

PETTY COMMODITY PRODUCTION IN AGRICULTURE CANNOT SURVIVE  
WITHOUT WOMEN’S LABOUR: FROM THE STANDPOINT OF RURAL  
WOMEN’S LIFE EXPERIENCES IN TURKEY

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

BY

ÜLKÜ BATUROĞLU BALCI

IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS  
FOR  
THE DEGREE OF MASTER OF SCIENCE  
IN  
GENDER AND WOMEN’S STUDIES

SEPTEMBER 2019



Approval of the Graduate School of Social Sciences

---

Prof. Dr. Yaşar Kondakçı  
Director

I certify that this thesis satisfies all the requirements as a thesis for the degree of Master of Science.

---

Prof. Dr. Ayşe Saktanber  
Head of Department

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

---

Prof. Dr. Mehmet C. Ecevit  
Supervisor

**Examining Committee Members**

Prof. Dr. Metin Özuğurlu	(Ankara Uni., CEE)	_____
Prof. Dr. Mehmet C. Ecevit	(METU, SOC)	_____
Prof. Dr. Ceylan Tokluoğlu	(METU, SOC)	_____



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

**Name, Last name:** Ülkü Baturoğlu Balcı

**Signature :**

## ABSTRACT

### PETTY COMMODITY PRODUCTION IN AGRICULTURE CANNOT SURVIVE WITHOUT WOMEN’S LABOUR: FROM THE STANDPOINT OF RURAL WOMEN’S LIFE EXPERIENCES IN TURKEY

Baturoğlu Balcı, Ülkü

M. S., Department of Gender and Women’s Studies

Supervisor: Prof. Dr. Mehmet C. Ecevit

September 2019, 163 pages

This thesis analyses women’s distinctive and subjective resistance and/or adaptation characteristics to neoliberal transformations towards their own and household/family lives on the basis of the field research conducted in a village in Western Black Sea in Turkey from the approach of Feminist Standpoint Theory as a contemporary feminist critical theory. The thesis argues that such an analysis is helpful to understand the specificities of subjectivities of rural women, which is critical in grasping rural women’s partial knowledge. The focus of the study is limited to the neoliberal transformations in Turkey’s agriculture after 1980s. In consideration of the aim of the study, qualitative research method is used to generate data. Two differently organized semi-structured in-depth interviews are conducted with thirty-three women and eight agricultural experts who are working in the region. Furthermore, direct observation and participant observation are other techniques that are used during the field research.

**Keywords:** Feminist Epistemology, Feminist Methodology, Feminist Standpoint Theory, Petty Commodity Production, Rural Women

## ÖZ

### TARIMDA KÜÇÜK META ÜRETİMİ KADIN EMEĞİ OLMADAN VARLIĞINI SÜRDÜREMEZ: TÜRKİYE'DEKİ KIRSAL KADINLARIN DURUŞUNDAN YAŞAM DENEYİMLERİNİN ANLATISI

Baturoğlu Balcı, Ülkü

Yüksek Lisans, Toplumsal Cinsiyet ve Kadın Çalışmaları Anabilim Dalı

Tez Yöneticisi: Prof. Dr. Mehmet C. Ecevit

Eylül 2019, 163 sayfa

Bu tez, çağdaş feminist kritik teori içerisinde konumlanan Feminist Duruş Kuramı yaklaşımı ile Türkiye'nin Batı Karadeniz bölgesindeki bir köyde gerçekleştirilen alan araştırmasına dayanarak, kırsal alanda kadınların neoliberal dönüşümlere kendi ve hane/aile yaşam biçimlerine yönelik özgün ve öznel olarak göstermiş oldukları direniş ve/veya uyum özelliklerini incelemektedir. Bu tez, aynı zamanda, böyle bir analizin kırsal kadınların kısmi bilgisini anlamak için kritik olan kadınların öznelliklerinin özelliklerini anlamak için yararlı olduğunu savunmaktadır. Çalışmanın odağı, 1980'lerden sonra Türkiye'nin tarımında yaşanan neoliberal dönüşümler ile sınırlandırılmıştır. Çalışmanın amacı göz önüne alınarak, veri üretmek için nitel araştırma yöntemi kullanılmıştır. Otuz üç kadın ve bölgede çalışan sekiz tarım uzmanı ile birbirinden farklı şekillerde organize edilen yarı yapılandırılmış derinlemesine görüşmeler gerçekleştirilmiştir. Ayrıca, doğrudan gözlem ve katılımcı gözlem, saha araştırması sırasında kullanılan diğer araştırma teknikleridir.

