yani mesela biri bi şey aldığı zaman ve ya markasız bi şey aldığı zaman dalga geçiyorlar. Pazardan mı aldilar diyolar mesela öyle şeyler yapıyollar. Ama biri normal markalı bi şey aldığı zaman vay diyolar markalı almış falan böyle havaya çıkarıyollar.103

In this statement, it is understood that differentiation is constituted through humiliation and injuries in self-respect. The critical point is that legitimacy of the brand is constituted through such differentiation and negation of lower classes. Brand provides status since it permits to be different from lower classes, who dress from the bazaar. In this sense, it can be claimed that the legitimacy of commodity and its image, which is concretized in the brand is constituted through encoding lower classes as “others”. This hegemony is constituted among apprentices through negating themselves, and imitating them in order to participate to civil society.

On the other hand, a complete subordination of apprentices to this hegemony is not the case. As long as they are excluded, differentiated and negated, they always experience the partial but obligatory incompatibility with the hegemonic discourse since these images and status are not the elements that they can perform, but which are performed through them. Thus, the image, which is provided with the brand, means status for upper classes but may have a pejorative sense like arrogance for lower classes. Metin says:

Marka...giysi marka olmus herkes ister bence. Ama hisi öyle merak etmedim marka giyiyim. Olmasa bi ayrımcılık olur.

---

103Brand clothes are better and more useful. They endure more. Plain and cheap things don’t seem beautiful. Friends are talking about brands. If someone buys a cheap thing they make jokes about him. They also do it when you shop from the bazaars. If one buys a brand thing people will praise him.
Apprentices sometimes try to buy branded goods, or at least their imitation to escape from exclusion and distinction. However, in interviews, apprentices who are indifferent to brands can be seen. Apart from the general legitimacy of image and brand in their reception, they imply that it is not important for them. The frequent expression of these apprentices is “I don’t mind”. They sometimes may present such behavior as moral superiority and modesty. As is seen in Sultan’s expression “in the end, having clothes is enough”, in Metin’s expression when he says that he has no interest in brands since he does not want to put on airs with branded goods; apprentices do not submit completely to the hegemonic cultural images. This disposition of the apprentice is compatible to Sayer’s analysis of self-respect. Sayer states: “the struggle of subordinated groups for self-respect is particularly likely to lead to contradictory dispositions and opinions. They may try to make a virtue out of their position and their toughness and fortitude in bearing burdens, at the same time as they feel shame about having to bear those burdens.” (2005: 160)

This issue is mostly seen in their perception of apache culture\textsuperscript{105}, which is generally discussed related to a sub-culture of lower class youth. Apprentices especially who work in the manufacturing sector, live and work in the peripheries of the city, choose their friends within youth who have similar daily life practices, in this sense they do not need to experience class differentiation. In the end, apache culture refers to the negation of the lower class position and an inversion of status through its imitation. Apprentices, who identify themselves with a lower position in most cases, seek the possibility of the inversion of status not through imitation but through possession of skill, owning a workplace or house. Such issues influence their leisure time activities.

\textsuperscript{104}Brands… everybody wants it. I am not into it too much but if not, it happens discrimination between the poor and the rich.

\textsuperscript{105}Apache culture has emerged as lower class youth’s sub-culture in 2000s in Turkey. This culture depends on inclusion and imitation of middle and superior class’s cultural practices, images and appearances. From this perspective, it differs from other sub-culture examples like Teddy Boys or Punk culture which develop an opponent stance against dominant culture. For further information see Yaman, 2013.
In the interviews, all apprentices mention that they frequently encounter with apaches in their living space but they certainly differentiate themselves from these youth. In the interviews hateful speech of apprentices about the apaches is remarkable. Their reception of apache youth is influenced by parental culture and conservative discourse, which is represented by parents, masters and bosses. Such conservative discourse, which is also performed by families, results in a certain prejudice among apprentices. Furkan says:


Such a perception cannot be explained with merely acceptance of parental culture and conservatism. In their discourses it is possible to perceive that apprentices differentiate themselves from apache youth and use hateful speeches since such culture damages the moral superiority of lower classes in the face of upper classes. When asked what he thinks about apache youth, İbrahim says:

Valla ne düşünüyorum... Çoğu zaman karıdır diye onları düşünüyorum. Hiç sevmem öyle şeyler. hayatoya öyle bi şey yapmam.

Similarly, Emir says:

Onlarla hiç ilgilenmiyorum. çünkü ters geliyor bana. Küpe takarlar, saç uzattı hoşlanmıyorum öyle şeylerden. Küpe hanımfendiyi yaklaşır, tesbih delikanlıya yaklaşır diye bi laf var ya... Ben o yoldan gidiyor yani. Dalga geçmiyorum ama beni rahatsız ederse ben tavır gösteririm.

These expressions are based on gender-based discriminative discourse, however the address of this discourse is not women but other youth who have similar conditions with them but who stray away from the traditional lower class discourse which identifies itself with honor, pride, strongness, masculinity contrary to the upper class.

---

106Everyone in our neighborhood criticizes such things(apache) I don’t like them.

107Well, they seem like women, I don’t like them and never do such things.

108I don’t get interested with them. Wearing earrings and long hairs which suit s more to ladies are not my style. I don’t jeer them unless they disturb me
typology which is identified as dandyism, effeminateness and weakness. From this perspective, critiques of apprentices can be explained as an inherent critique. They criticize apaches since they negotiate elements identified with poor people, and which permit cultural opposition to the upper class and the subversion of status of upper classes with the moral superiority of lower classes.

Necmi Erdoğan (2012:50) states that the hateful language against apaches derives from the grotesque hybridity of apache youth, their inclination to look like the superior classes. This issue causes the reproduction of upper classes’ discourse within apprentices. Yasin says:


Similarly Yalçın mentions that he makes fun of apaches whenever he sees them.


In these statements, although Yalçın uses upper class discourse, he differentiates his perception from them.


¹⁰⁹I don’t see them as humans. Nothing with me but its bad for them to be in this shape, too bad. I don’t care about them, even don’t look.

¹¹⁰We laugh at them too much. They just walk behind us. We make jokes about them, we sat things to crush them. Its not our evil, its just our thoughts with pure of heart, everyone is doing this.
Apprentices accuse apache youth since they escape from the difficulty of life. It is seen that, apache culture is not regarded as an alternative by apprentices who cherish hope for changing the concrete conditions, and see the possibility of planning the future. Kubilay mentions that he spends his free time with his friends whom he met in the apprentice training center. He says that he plans to set up a business with these friends in the future. Therefore, it is seen that apprentices may organize their leisure time in a future-directed form. As seen before, apache youth do not position themselves far from apprentices and according to apprentices, they represent a lower position than their own. They are identified as separated from their family, potential criminals and drug users. Apprentices, in many cases, who live in the same districts, try to protect themselves from “falling” into this position which is always excluded by people from all strata, identified as being hopeless and futureless. Rıza who lives in Sultanbeyli says:


111Not that much. We don’t like the rich. What I am mad about is: they have no job just gadding with the girls. They have no future. They are not manly.

112There were not such things like weed in our neighbourhood before. After the police stations establish, it became more. Many of our youth got into weeds. Some of them suiceded and some of them even don’t go their houses. All day and night out. Families don’t know their situation and if they get aware they cant make themselves listen. Sometimes police arrest them without any reason, call the families and give them some false data about their weed habit. I got into working in order to survive from these. I learned the difficulties of life in this period.
Working brings apprentices a hope for changing their conditions, and a lifestyle, which protects them from a process of criminalization, in this way providing them with a more powerful position in the face of upper class violence.