**Anahtar Kelimeler:** Feminist Epistemoloji, Feminist Metodoloji, Feminist Duruş Kuramı, Küçük Meta Üretimi, Kırsal Kadınlar

To my grandmother  
In the name of all women who struggled, suffered and sacrificed



## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to offer my sincerest gratitude to Prof. Dr. Mehmet C. Ecevit to whom I owe shaping the problematics and every single idea expressed within this thesis. I would like to thank him for his advice, criticism, inspirational comments, guidance, friendship and confidence in my abilities and I also thank him for reminding me of my capabilities and keeping my self-confidence alive throughout this long journey.

I appreciate Prof. Dr. Metin Özügurlu not only his valuable comments, which opened a distinctive perspective and further questions for my future researches but also his valuable contributions to agrarian studies in Turkey that I gladly benefitted from. I am grateful to Prof. Dr. Ceylan Tokluoğlu for her stimulating comments and careful reading on my chapters.

I specially would like to thank Assist. Prof. Dr. Çağatay Topal for not only sparing his time to discuss his comments with me in person and motivating me to complete this thesis but also for his precious and continuous support, encouragement and motivation from the beginning to the end of this thesis. I wish to extend my thanks to Dr. Atakan Büke for his valuable comments about the scope of this thesis and I also thank to him for his help and support.

I am grateful to Hacettepe University Institute of Population Studies members for their understanding and support. I am so grateful to work with them for one year, this experience is one of the outstanding experiences in my life. Furthermore, my longest field study experience of Demographic and Health Survey helped me to keep patience and motivation in the face of every situation during the field of this thesis.

I am grateful to Turan Yılmaz for his help and support during my field study. I wish to express my special thanks to agriculture experts who work in Samsun Directorate of Provincial Agriculture and Forestry and Çarşamba Country Food, Agriculture and Animal Husbandry Department and participated in this research.

I would like to thank my volunteer assistants and guides as well as friends, Şengül Y. and İlknur S. during my field study in Akçatarla village. Without their help, I could not have even found my way in the village. I owe a debt of thanks to all the women living in Akçatarla village who participated in this research for their patience and help. They welcomed me as their sister, daughter and friend and they never refrained from helping me. They shared not only their time but also their life stories, experiences, knowledges. Without them, this study would not have been possible.

I am grateful to have a friend, a colleague and a sister like Fatma Tamtürk Eren who have always been patient, gentle and supportive. She always listened to my worries about both the thesis and my life in general and tried to draw me away from my fears. I also would like to thank my friends, Elif Ceren Bostancı, Merve Tankal and Nur Çöllü who have always supported and encouraged me during the study.

I have been extremely fortunate to have such a family. I owe a lot to my parents, Ethem and Necla for their everlasting support and endless love in my whole life. They have never been tired even for a moment in my academic journey and always believed in me. I owe my special gratitude to my grandmother, Saibe for her limitless support and love; I know she always cares about me. I also would like to thank my sister, İlknur and my brother, İlker for their great love, support and encouragement.

Lastly, I owe a special thanks to my life partner Uğur Balcı who has always been with my side from the beginning of this thesis process. I am very thankful to him for always being patient and standing by me during the stressful process of writing my thesis. With his continuously increasing love, this process has been bearable. Without him, I would be lost in this long and challenging journey.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

PLAGIARISM .....	iii
ABSTRACT .....	iv
ÖZ .....	v
DEDICATION .....	vi
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS .....	vii
TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	ix
LIST OF TABLES.....	xii
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS .....	xiii
CHAPTER	
1. INTRODUCTION .....	1
1.1. Background and Scope of the Study .....	1
1.2. Aims and Objectives of the Study .....	4
1.3. Research Problem(s) and Research Design of the Study .....	5
1.4. Expected Contributions of the Study .....	7
1.4.1. Theoretical Contributions .....	7
1.4.2. Methodological Contributions .....	8
1.4.3. Practical Contributions .....	8
1.5. Structure of the Thesis.....	8
2. THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK: THE SITUATION OF RURAL WOMEN AND FEMINIST STANDPOINT EPISTEMOLOGY .....	10
2.1. Introduction .....	10
2.2. The Situation of Rural Women.....	10
2.3. The Structure of Agriculture in Turkey.....	21
2.4. The Situation of Women in Rural Turkey.....	28
2.4.1. The Situation of Women in Rural Black Sea.....	35
2.5. Feminist Standpoint Theory: Towards the Analysis of Rural Women.....	37
2.5.1. Feminist Standpoint Epistemology .....	39
2.5.1.1. Knowledge Production .....	40
2.5.1.2. Political Stand .....	42

2.5.2. Rural Women as Subjects of Knowledge and Political Action.....	44
2.6. Summary .....	45
3. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY:	
FEMINIST STANDPOINT METHODOLOGY .....	46
3.1. Introduction.....	46
3.2. Feminist Standpoint Methodology .....	47
3.3. Finding Position as a Feminist Researcher .....	49
3.4. Process of Data Generation.....	51
3.4.1. Deciding the Field: Akçatarla Village .....	52
3.4.2. Entering the Field.....	54
3.4.2.1. Interview Process with Experts.....	55
3.4.2.2. Interview Process with Women .....	56
3.5. Profile of Participants .....	58
3.5.1. Introducing the Experts .....	59
3.5.2. Introducing the Women.....	59
3.6. Analysing the Data .....	64
3.7. Summary .....	65
4. ANALYSING THE FIELD: KNOWLEDGE AND POLITICS OF	
RURAL WOMEN IN AKÇATARLA VILLAGE .....	66
4.1. Introduction.....	66
4.2. Reflection of Changes in Agricultural Policies to Samsun Agriculture .....	67
4.2.1. Deterioration of Agriculture by the Hands of the State .....	67
4.2.2. Changing Land Policy of the State .....	69
4.2.3. Dissolution of Tobacco Production: Hazelnut as an Alternative .....	70
4.2.4. Hazelnut Production Abandoned to the Conscience of the Market.....	72
4.2.5. Effects of Structural Adjustment Policies on Rural Women.....	77
4.3. PCP Hardly Maintain Their Lives .....	78
4.3.1. Resistance Strategies of PCP .....	84
4.3.1.1. Changing Agricultural Products .....	85
4.3.1.2. Differentiation of Labour .....	89
4.3.1.3. Subsistence Production.....	93
4.3.2. Feminization of Production and Reproduction.....	94

4.4. Women in Rural Social Relations.....	102
4.4.1. Rural as a Way of Life.....	102
4.4.2. Experiences of Rural Women in Their Daily Lives.....	109
4.4.3. Rural Women’s Everyday Life Politics.....	114
4.5. What is the Future of Hazelnut Producers?.....	119
4.6. Summary .....	121
5. CONCLUSION .....	122
5.1. Overview of the Study.....	122
5.2. Research Contributions of the Study .....	123
5.2.1. Theoretical Contributions .....	123
5.2.2. Methodological Contributions .....	124
5.2.3. Practical Contributions .....	125
5.3. Research Limitations of the Study.....	126
5.3.1. Theoretical Limitations .....	126
5.3.2. Methodological Limitations.....	126
5.3.3. Practical Limitations.....	127
5.4. Recommendations for Future Studies .....	127
REFERENCES.....	129
APPENDICES	
APPENDIX A: HUMAN SUBJECTS ETHICS COMMITTEE APPROVAL ...	143
APPENDIX B: FIELD GUIDELINE FOR WOMEN INTERVIEWS/ KADIN MÜLAKATLARI İÇİN SAHA YÖNERGESİ.....	144
APPENDIX C: FIELD GUIDELINE FOR EXPERT INTERVIEWS/ UZMAN MÜLAKATLARI İÇİN SAHA YÖNERGESİ.....	148
APPENDIX D: TURKISH SUMMARY/TÜRKÇE ÖZET.....	150
APPENDIX E: THESIS PERMISSION FORM/TEZ İZİN FORMU.....	163

## LIST OF TABLES

<b>Table 3.1.</b> Profile of Experts .....	59
<b>Table 3.2.</b> Profile of Women.....	62

## LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

ARIP	Agricultural Reform Implementation Project
BAT	British American Tobacco
Çaykur	Çay İşletmeleri Genel Müdürlüğü
ÇKS	Çiftçi Kayıt Sistemi
DGD	Doğrudan Gelir Desteği
ELI	Export Led Industrialization
FAO	Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations
FDK	Feminist Duruş Kuramı
Fiskobirlik	Fındık Tarım Satış Kooperatifleri Birliği
FST	Feminist Standpoint Theory
IMF	International Monetary Fund
ISI	Import Substitution Industrialization
İBBS	İstatistiki Bölge Birimleri Sınıflandırması
KİT	Kamu İktisadi Teşebbüsleri
NUTS	Nomenclature of Territorial Units for Statistics
OKA	Orta Karadeniz Kalkınma Ajansı
PCP	Petty Commodity Production/Producers
TEKEL	Tütün, Tütün Mamulleri, Tuz ve Alkol İşletmeleri Genel Müdürlüğü
TMO	Toprak Mahsülleri Ofisi
TNC	Transnational Corporations
TSKB	Tarım Satış Kooperatifleri Birliği
TÜİK	Türkiye İstatistik Kurumu
WB	World Bank
WTO	World Trade Organization