4.3. Concluding Remarks

This chapter dealt with the subjective processes which include making sense of class hierarchies and class differentiation. In a general sense, it tried to understand in which conditions class antagonisms emerge and bring the formation of a “we feeling” among apprentices. From the interviews, it is seen that the production area does not emerge as a field in which class antagonism has emerged and class culture is formed since the culture of small-sized enterprises which is the most preferred workplace, functions for the neutralization of class consciousness by making the labor of apprentices visible, feeding the hope of setting up your own business. Moreover, the relationships in the workplace benefit from the paternalist, familial, and impersonal relations. These relations provide legitimacy and authority to the boss within the workplace and make the development of class solidarity among apprentices and workers difficult. When apprentices encounter with an injustice in the workplace they seek consult in their personal relationships or behave individually instead of behaving collectively.

On the other hand, the perception of apprentices about class hierarchies mainly occurs when they feel and experience “difference”. In the perception of apprentices such differences are not related to hierarchies which are constituted in the workplace but related to social hierarchies, which refer to not only economic capital but also cultural capital. From this perspective, apprentices feel and experience difference in the encounters with the rich which have images of economic capital and educated youth which have an image of cultural capital. Especially the educational field emerges as a field in which their class positions become clear and a “we feeling” emerges since they frequently encounter with educated youth in their social environment.

On the other hand, it is seen that these factors cannot form a distinguished class culture which could be hegemonic in the daily life of the apprentices. Restrictions on
leisure time and deprivation of necessary economic opportunities play a negative role in the constitution of a counter-culture or a complete submission to popular culture and consumer society. In the interviews, it is understood that an homogeneous and uniform culture among apprentices is not the case.
CHAPTER 5

CONCLUSION

This study has attempted to understand class culture among young workers who work in the apparel and metalworking sectors. In contemporary capitalism, due to the increasing dispossession and impoverishment, more and more children have participated to labor market and become a component of the working class. This issue which could mean crystallization of estates (Gramsci, 2000), in other words, homogenization in terms of class positions also accompanied by commodification of education and its direct submission to the needs of capital in the late capitalist era. In this way, children of the people from lower classes have been excluded from the educational field which meant previously the way of moving up the social ladder.

The main issue of this study is that proletarianization of children occurs through apprenticeship, in a sense, through a pre-capitalist, craft-type relationship in which personal, flexible, non-contractual, paternalist relations are dominant. As seen in Chapter 3, such pre-capitalist relations are compatible with flexible labor regimes of the late capitalism. In the late capitalist era, labor is brought under control of capital and irregular, precarious and unorganized forms of labor have become prevalent. Such process which could be conceptualized as deconstitutionalization of labor by referring to Burawoy (1983) is accompanied by downsizing tendency of production area. This process which could be remarked in prevalence of subcontracting, has also constituted the basis of new-right policies.

In this study, it is claimed that the pre-capitalist relations, said above, which are also situated in commonsense of the society have a role in the hegemony of capital in the late capitalist era. In other words, pre-existent culture which prevents the emergence of class culture by constituting familiarity between workers and employers through personal, de facto relations function as ideological instrument and a form of control for neutralization of class antagonism in the late capitalist era.

Apprenticeship which is revitalized in this process through educational policies which could be observed in the recent reform of 4+4+4, on one hand, clarify class
positions between children, on the other hand, emerge as an ideology which function for sustaining “deferential workers” (Lockwood, 1977).

The main concern of this field research, which is made among apprentices who work in the apparel and metalworking sectors within the frame of this study is understanding this process, mentioned above, in terms of class culture. In this context, the main question of the thesis is whether flexible production and employment regimes, class culture among apprentices which newly entered to the labor market and what he objective and cultural factors which effect formation and non-formation of class consciousness among apprentices. The one of the results which become apparent in the field research is that such process refers to a heterogeneous process in terms of labor regimes; and objective factors which differentiate labor regimes influence the functioning of ideological apparatus in the production area by revealing different class experiences and perceptions in daily life.

Differentiation of objectivity between two sectors is related to labor-capital intensity. Since the apparel sector is a labor intensive-sector, flexibilization strategies depend on reduction of labor cost. In this context, precarious, irregular, unregistered working becomes more significant. Since the cheapness of labor is more important rather than the quality of labor, the most disadvantageous part of the labor market is employed in this sector. In addition to labor policies which include increasing working hours and reducing wages; performance of labor is strictly controlled during the production process to increase the speed of production. This control process brings out arbitrary working relations within the workplace and causes abuse of apprentices. All these characteristics refer to despotic labor regime, in which coercion prevails consent.

On the other hand, since the metalworking sector is a capital-intensive sector, the production-oriented flexibilization strategy is followed in order to reduce costs. For this reason, increasing the productivity of labor through investing in advanced manufacturing machinery is important rather than reducing the labor cost. In this sector, skilled labor is more critical than cheap labor. For this reason, in the sector, skill-based job security and insured working are more significant than the ones in the apparel sector. Apprentices in the sector are not only employed for the need of cheap
labor, but also are employed for training skilled labor. Unlike the apparel sector, the quality of the product is more important than the speed of the production. For this reason, discipline and control process in the metalworking sector is less oppressive than the apparel sector. All the specificity of the sector refers to the hegemonic character of the labor regime in which consent prevails coercion.

In parallel to differentiation of labor regimes, the perception of apprentices about work differentiates between two sectors. Metalworking is defined as “respectable work”, contrary to the apparel sector due to the fact that working conditions are more regular and working relations depend on mutual respect. Such perception stems from the fact that the relative surplus is provided by mainly increasing performance of labor in the apparel sector. For this reason, apprentices are observed during the workday and forced to be quick in the production process in order to multiply the amount of goods. The duration of the breaks could be shortened arbitrarily and conversing at work between each other could be punished. On the other hand, in the metalworking sector, the relative surplus is mainly provided by advancing in manufacturing machines. Since the mechanization is more developed and replaces the living labor more and more, the oppression on the labor force becomes less. In addition, quality and zero defect production have become more important for the sector in the late capitalist era, for this reason, instead of speed; slowness and carefulness are more important in the production process.

In parallel to this differentiation, perception of work differentiates between apprentices. “Respectability” emerges as a constitutive factor of consent and sustains hegemony in the metalworking sector, on the other hand, the most significant sign of coercion in the apparel sector emerges as conflicts within the workplace. In this sense, apprentices in the apparel sector generally leave the job not because of the working conditions but because of the arbitrary working relations.

Not only objective conditions but also pre-constituted cultural forms play a role in the formation and non-formation of class culture, and in the conflict and consent processes. The general disposition of apprentices depends on escaping from the submission to capitalist discipline and time; in other words, from being “class”. They
tend to avoid rationalization of production process and production relations. This issue is more apparent in the dispositions of apprentices who work in metalworking sector. In this sector apprentices generally prefer to work in small sized enterprises rather than factories even though factories represent more regular working condition and working relations. Apprentices tend to refuse “lifeless mechanism” of factory system which reifies and alienate them to their work and transform them to simple commodities by making them invisible in the production process. Small-sized enterprises emerge as an alternative to factory regimes by giving the opportunity of learning skill, in this way giving the status and a visibility to labor. Visibility of labor makes apprentices “subject” during the production process by creating “self-worth” among apprentices.