## **CHAPTER I**

### **INTRODUCTION**

#### **1.1. Background and Scope of the Study**

Classical rural sociology was institutionalized within the boundaries of social sciences. The research agenda of classical rural sociology tended to focus on the results of the changes in the rural areas within the framework of the rural and urban continuum until the mid-1960s (Newby, 1983; Ecevit et. al., 2009). After the 1960s, ‘new rural sociology’ influenced by Marxism became a current debate in classical rural sociology. Newby and Buttel remarked that new rural sociology comprises the structure of agriculture within advanced capitalism, agricultural policies of the state, labour in agriculture, regional inequalities and agricultural ecology (as cited in Friedland, 1982, p. 60). However, it can be argued that both classical rural sociology and new rural sociology or sociology of agriculture problematize rural social relations within the boundary of modernism. This problematization depends on dichotomic, unified and homogenous categories; therefore, both classical rural sociology and sociology of agriculture universalize, rationalize and essentialize their subject matter. In their study titled “Evaluations on Agriculture-Food-Peasant Relations in the Narrowed Scope of Rural Sociology”, Ecevit et. al. (2009) argue that, on the one hand, Marxist approach generally focuses on the problem of transition and transformation, while on the other hand, other approaches have addressed a scope that focuses on change. However, the backward relations of change are not problematized within the broad scope of the capitalist society by different approaches in rural sociology. According to Ecevit and his friends (2009, p. 42), rural sociology studies have focused on the consequences of rural changes, rather than theoretically problematizing whether the observed changes in rural areas lead to a transformation in society, in general.

Contrary to modernist rural studies, various studies offer an expansion to postmodernist rural studies. According to van der Ploeg, who is one of the leading scholars in postmodern rural studies, rural sociology should be a science of narrative, recording narrations, documenting experiences, practices, insights and important biographies that currently are forgotten, neglected or deemed unrelated (1993, p. 256). Postmodern rural sociology differs from classical rural sociology epistemologically and methodologically. Epistemological significance of the postmodern rural studies lies in emphasizing the subjective character of the subject of knowledge. Özügürü (2013, p. 66) defines postmodern agricultural studies as an approach that emphasizes the differentiation of the peasantry, the exploitation of rural women's labour and the gender dimension. It should be noted that the contemporary modernity position<sup>1</sup> provides rural sociology with a significant theoretical standpoint in problematizing rural social relations. From the point of Ecevit et.al. (2009), contemporary rural sociology covers rural relations not only on the basis of agriculture and peasant relations, but also on the ground of agriculture and food relations.

Turkey has experienced its most dramatic rural transformation in the 1980s due to neoliberal structural adjustment policies. Industrialization strategies have changed from import substitution industrialization (ISI) to export led industrialization (ELI). As a result, production relations have changed from subsistence production to commodity production over time. According to Özügürü (2013, p. 20), from the 1980s onwards, when agriculture experienced its most dramatic transformation, it remained out of the analytical interest of the social sciences disciplines in Turkey. Within this limited interest of social sciences in Turkey, even though researches have been carried out on rural women and urban-migrated women, daily lives and experiences of rural women have received limited attention.

On the northern part of Turkey, the Black Sea region, village structures are different from the rest of Turkey because of the geographical feature of the region. Within the

---

<sup>1</sup> Contemporary modernity position of rural sociology has been discussed by M. C. Ecevit throughout his rural sociology lectures at Middle East Technical University.

Black Sea region, high mountains and large forests make the connection between the coastal and inland areas difficult. Gündüz Hoşgör and Smits (2007) argue that the North of Turkey was connected relatively late to the market economy because of its geographical features. Agriculture is still one of the main sources of income in the rural Black Sea. According to WYG's report (2016), the share of employment in the agricultural sector in the region (39,3%) was well above the average of Turkey (20,6%).

Gender division of labour is a matter in Western Black Sea as in the other rural parts of Turkey. In the Western Black Sea region, women were limited to private domains, where their boundaries could be a household or a village, while men began to participate in broader economic relations that crossed the village boundaries, which depends on sexual division of labour (Gündüz Hoşgör & Suzuki Him, 2016) due to the agricultural transformation in Turkey since the 1980s. While women are identified with reproductive labour such as unpaid household labour, child and elderly care; men are identified with productive labour which is defined as wage labour outside the household. In addition to women's unpaid household labour, agriculture and husbandry are generally under women's responsibility. According to data (TÜİK, 2018), both the employment and labour force participation rates of women in the Western Black Sea region, respectively in the ratio of 35,9% and 39,2%, rank second after those of the Eastern Black Sea region, which ranks in the first place with the ratio of 37,7% and 40,4% in Turkey respectively. Nevertheless, rural women's labour remains usually unpaid and invisible due to the patriarchal social structure in rural Turkey.

Petty commodity production is the common form of production in rural Black Sea and it continues to exist on the basis of family/household labour. Hazelnut is one of the primary products in the rural areas of Western Black Sea and it maintains its existence on the ground of family/household labour. Women's and children's labour are in the category of unpaid family labour in terms of hazelnut production. According to FAO (2017), Turkey produces more than 70 % of the hazelnut produced in the world. Samsun ranks second in the production of hazelnut in Turkey

(OKA, 2018) and 39,6 % of hazelnut is produced in the Çarşamba district (TÜİK, 2018).