This issue plays a negative role in the formation of free labor and class consciousness which occur in the production process in terms of rational class interests; and causes reconciliation between employers and apprentices. Skill brings absorption by work, as Marx states, and prevents complete submission to capital; in this way play a negative role in the emergence of free labor which is precondition of modern proletariat as well. In addition to this, such reconciliation is constituted by referring to future expectations. Apprentices pay attention to learning job for setting business in the future; and for this aim, they put up with heavy and risky working conditions. In this sense, it may be claimed that pre-constituted class culture has a role in legitimizing present working conditions.

In addition to this, in both sectors apprentices prefer workplaces which they could constitute personal, close relations with masters and bosses. Personal and face to face relations hinder alienation of apprentices to working relations and prevent their transformation to mere productive bodies. On the other hand, employers benefit from these relations for sustaining their authority in the control processes. In this way, authority of boss gains paternalist form. Through these informal relations in the small sized enterprises apprentices find de facto ways for negotiation their working conditions. In addition to this, close personal relations are preferable for the apprentices since they neutralize class differentiation between apprentices and bosses.
Regarding all these preferences and dispositions it may be claimed that the tactics of apprentices in their daily life depend on escaping from class experiences and class identity. Hence, solidarity, unionization and struggle are not observed in the dispositions of apprentices. When apprentices encounter a problem in the workplace they tend to solve these problems either by themselves or through their personal networks. In addition to this, apprentices do not associate these problems with class antagonism. The notion of right is constituted as a moral issue which benefits from a belief of justice which is not structurally determined by rational class interest, but rather culturally constituted in reference to discrimination differentiation which are regarded in the behaviors of the employer.

In this sense, class relations reveal as personal relations; and problems between apprentices and employers are not explained by referring to labor-capital relations but personal characteristic of the employer. From this perspective, there are good employers as well as bad employers. This means that the position of the boss is legitimate in the perception of apprentices. The boss is seen as employer who provides the job to the workers and protect them. Such perception differentiates the boss from the rich who is identified with pretentious consumption and distinctive habitus.

All these issues show that production area does not permit to the emergence of class consciousness and class identity among apprentices and the class relations within this area are not formulated as antagonistic relations. Class identity is constituted rather by referring to the “other” as such in master-slave dialectic. In this sense, social hierarchies, which are constituted not only by way of economic capital but also cultural and symbolic capital, play a role in the constitution of class identity. In the face of social hierarchies apprentices generally develop reinforcement strategies. This issue could be understood in the discourse of apprentices related to the rich and educated population. While the rich generally associated with acquiring unmerited illegitimate earnings, educated people associated with laziness and reluctance to work. In this way, social hierarchies are subverted by moral superiority identified with lower classes. In addition to this, apprentices in the metalworking sector
emphasize their advantageous positions against educated youth by referring to unemployment and precarious working conditions within educated population.

Nevertheless, such a distinction does not directly result in formation of class culture which depends on “distinctive way of life” among apprentices due to the restrictions on the leisure time and hegemony of the popular cultural products among lower classes. Apprentices have very limited leisure time because of the flexible working hours. For this reason, they could spend little time with their friends who are consisted of the young from their neighborhood. In addition to this, popular cultural products have penetrated their daily lives in accordance with commodification.

Within the frame of this study, it is claimed that apprenticeship and the paternalist culture of small-sized enterprises do not permit to a perception of class, in this way, prevent formation of class culture in general sense. However, this claim cannot be generalized for all apprentices. A study which will be made among apprentices who work in service sector will probably reach different results since service sector has multiple dynamics differently from manufacturing sector. In this context, a study which aim to deal with class experiences and class culture among young workers should enlarge its field of study with other questions.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Job</th>
<th>Working Experience</th>
<th>Size of the workplace</th>
<th>Number of the Brother and sister</th>
<th>Birth Place</th>
<th>Father's Occupation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dilan</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Apparel</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Small</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Batman</td>
<td>Textile worker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emir</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Apparel</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Small</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Mardin</td>
<td>Watchman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ibrahim</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Apparel</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Small</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Erzurum</td>
<td>Death</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metin</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Apparel</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Small-Formal</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Diyarbakır</td>
<td>Unemployed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fatma</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Apparel</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Small Formal</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Bitlis</td>
<td>Chauffeur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arzu</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Apparel</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Small-Formal</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Bitlis</td>
<td>Construction Worker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sabuha</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Apparel</td>
<td>8 ay</td>
<td>Small-Formal</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Bayburt</td>
<td>Construction Worker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nihat</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Apparel</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Small</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Batman</td>
<td>Village Guard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Firat</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Apparel</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Small</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Malatya</td>
<td>Death</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rasim</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Apparel</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Small</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Kastamonu</td>
<td>Watchman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sultan</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Apparel</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Small</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Batman</td>
<td>Death</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Küb十里</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Metal</td>
<td>2,5</td>
<td>Small</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Erzurum</td>
<td>Construction Worker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yalçın</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Metal</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Large</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Sinop</td>
<td>Butcher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oğuzhan</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Metal</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Small</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Mardin</td>
<td>Scrap Dealer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rıza</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Metal</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Small-Formal</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Erzurum</td>
<td>Construction Worker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>İsmail</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Metal</td>
<td>2,5</td>
<td>Large</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Batman</td>
<td>Textile worker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enver</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Metal</td>
<td>2,5</td>
<td>Small</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Erzurum</td>
<td>Textile worker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yasin</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Metal</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Small</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Trabzon</td>
<td>Technician</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Furkan</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Metal</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Large</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Kastamonu</td>
<td>Furniture manufacturer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tahsin</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Metal</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Small</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Yozgat</td>
<td>Chauffeur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Celal</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Metal</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Small</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Erzurum</td>
<td>Construction Worker</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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APPENDIX B: SAMPLE OF INTERVIEW

KUBİLAY

Meslek: Tornacı. 8 Ekim 2013 Sultanbeyli, Mayısta Yaşam Kooperatifi’nde yapılan mülakat:

Önce seni genel olarak tanıyalım. Nerelisin?
Erzurumluyum.

Kaç yaşındasınız?
17 yaşındayım.

Buraya nasıl geldiniz?

Burada peki tanıdıklarıımız mı vardı, onların yanına mı geldiniz?
Evet burada tanıkılardı. Sultanbeyli’de özellikle.

Peki size yardımcı oldular mı burada, kalacak yer, iş güç konusunda?
Kalacak yer sıkıntı yoktu zaten. İlk geldiğimiz zaman da kira da kaldık. İş... zaten babam inşaatta çalışıyordu. Bu tanıklar falaş vardı işte, onların yanına gidip geliyordu. öyle işte...

Tanıklardı dediğin yine sizin hemşeriler mi

Hala orada mı çalışıyor?
Yok şu anda Rusya’da. Oradaki inşaatta çalışıyorum. Fayans işi yapıyo genelde.

Peki, ailende başka çalışan var mı kardeşi lerin vesaire?
Üç kardeşiz bi ben çalışıyorum, bi abim var okuyo son sınıf liseye gidiyo. Bi kız kardeşim var o ilk o kul dörtte.

Peki sen liseye hiç gittin mi?
Ben liseye hiç gittiyo liseye hiç gittiyo ama açıklögretim okuyorum.

Peki neden gitmedin, nasıl oldu bu meslek üzerine çalışmaya başlanaman?

Biraz senin kararınırdı?
Evet benim kararımdı.

Daha önce başka bir iş yaptın mı?

Tekstilden neden devam etmedin?

Fabrika mesela daha güvenceli bi yer değil mi, iş sağlığı konusunda, sigorta vesaire?

Peki hiç ustanla patronunla ters düştüğün oluyo mu?

Ne yapıyorlar?

Hakllar diyosun...

Neler yapıyorsunuz mücadeleden etmek adına?