## **1.2. Aims and Objectives of the Study**

This study attempts to understand the position of women in rural social relations. As I discussed in the previous sub-section, contemporary rural sociology has expanded its content by including some concepts of sociology of agriculture such as ‘petty commodity production’ and ‘underdevelopment’ in the discussion and by incorporating the literature of the sociology of food and agriculture such as ‘agri-food relations’, ‘transnational corporations’ and ‘commodity chains.’ Therefore, the new meaning of the rural has a wide spectrum as it includes both agricultural productions and food relations<sup>2</sup>. In this study, however, the relation of agriculture and food<sup>3</sup> is not examined since the scope of the rural in the study is reduced to hazelnut production in order to understand women’s position in the Western Black Sea region. It should be emphasized that the aim of the study is not to understand the changes in hazelnut production, but it is to rather understand the changes in women’s lives in the Western Black Sea region by focusing on the post-1980 period.

As I indicated in the previous sub-section, 1980 is a critical period to understand the rural transformation in Turkey. The reason why the historical focus of this study is reduced to the post-1980 period is that Turkey is one of the primary examples of the so-called neoliberalism; therefore, focusing on the period of post-1980 is crucial to understand the neoliberal change and/or transformation in Turkey’s agriculture. In parallel with this argument, this thesis focuses on the changing dynamics of women’s lives during the neoliberal change and/or transformation in Turkey’s agriculture after 1980.

Feminist Standpoint Theory provides the theoretical framework of this study. It should be noted that epistemology, methodology and ontology cannot be considered

---

<sup>2</sup> This argument has been developed by M. C. Ecevit during our meetings.

<sup>3</sup> See Büke (2008) for a critical evaluation of the conceptualization of food and agriculture sociology in the case of Turkey.

separate from the theory. Therefore, Feminist Standpoint is the foundation of epistemology, methodology and ontology of this study. From the Feminist Standpoint perspective, knowledge should come from the oppressed since the knowledge of both the oppressor and the oppressed exists within the knowledge of the oppressed. Within the traditional rural sociology, rural women are marginalized as a subject of knowledge; therefore, this study aims to position women as a subject of knowledge. From the point of Feminist Standpoint methodology, women are placed at the centre of the research in order to question the problems in the study since women have their own stories and experiences as subjects.

It should be underlined that women do not refer to a unified and homogenous category according to the FST. One of the methodological aims of the study is to analyse women's lives and experiences from their multiple perspectives. The multiple, conditional, situational, locational, contextual, contingent, reflexive, embodied and constituted character of knowledge indicates to partial knowledge. Meaningful differences between those we think similar are significant because similarities refer to partial knowledge. This study aims to discover the partial knowledge of women.

Feminist Standpoint methodology necessitates a non-hierarchical and self-reflexive research process; therefore, another methodological aim of this study is to constitute a non-hierarchical and self-reflexive research process. In the light of this aim, I consciously use subjective language throughout the thesis to reflect my own subjectivity.

### **1.3. Research Problem(s) and Research Design of the Study**

The aims and objectives of the study are deepened in the light of the research problem of the study. The main research problem of this study is that women have demonstrated distinctive and subjective resistance against and/or adaptation characteristics to neoliberal transformations through their own selves and family lives over the last few decades. Within the scope of the main research problem, the sub-research problems of the study are as follows;

- The patterns of labour use in the family/household have differentiated between men and women in rural areas. As a result, production and reproduction characteristics of the family/household have been significantly affected.
- Women's working conditions have differentiated in the rural areas; (1) the work-time of women have increased and their work has intensified, (2) the division of labour within the family/household has differentiated against women when compared to the position of men within the household, (3) the necessity of full-time or seasonal labour outside the family/household has increased.
- There have been significant changes in the annual hazelnut production cycle in the last twenty years. Moreover, changes in the composition of the product within the last few decades have been a necessity.
- With the assumption that rural producers are petty commodity producers, the income of rural families/households has not been able to reach a level that can raise the living standards of the family/household and enable their investment in production.
- Rural women have considered themselves indispensable in every aspect of life, especially in the production and reproduction of the family/household.
- The need for any kind of solidarity has become more and more of an indispensable element of life.
- Feminization of family/household labour has negatively affected women's lives.
- Rural women have positioned and experienced neoliberal transformations in their lives differently; and thus, they have reacted differently to neoliberal transformations in the last few decades.

In order to question the research problems of this study, the case study was conducted in Samsun located in the Western Black Sea region by using qualitative research as a tool. The case study is designed in two parts; in the first part of the case study, I conducted eight semi-structured interviews with agricultural experts who are working in Samsun Directorate of Provincial Agriculture and Forestry (Samsun İl Tarım ve Orman Müdürlüğü) and Çarşamba Country Food, Agriculture and Animal Husbandry department (Çarşamba İlçe Gıda, Tarım ve Hayvancılık Müdürlüğü). Moreover, direct observation is carried out during the expert interviews.