Buna karşı örgütlenmeye çalışıyosunuz ama diyosun ya çoğu patronun akrabaları… onun dışında ne yapmak gerekir?


Hiç böyle dertleşebilir mi? Ustabaşıyla olsun patronun équipéleriyle olsun kendin sıkıntılarınızı dertlerini... Bazen olsun olsun mesajınızı veriyor. Bazen hiç kaele almıyollar. Ne gibi şeyler konuşuyorsunuz aranızda?
Ne gibi şeyler olsunuz... mesela nasıl diyim size... bi bisiklet olayı vardı. Bisiklet alalım falan demiştim ben. Kimsenin umrunda değil zaten onun. Ondan sonra hafta sonu mesaisiz almaya devam etti. Ondan sonra hafta sonu mesaisi almaya devam etti.

Kendi dertlerini peki?

Babam Rusya’da dedin ya, ne sıklıkta görüyorsunuz? Görüyorsunuz?
Buraya maddi destek sağlayabilo mu?

Sence patron kime denir? patronu nasıl taraf edersin?

Patrona ihtiyaç var mı peki bi çalışma düzeninde?

Ayakkabı?
İş ayakkabıları. Torna sektöründe parçalar sürekli yerlere düşüyor, ayakların üstüne düşüyo. Çok tehlikeli aslinda bi de taşıs falan var yerlerde o ayakkabilir iyi oлюyo. Onlar da yazın çekilmiyo ya. Çok kötü bi şeyi var bunların, kokusu var.

Patron olmak için ne yapmak lazım sence?

Sen olmak ister misin?
Tabiki de, bi işveren olmak isterim yani.

Öyle olsan, hani daha çok dediğin gibi heralde
Yani şimdi benim çektiğim sıkıntıları işçillere çektirmek istemem yani. Cumartesi olayını kaldırım ortadan, çalışma saatlerini çok düzgün yaparım. Yani sabah işverine geldiğim zaman işçilerin kahvaltısını getiririm ismarların mesela. Her gün bunu
şarkıları var mı senin gibi çalı.


**Peki yapabilir misiniz kendi imkanlarınızla?**


**Başka kalfalar var mı senin gibi çalıyanlardan?**
Benim gibi çalışan var evet, bi kaç kişi var. Daha doğrusu bi tane üstabaşı var orda. Bi tane de usta başına biraz altı var. Gerisi kalfa olarak görev yapıyor.

**Peki hep aynı ücreti mi alyorsunuz yoksa farklılaşma oluyor mu?**


**Öyle olmasa lazımda bu neden yapıymor, siz bunla ilgili ne düşünüyorsunuz?**


**Peki sizin ücretleriniz neye göre farklılaşıyor kendi aranızda?**


**Peki iş kazası geçirdin mi?**


**Peki onunla ilgili hiç işyerinden sana bi yardımcı olma durumları oldu mu?**

Peki kaza vesaire olduğu zaman tavırları nasıl oluyo?
Bazen mesela şöyle bi durum vardı gözümüze çapak gelyo.Bizim bi usta var kaynakçı direk onun yanna gideriz kim olursa olsun yani patron da olsa usta başı da olsun direk onun yanna gider.Yani o kağıt parçasını yırtıyo, gözümüzden o çapağı çıkartıyo.

Kaynakçı mı?

Çok önemsemiyo yanı?

Peki bununla ilgili olarak hiç kendi aranızda konuşuyor musunuz?
Ya onlar genellikle bana söylüyorlar.Ecza dolabı olayı var. Onu benim doldurmayı istiyolar. Malzemesi falan olduğu zaman... Mesela yara bandı eksiliyo, tenditüyot falan var işte onları aliyoruz. Öyle bi şey fazla üstünde duruyolar yani. Ama kötü bi kaza olursa ilk müdahaleyi yapamazak çok kötü olur yani. Mesela parmak kopması falan..

Böyle bi şey yaşandı mı hiç?

Sizin İMES’te bildiğim kadariyla sendika yok sen hiç biliyo musun?
Cık. Ben de bilmiyorum.

Sendika olan bi iş yeri?
Vardir heralde ama.

Hiç senle konuştular mı bunla ilgili?
Yok benle hiç öyle bi şey konuşmadilar ya.
Olsa peki nasıl olur, sendikalarla ilgili ne düşünüyosun?
Sendikaların ne oldugunu bilmiyorum şu anda ben bilmiyorum.

İşçilerin örgütlendiği mesela DİSK var
İşçilerin örgütlenme biçimi mi? İMES’te vardır ya.

Birleşik Metal iş var mesela Türk-Metal İş var
İMES’te mi?

İMES’te yok. Ama mesela metal sektörü içerisinde var. Hiç haberedar oldun mu bunlardan?
Yok oldum. Hiç duymadım ya. İlk sizden duyuyorum.

Peki mesela işçilerin böyle bir örgütün patronla bir anlamda pazarlık yapacak haklarını savunacak mı? İMES’ten mı?

Peki, 1 Mayıs’a gitmiş mi hiç?

Peki sence gitmek gerekir mi?

Daha önce hangilerine gittin?
Daha önce hangilerine gittim... bu okmeydanda olaylar taksim olayları falan vardı onlara katılmıştık Gezi Parkı falan bi oraya gitmiş. Ondan sonra fazla da bi şey hatırladığım olmadığından yani fazla gittiğim bi şey olmadığı.

Kadıköy’de fahal?
Şey Kadıköy Gazdan Adam Festivali vardı oraya gitmişim. Bi de bu şey vardı Dünya 1 Eylül Barış Günü. Oraya da katılmıştık Kadıköy’de

Bu en sonuncusu mu?

Peki, biraz önce biraz bahsettik ama bi daha sormuş olayım genel olarak hayallerin neler hayal kurduğun zaman neler kurarsın?
İş olmam mı?

Hem iş olarak hem başka varsın?
Yani şimdi güzel bi iş yerimin olmasını isterim. Güzel bi çalışma standartları, işçilerin güzel bi şekilde çalışmaya meylli olduğu bölümler falan, temiz bi ortam yani çok temiz bi ortam olucak. İşyerinin ünü çok iyi olucak. Herkes kıskanacak
işyerini. İşyerleri arasında mesela hani şeyler olur nasıl diyim size ben... hani çekişmeler olan olur ya, onu değil de herkesin meslektası olarak birbirlerine saygı duymasını isterim. Bazı bazı bizim hidrolikçiyiz ya, başka hidrolikçilerin bize karşı bazı şeylerı vardır. Ustalar olun, çıraklar olsun böyle ters ters hareketleri olanlar vardır. Bazi sevmeler istemezler. İki kişi hidrolikçi istemezler bunlar. Patronlar arasında sıkıntı yoktur, ama ustalar böyle malzeme almaya falan olayı olmayor ciddi ciddi mesela...

**Ne diyolar?**
O iş öyle yapılmaz diyo, gelin size öğretilim hesabı. Öyle bi olay var. Yani hayallerim güzel bi isteme olmak, işimi güçlü bilen biri ondan sonar, yani usta olduğunu zaman ,hem usta hem patron olmayı isterim yani güzel bi araban olun güzel bi aileyi olun onları isterim.

**Peki bunlar olabilir mi?**
Oyl Or. İmkansız değil yani. Çok istersek olun yani.

**Peki aileden yardım eden olur mu bu süreçte?**

**Arkadaşların daha çok çıraklık eğitim merkezinden mi?**

**Ne yapıyorsunuz Kadıköy’de?**
Ya biz geziyoruz böyle, işte yani nasıl diyim. Aslında çok özel konular da var da onlara söylemek istemiyorum.