In the second part of the case study, I conducted thirty-three in-depth semi-structured interviews were conducted with women living in the Akçatarla village located in the Çarşamba district of Samsun. In addition to the in-depth semi-structured interviews with women, I attended some informal gatherings called as “gün” and family dinners upon the invitations of women, so participant observation was also carried out during the field. In both of parts of the case study, the snowball sample selection technique was used to determine participants.

#### **1.4. Expected Contributions of the Study**

Feminist Standpoint Theory as a theoretical framework of this study will provide theoretical, methodological and practical contributions on the subject matter. Its paradigmatic position, methodological assumptions and arguments related with politics will contribute to feminist rural studies.

##### **1.4.1. Theoretical Contributions**

One of the main arguments of the thesis is that rural social relations should be conceptualized through the feminist perspective in order to understand women's position within the rural areas. Through this argument, this study differentiates from classical rural sociology in which rural women are marginalized and this study examines rural social relations by giving an epistemological significance to rural women as subjects of knowledge. Therefore, this study will contribute to both the growing literature of feminist studies in general and feminist rural studies in particular.

This study differentiates from classical rural sociology, which is positioned in modernity, because of its strong criticism towards modernist thinking. This study is not aimed to universalize, rationalize and essentialize women's knowledge; it is aimed to understand different positions of women within a similar context. On the other hand, it does not mean that this study is located in a postmodern paradigm. Although postmodern paradigm analyses social relations on the ground of language, language is positioned as a structure from the feminist standpoint perspective. The position of the FST as neither in modernity nor in postmodernity provides an

intermediate position, contemporary modernity paradigmatic position<sup>4</sup>. Therefore, the main theoretical contribution of the thesis is understanding rural women's position in Turkey from the contemporary position.

#### **1.4.2. Methodological Contributions**

This study handles rural women as a subject of knowledge without giving an essential position; therefore, women's experiences and life stories provide a methodological starting point. The FST argues that "starting thought from women's lives" and their experiences provides an epistemologically privileged knowledge. In consideration of this argument, the methodological contribution of this study is conducting a field study by using Feminist Standpoint methodology.

#### **1.4.3. Practical Contributions**

With the help of the feminist methodology, women's life stories and their different experiences contribute to enrich both feminist methodology and feminist politics throughout the fieldwork. Conducting a fieldwork from the feminist standpoint creates an opportunity to constitute a non-hierarchical sharing environment and solidarity among us since the FST argues that we learn a lot from each other as women.

#### **1.5. Structure of the Thesis**

The thesis is mainly divided into five chapters that expand and develop the arguments that are briefly discussed above. This chapter, as the first chapter of the thesis, aims to give a brief introduction about the background and scope of the study; the aims, objectives and research problems of the study; and the expected contributions with respect to the theoretical, methodological and practical contributions of the study.

---

<sup>4</sup> Contemporary modernity position of the FST has been developed by M. C. Ecevit and theoretical discussions have taken place during both Sociology of Family lectures and our Seminar meetings in which M. C. Ecevit and his postgraduate students have periodically met.



Following the introduction chapter, the second chapter involves prominent discussions on rural women in the world, especially in the so-called underdeveloped countries, as well as relevant discussions in rural studies in Turkey. The general structure and historical change of agriculture are also within the scope of Chapter Two. In the last section of the following chapter, I will provide the theoretical stand of this study. Feminist Standpoint epistemology will be elaborated with the relevant concepts of this study in the light of knowledge production and political stand.

Chapter Three provides the methodological ground of the study, clarifies data generation process, underlines the significant points from the field and explains the process of the analysis of the data generated from the field. In the first instance, methodological arguments of the Feminist Standpoint Theory and its methodological criticism of modernity will be presented. After providing the methodological ground of the study, data generation process will be clarified in detail. I will explain which qualitative research techniques I have used, how I decided on the village, the general profile of the village, my subjective experiences as a researcher, the profile of respondents and the process of the analysis.

In the fourth chapter, I will present the generated data, its analysis and interpretation along with the main findings of the research in consideration of the research problems of the study. Firstly, I am going to elaborate on the reflection of agricultural transformation on Samsun's agriculture. Secondly, I will analyse the effects of neoliberal transformation of agriculture on PCP families living in the Akçatarla village. Thirdly, I will examine the effects of rural transformation on women's daily lives in PCP families. Lastly, I will question the future of hazelnut producers with the position of women in PCP families.

In the last chapter, I will conclude the study with a brief summary of the main discussions in the fourth chapter. In addition to this brief summary, I will introduce the theoretical, methodological and practical contributions and the limitations of this research. And lastly, I will present recommendations for future studies.

## **CHAPTER II**

### **THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK: THE SITUATION OF RURAL WOMEN AND FEMINIST STANDPOINT EPISTEMOLOGY**

#### **2.1. Introduction**

Rural sociology has examined rural women by not attributing an epistemological significance on the ground of feminist approaches that consider women's inequalities, so rural sociology has often been far from revealing both rural relations and the position of women within these unequal relations (Ecevit et. al., 2009, pp. 43-44). In order to understand women's position within the rural, social relations will be conceptualized through the Feminist Standpoint's perspective.

In this chapter, I attempt to describe the situation of rural women in the so-called underdeveloped countries and in Turkey respectively. In doing so, I will focus on the major concepts that are related to rural women in the existing literature, such as paid labour, unpaid household labour and the sexual division of labour in order to keep the two sides of literature in a parallel line. Before explaining the situation of rural women in Turkey, the structure of agriculture and major changes that occurred in agriculture after 1980 will be examined. In the last sub-section of this chapter, the Feminist Standpoint Theory will be discussed as a theoretical foundation of this study on the basis of knowledge production and political stand.

#### **2.2. The Situation of Rural Women**

The studies about rural women mostly concentrate on the sexual division of labour, unpaid family/household labour, wage labour, subsistence production, alternative agriculture, and the politics of food and empowerment. Rural women in especially the late capitalist or the so-called Third World Countries play a significant role as

farmers, labourers, entrepreneurs and reproducers; therefore, it can be said that women are essential for agriculture and rural economies.

According to 'The Role of Women in Agriculture' report of FAO, almost 43 percent of the agricultural labour force is comprised of women globally and in developing countries (2011, p. 1). The female share of the agricultural labour force is higher in Asia and the average range is from 35 percent to almost 50 percent (FAO, 2011, p. 4). In sub-Saharan Africa, almost 50 percent of the agricultural labour force consists of women (FAO, 2011, p. 4). According to the FAO report, the most significant source of employment in South Asia and in sub-Saharan Africa is agriculture for women by a wide range and agriculture is so much more significant for women than men with regard to employment in Asia, Africa and the Middle East (2011, p. 5). Women's contributions to the rural and agricultural economies are indispensable in all developing countries. FAO (2011) reports that women are over-represented in the rural parts of some areas and countries whereas it is stated that global and also national data from many of the countries do not support a general claim of increasing women's dominance in agriculture.

De Schutter (2013, p. 1) argues that due to limited mobility and time constraints of women, the agrarian transition is deeply gendered particularly in developing countries. Unlike women, men are more likely to leave agricultural work and seek wage employment or other income-generating activities (De Schutter, 2013, p. 2). In addition, according to the FAO report, women make essential contributions to the well-being of rural households and agriculture in and beyond developing countries although many of the activities that women participate in, such as agricultural crops, livestock, preparing foods for family, working as an agricultural wage labourer, or caring for and maintaining their family, are not identified as "economically active employment" in national accounts (2011, p. 2). De Schutter clarifies that household members working on the family farm to produce for subsistence rather than for the market would not enter official statistics in many countries since official statistics calculate the contribution of the country's GDP (2013, p. 2). Statistics are often unreliable because women's labour is mostly informal and undeclared, and the

underreporting of women's employment in the agriculture depends on women's labour in subsistence agriculture (De Schutter, 2013, p. 29).

Women are responsible for many of the household and child-rearing activities and the nature of these tasks, such as caring for children and the elderly, necessitates women to stay close to their home in many societies. Furthermore, women face a work burden in rural labour markets that men do not, so women's choices for wage work is limited. As a result of this, women are also more likely to work in part-time jobs and in the informal sector that is characterized by low wages, high job insecurity, poor labour standards but provide more flexibility (FAO, 2011, p. 16).

De Schutter states that the discussion of feminization is used for industrial labour initially, and later on applied to agriculture (as cited in Upreti, Ghale, Shivatoki & Acharya, 2018, p. 2). It is generally argued that "women predominate in the agricultural sector" or "women are rapidly gaining a predominant position"; which displays that rural areas and agriculture are becoming 'feminized' (FAO, 2011, p. 27). In the background paper for the world development report 2008 titled "Feminization of Agriculture: Trends and Driving Forces", Lastarria-Cornhiel (2006) states that feminization of agriculture is constituted in two types: the first is "feminization of agricultural labour" and the other is "feminization of farm management". While feminization of agricultural labour refers to the increasing engagement of women in the agricultural work on a specific farm, feminization of farm management implies increasing decision-making capacities of women about agricultural production such as which types of crops to produce, the quantity of inputs to use and the price of the product which is produced to sell (De Brauw, J. Huang, Zhang & Rozelle, 2013, p. 690). It is implied that managerial feminization is defined in relation to a female-headed household because of the difficulty to measure (De Brauw et. al., 2013, 690).