**Söyle söyle aramızda...**
Ya bu barlar falar olayı var yani da oralara gitmiş. Bi de bu bizim arkadaşları da aşağıda oturuyor onun evinde bi kalı mıstık bi gece falar üç-dört kişiş diyik, çıraklık okulundan yine arkadaşlarla. İşte böyle vår bi içki bi içme olayı var. Güzeldi asında ya. Ama evi baya dağıttık. Arkadaşın biri fena dağıttı ortalığı, kustu falar. Tuvaleti de bulamadı şimdi her taraf aidiyo bi o odaya bi bu odaya. Pardon afedersiniz abla... (gülérer)
Yok, ara sıra bizim aramızdan da çıkıyo.

Bu tarz şeyler ne kadar zamanda bi yapıyosunuz?

Onun dışında kazandığın parçayı nereye harcıyosun?

Peki sen sadece gezmek için mi para harcıyosun?
Aslında gezmek için para harcanan en son iş gezmek. Normalde böyle kendi çıkarlarım için, mesela elbise olsun ayakkabı olsun yani giyim olsun o tür şeylerde harcarım yüküyle parayı.

Peki giyim türü şeylerde ya da telefonda hiç marka gibi şeyler gözetir misin?
Fazla abartmam ama normalde gözetirim yani.

Neden peki bunun peki anlami ne marka olsa nasıl oluyo?
Marka olsa daha kaliteli, daha kullanılsa oluyo. Ömrü daha çok oluyo. Yani normal ucuz markasız bi şeyler hem göre hoş gelmiyo, kullanılsa olmuyo bi de hani arkadaş ortamında falan yani konuşma olayları var markalarla ilgili. Sohbetler ediyolar falan...

Ne diyolar?
Yani mesela biri bi şey aldığı zaman ve ya markasız bi şey aldığı zaman dalga geçiyorlar. Pazardan mı aldilar diyolar mesela öyle şeyler yapıyolar. Ama normal birir markalı bi şey aldığı zaman vay diyolar markalı almış falan böyle havaya çıkıyarlar.

Daha uygun olunca daha iyi olmaz mı?

**Peki müzik falan dinliyo musun? Neler dinliyosun?**
Neler dinliyorum... arabsk, pop. Müslüm Baba.

**Müslüm Babanın hangi türkülerini seviyosun?**

**Ben de heyecanlıyım gerçekten.**
Pop şarkıları falan var Demet Akalın'in Hande Yener’in

**Neler düşünuyosun bu şarkıları dinlerken?**
Neler düşünlüyoruz. Bazen kulaklık takıp böyle söyleyin. Rüzgarla karanlıkta, otobüslerde güzel oluyoruz. İyi oluyoruz.

**Var mı sevdigin bi kız?**
Sevdigim bi kız var.

**Onu mu düşünuyosun şarkıları dinlerken?**
Yani genel olarak. Herkes öyle, o yüzden.

**Facebook kullanıyosun heralde**
Evet, twitter da var.

**Neler paylaşıyosun facebookta?**

**Peki bunlar sana neler düşündürüyo?**
Siz kürt müsünüz?
Yok normalde biz kürt alevi olarak görülyoruz yani.

Sen peki kendine kürt diyo musun?
Yok demişyorum.

Niye demişyosun?
İstemişyorum kürt olmayı ya.

Neyi kötü kürt olmanın?

İnsanlar öyle olduklarını düşünüyorlar belki ama sen de öyle olduklarını düşünün musun?

Sen peki alevi olduğunu falan iş yerinde söylüyo musun?

İMES'te bi cami var baya da bi gideni var

Peki bir ayrımcılık bundan ötürü?
Çalışanlar içerisinde başka yok mu alevi?

Peki patron aleviolsaydı, usta başı alevi olsaydı daha rahat olur muyduz, bunun bi etkisi olur muydu senin çalışma koşullarına?

Çalışanlar yapıyo ayrımcılığı yani?

Üzerinize bi baskı var yani?
Var yani. Her cuma namazı... cumadan önce, bi tane kaynakçı var bizim o sürekli herkesin gidip yanna diyo. Hoca seni çağrıyı, hadi gel namaza gidelim falan.

Sen cumaya onun zoruya gidiyosun biraz yoksa senin de içinden geliyo mu?

Neden sence bu bi gereklikli?

Dua ediyor musun?
Tabiki de.

Neler diliyosun?

Televizyon izliyo musun?

**Genel olarak kendine örnek aldığın biri var mı?**
Film olarak mı yoksa...

**Ünlü olabilir bu kişi?**

**Nasıl bi fark var aranızda?**
Şimdi mesela patronun yani ne istese alır mesela. Öyle bi şeyler var yani. Patron oğluna ne istese alır. Ama bizde öyle ne istese alma durumu yok. Mesela insanlar patronun çocuğunu zaman maddi sıkıtı olmuyo. Yani istediği gibi gidip geziyolar, yiyolar içiyolar falan. Ama normalde insanların... insan olduğumuz zaman, normal bi insan olduğumuz zaman kısıtlama oluyor var. fazla açılamıyoruz.

**Sen hiç patronun çocuğuya karşılaman mı?**

**Patronun öğülya mı bunları konuşuyosunuz?**
Yok kızlarıyla. Oğlu benden bi yaş küçük. O fazla gelmiyo o anca geziyo zaten. Okula gidip geliyo bi şeyler.

**Oğluyla karşılatağında ne hissediyosun?**
Şu ana kadar hiç bi sohbetim olmadı onla. Karşılaştığında tabi merak ederim yani nasıl bi hayati var acaba napriyo ne ediyoz gün içinde arkadaş ortamını falan merak ederim yani ettiğim de oluyo.

**Zengin diyince kim akлина geliyor? Türkiye’de baktığın zaman ya da çevrenel bakışın zaman?**
Peki insanların nasıl zengin olduklarını düşündüyo?

Başka türkiyede bildiğin zengin var mı?
Yok ben Galatasaraylıyım da Aziz Yıldırım çok kariştırdı ortalığı şihe falan.

Peki Ali Ağaoğlu dedin ya Ali Ağaoğlu nasıl yaşına sence?

Sen ne düşündün onun üzerine?
Ben o programı yapan kişiye o kadar böyle dua ettim ki, helal olsun dedim adama ya dedim. Programı bi de akyırtı sorular yani. Oraya gelmişen onu gözeye alıckın. Bi de adam dedi şu anda dedi cebinizde ne kadar para taşıyorunuz dedi. Ceketin cebinden bi çıkardı bu kadar para (eliyle gösterir). Bi de normal ceketler var onları hiç saymıyorum. Çok farklı yani. Zenginlik... çok... acayip paraları var ya. Mutlular mıdır peki?

onlar da çağışiyolar diyosen?
Evet onlar şirkete bakıyorlar artık nasıl bakıyor muy? (gül) hiç bi zaman ayıramadı kendisini. Çok büyük şirket yani mikrosoft. Dünyanın en zengini zaten kendisi, Bil Geyts. O kadarını da biliyorum yani. Takip ediyorum (gül)

Peki genel olarak mahalleye olan ilişkini konuşsa?

Peki mesela çıraklık eğitimdeki arkadaşlarını mahalledeki arkadaşlarını kıyasladığında hangileriyle daha çok da şey paylaşıyor yoz?

Peki mesela ilerde bi işveren olduğunda yani bir patron olduğunda yine burda mı oturmak isterdin yoksa başka bi yerde mi oturmak isterdin?
O zamanın şartlarıyla konuşmas alında pek mantıklı değil. Şu anda patron olsaydım burda ne işim vardı. Şu anda işyeri çalışıyorum olsaydım, bugün cumartesi çalıştım normalde. Şu anda evimde olurdu ve aileme geziyoz olurdu.

Nerde oturmak isterdin?
Nerde oturmak isterdim.. Şu anda işyeri çalışıyorum olsaydım, bugün cumartesi çalıştım normalde. Şu anda evimde olurdu ve aileme geziyoz olurdu.

Evin nerde olurdu?

Burada deniz kenarına gidiyo musunuz?
Ya arkadaşlarla dediğim gibi bu çıraklık okulundaki arkadaşlarla Kadıköy’e falan gittiğimiz zaman sahildeki o taşları bilirsiniz belki, orda öyle oturuyoruz zaman geçiriyoruz falan. Çekirdek falan aliyoruz. Onlar bazen içiyor. İşte geziyoz oraları ya. Bazen orda bi yeşillik alanlar falan var. Orda oturuyoruz sohbet ediyorum. Bu

Sevmiş miydin?

Güzell ya yerler var mı?
Tabi çok güzel yerler

Peki bu zenginlerin oturduğu semtler var dedin ya onları hiç gördün mü ya da televizyondan mı gördün?
Aslında karşıya gitme şansımız çok olduğu. Belki de geçmişizdir bı onların bulunduğu yerlerden falan da tam olarak neresi olduğunu ne olduğunu bilmem. Ama ben şimdi bugüne karşıda bı geceeler barlara falan gitmiş olsanız, önünden geçmiş olsanız kameramanları falan görürüm. Yani bazen magazin programlarını izlerim ordan falan görürüm.

Peki mesela okulu hiç bırakmayacağım dediğin oluyor mu?

Peki mesela böyle okuyan devam eden arkadaşlar var mı?
Abine özendin oluyo mu peki, neticede senin kadar çalşmıyor.

Üniversite okumanın iyi yönü ne olurdu okusaydın?

Okusan ne okursun peki?
Okusam ne okurum... onu o zaman düşünüyorum. Şu anda aklıma hiç bişey gelmiyo.AMA bu meslek dalında bi şey okurdu yani. Genellikle meslek dalında mekanikle alakalı bi şeyler okurdu.

Ortami için mi daha çok üniversiteyi tereci edersin?
Ortami için de tabiki de. Normalde, mesleği elimize almamız için, yani belgemizin olması lazım. Ortamı zaten ister istemez kazanıyoruz ortamı bi şekilde. İyi olurdu yani.

Peki siyasetten konuşacak olursak, bir ideolojinin olduğunu düşünüyono musun?
İdeoloji? Yani bi düşüncem mi?

Siyasal bi düşüncen

Peki böyle düşünmeye nasıl başladın, ne zaman başladın?

Buraya nasıl geldin peki (Mayısta Yaşam Kooperatif'i)

Neler yapıyosunuz peki, burası sana ne katıyo?

Aleviler CHP’ye oy veriyolar dedin ya Neden peki oy veriyolar?
CHP’ye neden peki oy veriyolar... ya alevi olarak görüşler hepsini. Alevi insanlar, oyunumu onlara verelim düşünceyle hareket ediyorum. Hani genellikle artık eşitlik ve özgürlük için.. Daha CHP iktidar olmadığı hali ne yapacaklarını onlar da bilmem. Ama alevi olduklarını için oy veriyorlar.

Peki sence vermek gerekir mi?
Bence vermek gerekir mi... Yani gerektirir. Kim daha iyi yönetirse ona vermeleri gerekir.

Böyle bi parti var mı sence şu an seni temsil eden, senin taleplerini gerçekleştirecek?
Valla şu anda öyle bi şey yok, ama bu Kadıköy’e gittiğimiz zaman BDP’iler faaln vardı. Onlara o zaman kanım biraz ısladım. Kürtlükten kaynaklanıyo heralde (gülüyor).

Kürt olduğuunu kabul etmiyodun hani...
Taman da... şöyle bi durum var, hani biz kürtlerin içinde yaşamışız. Normalde kurt deildik, ama kürtlerin içinde yaşadığımız için kurtçy faaln biliyorum ben. Ailem faaln biliyo. O yüzden yani sıcak bakıyorum.

Peki yani genel olarak başka neden seviyosun?
siyaseti mi?

Evet evet...

İş yerinde sen böyle düşünüyüğünde onlar ne diyolar?

Peki mesela sence bu memleketin en büyük sorunu ne?

Peki özgürlü ve eşit olmadığını sorumlusunu nerede görüyosun?

Bu çözüm sürecyle ilgili olarak hani hükümetin böyle bi meselesi olduğu hem aleviler için alevi açılımı, bi de körtler için çözüm süreci diye bi şeyler yapıyolar. İşte artık bu konuda bişey olursa, o sana bişeyleri da, yani ona oy vermesi için de bişey etme zorunluğu da. O da insan, o da insan sonuçta.

Bu çözüm süreci olarak körtler için bu Abdullah Öcalan çıkarma olayı falan vardı. İşte artık onla artık bişeyler yapıyolar onu pek fazla takip etmedim. Ama onu biliyorum.

Ne düşünüyorsun peki genel olarak?

Peki, sen bunlara karşı bi şey diyo musun?
Ben, tabi yanlışı bi şey olsun. AKP’nin veya Abdullah Öcalan’la birlikte olması mesela, onun ordan çıkarmının söz konusu bile yapmamamı lazımdır.

BDP için mi diyosun bunu?
Yani BDP için değil iktidarın. Öcalan meclise gelsin falan diye, bunu istememeleri lazımdır. AKP’nin de bunu yapmamamı lazımdır. Ya ben fazla ilgilenmiyorum siyasetle. Anlamışsinizdir heralde. (gülser)

Gezi Parkı eylemlerine katıldığım. Ondan önce hiç Taksim’e gitmiş miydin?
Ondan önce hiç taksime gitmemiştım.

Peki bu Gezi Parkı eylemleri sırasında hiç gittin mi?
Gittim.
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Nasıl bi ortam vardı orda, neler düşündün?
Ya ortamı çok iyidi aslında ama o ordaki heyecan falan polis toplarını falan görüyoruz böyle. Bi yandan da korku var. O gün fazla bi şey olmadığı yani.

Sultanbeyli’den genel olarak gittiniz?

Neler gözlemledin peki? İnsanlar neler yapıyolardı orda?
Her çeşit insan vardı orda ya. Çok farklı bi ortam yani. Bissürü insan görüyosun ve çeşit çeşit insan. İlk defa gördüğüm tipler, böyle yani yaptıkları hareketleri olsun, giyinme tarzları olsun veya savunduğu şeyler olsun böyle.

Neler düşündün? Sana göre miydi o insanlar, Sevdin mi o tipleri?
Sonuça... tabi sevdim aslında. İnsanlar farklı farklı, ama düşünceleri birdi. Yani hepsi polise karşıydı orda.

Sen de orda kendini polise karşı hissedebildin mi?
Evet ben de biraz. Ama ben polise taş atmak taraftarı deildim tabiki de.

Senin ordaki talebin neydi? Sen hangi taleple gittin?

Beklediğin gibi miydi peki, yoksa farklı mıydı?
Çok farklıydı. Başka bi dünyaydı sanki. Sanki ülke bölünüşfalân. İnsanlar göç etmiş, savaştılar falan. Øyle bi şeyler vardı.

Sence bu tarz bi eylem yapılmalı mı? Ne için yapılmalı?

Hiç konuştun mu peki ordaki insanlarla?
ordaki insanlarla pek sohbetim olmadığı yani. bi sloganlarda falan beraberlik o kadar.

Hangi sloganları attınız?
Hangi sloganları attık...bi hattılasam aslında biliyorum da akımı geliyir yaa.

Peki genel olarak hiç iş yerinde okuldaki arkadaşlarınızla hiç konuştunuz mu gezi meselesini?

**Geldiler mı?**

**Şey ben kaçtırdım ev kirada mıydı?**

**Siz buraya ilk geldiğinizde akrabalarımız burda ama konuşurken de şey dedin ben zengin olunca akrabalırm bana yakınlaşır da dedin. Neden öyle düşündünüz? Yani niye uzaklaşırlar ya da yaklaşırlar?**

**Cumaya patron da geliyo heralede**
Patron da geliyo.

**Beraber mi gidiyosunuz peki?**

**Peki Allah kabul etsin derken samimiyetle söyleyo musun? Mesela patron olomak için iyi bi insan da olmak lazim. İyi değil ama patron mesela, zam vermiyo, nasıl oluyo yani**

**Okula gittiğiniz günün dönüşünde çalışiyonomuşsunuz ya sonrasında o kalkmış. O süreç nasıl oldu?**
Şimdi okula ilk başladıgımız zaman tabi kimse kimseyi fazla tanımyor. İlk defa görüyosun arkaadaşlarını. Üç, dört hafta ben böyle okuldan sonra ise gidiyorum.

İşe burdan kaç saate gidiyosun? Kaç saate gidiyoruz? Normal kendi arabamız var teyzemin oğlunun onun arabasıyla bir yarım saatte gitmiyorum. ama normal söylemesi olmasa iettlerle falan gitmiyorum bir saat bir saat on dakkayı buluyu.


Ücretini almyosunuz Evet.


Onların duası neden kabul oluyor da seninkiler niye olmuyor, o zengin oluyo da sen neden zengin olamıyosun


Onlar da cennette giderler mi?
Onları bilmiyorum ya... ama bence gitmeyebilirler de ama gidenleri de yamp giderler biraz tadına bakarlar yani. (gülüyor) yani biraz kızartma olur.

Kürt arkadaşlarım var dedin ya sen kürt ve iyi arkadaşların var. mesela bu kimliği sen üstünde kabul etmezkenn...


Peki türkçeyi sonradan mı öğrendin evde hangi dili konuşuyorsunuz mesela?

Patron Kürt değil heralden.  
Birim patron Kürt değil.

Siz kendi aranzda bi şeyler konuşsansız Kürtçe anlar mı?

Teyzeoğlu olmasaydı belki de bu kadar dayanmazdım diyo musun?

O olmasaydı işe girmeye durumu olmazdı. İlk zamanlarda çok zorlu çekerdim. ilk zaman işe gittiğim zaman o benim yanında çok olduğu yani çok yardımıcıydi. yani ne yapmam gerektiği nasil yapmam gerektğini o öğretyiyodu bana. İçiçey狄k yani böyle

**Bi de cumaya gitme konusunda dedin ya patron bi şey demiyo arkadaşlar diyo. Teyzeoğlüm olmasaydı çok daha fazla bi başka hissederdim ben camiye daha sık giderdim diyo musun?**


**Buna karşılık herhangi bi şey itiraz vs. ettiniz mi?**


**Okuldan arkadaşların var ya, arada Kadıköy’e gittiğiniz gezdiğiiniz? Beraber biraraya gelince ne konuşuyonuz?**


**Onunla buluşabiliyo muydunuz?**

Fazla buluşamıyoduk ya. Arada bi okula gittiğim zamanlar buluşuyoduk.

**Okulda mı?**

Yok okuldan değioldi o. Bunun okuluna ben gidiyodum. Normal liseye gidiyodu.

**E nasıl tanıtırınız?**

O da çalışıyor mu?
yok o çalışıyorum normal okuyo.

Tamamdı Kubilay. Çok sağol. Çok yorduk seni.
APPENDIX C

TÜRKÇE ÖZET


Kendi işinin patronu olmak ve eğitim yoluya sınıf atlamak ortak duyuda yer alan ve sınıf kültürünün gelişimini zorlaştıran bir başka husustur. İşçi sınıfı aileleri için çocukların örgün eğitim kurumlarına gönderilmesi, yolla proleterleşmelerine engel olmak temel motivasyonlarından biri olmuştur. Buradaki kritik husus, bu durumun Türk eğitim sistemi içerisinde geç kapitalist dönemde kadar mümkün olmasıdır.

Günümüz kapitalizminin temel özelliği sermaye birikminin mülksüzleşme yoluya sağlanmasıdır. (Harvey, 2004). Bu süreç bir taraftan mülksüzleşmeye bağlı olarak


Bununla birlikte çırak emeğinin önem kazanması sadece nitelikli emek değil aynı zamanda geç kapitalizmdede uluslararası rekabetin artmasıyla birlikte sermaye için ititkçe önemli bir mesele haline gelmektedir. Bu perspektiften çocuk istihdamı aynı zamanda emek piyasasını esnekleştirilmesini ve maliyetin düzlmesini amaçlayan politikaların bir parçasıdır. Emek piyasası hiyerarşisinin en altında yer alan çocuk işvereneler için düşük maliyetli emek gücü...
sunmaları bağlamında tercih edilmektedirler ve bu şekilde kayıtsız, sigortasız, güvencesiz istihdam biçimlerini daha fazla deneyimlemektedirler.

Geç kapitalizmde çocuk emeğinin emek piyasasına dahil olunudaki kritik husus çocukların bir çeşit kapitalizm öncesi ilişki biçimini imleyen “çıraklık” yoluyla ve geç kapitalizmde işletme ölçeklerinin küçülme eğilimiyle ve taşeronluk uygulamalarının yaygınlaşmasıyla uyumlu bir şekilde temelde küçük işletmeler içerisinde proleterleşmesidir. Bu küçük işletmeler enformel, sözleşmeci olmayan, keyfi ve paternalist ilişkiler içeren küçük ölçekli işletmeler içerisinde proleterleşmesidir. Başka bir deyişle gittikçe daha fazla işçi sınıfının parçası olurken, pre-kapitalist sınıf ilişkilerini yeniden üretemektedirler bu durum, çocuk ve genç işçilerde sınıf kültürünün oluşma koşullarını sorunsalmaştır.


Böyle bir çalışma için hazır giyim ve torna sektörleri örnek alan olarak seçilmiştir. Bu seçimin temel bir nedeni bu sektörlerin farklı açılarından Türkiye’deki imalat


Diğer taraftan, bu iki sektörde odaklanan bu çalışma, çırakların tümüne dair bir sınıf kültür analizinin verisini sunamaktadır. Hizmet sektörünün çırakların önemli bir
bölümünün istihdam edildiği bir sektör olduğu bilinmekle beraber bu çalışma kapsamında ele alınmamıştır. Görece daha farklı dinamiklere sahip olan hizmet sektörünün, daha detaylı ve farklı soruları içerecek şekilde analiz edilmesi gerekmektedir. Dolayısıyla bu çalışmanın kıyaslanabilir, ortak ve ayrıntılı noktalarını saptayabileceğimiz bir zeminde yapılması anlamlı olacaktır. İmalat sanayinin bu ortak zemini temsil edecektir.


Tekstil sektöründe yapılan görüşmelerin 3’ü çıraklık eğitim merkezinde, 8’i ise işyerinde yapılmış, torna sektöründe görüşmelerin 7’si çıraklık eğitim merkezinde, 4’ü ise mahalledede yapılmıştır.

Görüşmecilerin seçiminde çalışan işinin ölçeğine dikkat edilmiş, mülakatların küçük ve büyük ölçekli işletmeleri kapsayanak şekilde gerçekleşmesi hedeflenmiştir. Bunun temel nedeni, işletme büyüklüğünün emek süreçlerinde önemli bir faktör olmasıdır. İşletme büyüklüğü, kontrol mekanizmalarının tarzını, sınıf deneyimlerinin, iş algısını, işveren algısını, gelecek beklentilerini belirleyen nesnel bir ölçüt olarak ortaya çıkmaktadır.

Çıraklara yöneltilen sorular şu konular altında toplanmıştır: çıraklara dair demografik bilgiler, çalışma koşulları ve iş ilişkilerinin algılanması, yapılan işin algılanması, sınıf bilinci, örgütlenme eğilimi, direniş pratikleri, patron, zengin ve eğitilmiş gençlere dair algı, gelecek beklentisi, kültürel tüketim ve boş zaman faaliyetleri. Bu şekilde bir açıdan yapisal süreçler, başka bir deyişle, maddi ve objektif koşullar analiz edilmesi hedeflenmektedir. Bu bağlamda sınıf yapısı ve sınıf konumu emek rejimlerine ve çırakların somut gündelik hayat deneyimleriyle ilişkili olarak tartışılmalıdır. Diğer
bir açıdan, algılar, bilinç, duygular, rıza ve çatışma süreçlerini içeren özel süreçlerin algılanması hedeflenmektedir. Bu açıdan çırakları mücadele, örgütlenmeye iten ya da kendi koşullarını dönüştürmekten ali koyan süreçlere odaklanmalıdır. Bununla ilgili olarak çırakların nesnel koşulları karşısında nasıl düşündükleri ve davranışlarını tartışılmalıdır.


dikkatli iş yapmaları gerektiğini söylediklerini belirtmişlerdir. Bu nedenle bu sektörde disiplin ve kontrol yöntemleri torna sektörüne göre daha az baskıcıdır. Bu sektörün tüm bu özellikleri torna sektöründeki emek rejiminin rızanın baskıya üstün geldiği hegemonik karakterine işaret etmektedir.


Diğer taraftan torna sektöründe göreli artı değerin üretim teknolojisinin artırarak sağlanması emek üzerindeki baskı ve denetimi azaltmaktadır. Bu açıdan çarpıcı bir örnek çırakların işyerlerindeki kamerayı algılama biçiminde ortaya çıkmaktadır. Hazır giyim sektöründeki çıraklar için kamera kendilerini gözleyen ve bu nedenle rahatsız edici bir NESNE olarak algılanırken, torna sektöründe kamera, bu tarz bir baskı unsurу haline gelmemektedir, torna sektöründe kameranın işlevi hazır giyimde olduğundan farklı olarak işyerinde bulunan malzemelerin çalınmasını önlemek için olduğu söylenmektedir.

Göreli artı değer sağlama yollarının ve disiplin-kontrol süreçlerinin birbirinden farklılaşmasına paralel olarak iş algısı çıraklar arasında farklılaşmaktadır. Torna sektöründeki çıraklar kendi işlerinin hazır giyim sektörü kıyaslara daha saygın bir iş olduğunu vurgulamakta, bu açıdan saygınlık torna sektöründeki hegemonik emek rejiminin temel kurucu unsuru olurken, hazır giyim sektöründeki en temel eksiklik, baskı süreçlerinin ve çatışmanın en belirgin göstergesi olmadığını olmaktadır. Hazır giyim sektöründeki çıraklar keyfi çalışma ilişkileri nedeniyle sıkça işten ayrılmaktadırlar.

Diğer taraftan bu durum emeğin özgürlüğü ve üretim süreci içerisinde rasyonel sınıf çıraklarına referansla oluşabilecek bir sınıf bilinci üzerinde negatif etkide bulunmakta ve işverenlerle çıraklar arasında bir uzlaşmaya neden olmaktadır. Bu açıdan nitelik, Marx’ın dediği anlamda işe tabiyet yaratmakta ve emeğin sermayeye tam olarak tabi olmasını engelleyici bir işlev görmekte. Bu ise Marx’ın proletaryayı ve özgür emeği tariflemek için kullandığı “zincirinden başka kaybedecek bir şeyi olmayan” öncosunun çıraklar açısından reddedilerek, direnilen bir unsur olduğunu göstermekte, küçük işletmelerinse böyle bir direnişe imkan verdiği göstermektedir.

Emeğin özgürlüğünün engellenmesine dair bir diğer husus, küçük işletmelerin çırakların gelecek beklentilerine referans olmasıdır. Çıráklar gelecekte kendi kalerine ait bir işyeri açabilme için mesleği öğrenmeye çalışmaktadır. Bu ise bir yandan işveren algısını güçlendirmeye, örnek almaya ve performe etmeye neden olurken diğer yandan ağır ve riskli çalışma koşullarına katlanmayı getirmektedir. Bu anlamda
önceden kurulan sınıf ilişkilerinin mevcut çalışma koşullarını meşrulaştıracı bir işlev gördüğü iddia edilebilir.


Bu anlamda sınıf ilişkileri kişisel ilişkiler olarak ortaya çıkmaktadır. Çıraqlar ve işverenler arasındaki problemler, emek-sermaye çelişkisine referans verilerek açıklanmak yerine işverenin kişisel özellikleriyle açıklanmaktadır. Bu perspektiften bakıldığında “iyi” patronlar ve “kötü” patronlar vardır. Bu durum, çıraqların algısında işverenin konumunun meşru bir konum olduğunu göstermektedir. Yapılan mülakatlar sırasında da açığa çıkan bir husus, patronun zenginden farklı olarak hak
edilmiş bir zenginliği temsilt etmesidir. Pek çok durumda patronluk iş imkanı sunan ve çalışanları koruyan Sennett’in de ifade ettiği gibi otoriter baba imgesiyle özdeşleştirilmektedir. Diğer taraftan zengin, gösteriçi tüketim ve sınıfshal olarak ayrımcı davranışlarla özdeşleştirilmekte, bu açıdan daha olumsuz bir imaji temsil etmektedir.


Tüm bu ususlar “haksızlık” ve “adaletsizlik” kavramlarının çocuklara algısında oluşturduğu fakat bu kavramların belli bir yapısal sorunla ilişkilendirilmeip daha çok kişisel bir takım sıfatlarla açıklanlığı söyleyebilir. Bu nedenle üretim alanının homojenleştiriici söylemine karşı, üretim alanının dışını bir dizi sınıf karşıştırılarak almaktadır. Bu açıdan çıraklık ve onun bağlı olduğu küçük işletme kültürünün çelişkisiyi genelleştirme bakından negatif bir etkide bulunduğu iddia edilebilir. Bu durum, aynı zamanda çocuklara bir “biz” algısına dayanan sınıf kültürünün aynı bir yaşam tarzı
(distinctive way of life) bağlamında da kurulmasına engel olmaktadır. Zira sınıf konumları dahil olunan her alanda farklı deneyimlenmektedir.
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TEZİN TÜRÜ: Yüksek Lisans  ✔ Doktora  

1. Tezimin tamamından kaynak gösterilmek şartıyla fotokopi alınabilir.  ✔

2. Tezimin içindekiler sayfası, özet, indeks sayfalarından ve/veya bir bölümünden kaynak gösterilmek şartıyla fotokopi alınabilir.  

3. Tezimden bir bir (1) yıl süreyle fotokopi alınamaz.  
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