Scholars argue that a debate called "feminization of agriculture" takes place in many areas such as Asia (De Brauw, 2003; Vepa, 2005; Srivastava, 2011; Y. Huang, 2012; Maharjan et. al., 2012; De Brauw et. al., 2013; Tamang et. al., 2014; Song & Vernooy, 2017; Upreti et. al., 2018), Africa (Lastarria-Cornhiel, 2006; O'laughlin,

2008; Ajani & Igbokwe, 2011; Manzanera-Ruiz; 2016) and Latin America (Lastarria-Cornhiel, 2006).

In Nepal, the feminization of agriculture has been emphasized by many scholars. According to Upreti and his friends, feminization became apparent via a shift from subsistence farming to wage labour in smallholder agricultural production (Upreti et. al., 2018). In Nepal's agriculture, particularly in cash crops, the transition from subsistence farming to wage labour-based agriculture, such as cardamom and ginger, is observed in relation to the participation of women in production (Upreti et. al., 2018, p. 2). It is argued that the transition in general and particularly high-value agriculture in Nepal regarding the participation of women is affected by different factors as follows: (1) armed conflict, (2) changing roles of women owing to the male shift caused from the armed conflict, (3) large scale male out-migration for work, (4) awareness on the issues of gender mainstreaming and inclusion of women, (5) policies addressing gender concerns by the government and (6) the new constitution guaranteeing minimum 33% representation of women in all state institutions (Upreti et.al., 2018, p. 10).

Another case study conducted in the two districts at the hills of Nepal, Baitadi and Syangja, concentrates on changing workloads, roles of women, access to resources and household decision making dynamics in order to analyse the impact of male out-migration on the gender relations in the rural Nepal (Maharjan, Bauer & Knerr, 2012). Their findings support that male out-migration causes either women's empowerment or disempowerment because of their broadened and deepened involvement in rural Nepal. It is argued that although feminization of Nepal's agriculture is on the increase, there is no significant difference between migrant and non-migrant households in each aspect that is concentrated on in the study (Maharjan et. al. 2012, p. 121). For instance, Maharjan and her colleagues argue that household members of migrant households work more than non-migrant households in Baitadi although the workload of the household is greater in non-migrant households than in migrant households in Syangja (Maharjan et. al., 2012, p. 114).

Another study, which is conducted in two mid-hill districts of Nepal is focusing not only on agricultural practices but also on food security in order to understand the

effects of male out-migration on women's role in the household and the local community in general (Tamang, Paudel & Shrestha, 2014, p. 21). It is indicated that the feminization of agriculture affects both the social and economic spheres. In the social sphere, feminization of agriculture causes social inequality for women while adding the burden of agricultural work on male dominant technologies, institutions and policies; in the economic sphere, underutilization of agriculture causes food insecurity, chronic malnutrition of the agriculture-dependent poor and marginalized communities, and dependency of economic opportunities (Tamang et. al., 2014, p. 30). The researchers agreed that Nepalese agriculture is being feminized; as a result of this, in order to minimize the prevailing gap of gender inequality in agriculture, women's empowerment is the principal basis for referring to the feminization of agriculture (Tamang et. al., 2014, p. 30).

Sekher and Ghosh highlight that the Indian case differs from East Asia (as cited in Vepa, 2005, p. 2563). Srivastava (2011, p. 341) indicates that more than half of India's workforce worked in agriculture as their primary occupation. Although women have participated and been engaged in agriculture at a high number from past to present, it has not been sufficiently acknowledged and registered (Srivastava, 2011, p. 341). According to Vepa, outmigration of men from low paid agriculture to high paid industry causes feminization of agriculture in India (2005, p. 2563). Therefore, the number of women in agricultural activities, such as farming, livestock, fisheries and forestry, rather than in non-agricultural activities has increased (Vepa, 2005, p. 2564). In the same manner, Srivastava states that feminization of agriculture has occurred in India owing to increasing male out-migration and women's high participation in agriculture (2011, p. 341). The data from National Sample Surveys (NSS) in India supports the arguments and states that the number of women workers in agriculture is more than male workers in India (Srivastava, 2011, p. 342).

Ajani and Igbokwe examine the reasons behind the new roles that have been assigned to women in agriculture and the implications in their study about the feminization of agriculture in Nigeria (2011, p. 33). According to Ajani and Igbokwe, most of the women farmers have taken up new roles, which were not normally associated with them in the past, owing to increasing economic pressures.

As a result of the new roles which are shouldered by women even though they were traditionally male activities in the past, women's responsibilities and workloads increase in Nigeria (2011, p. 37). Thus, they underline that the results of the continuing gender inequalities are even more important than before. Because of the feminization of labour, it is argued that women-headed households increase mainly in Africa and some studies associate women-headed households with rural poverty. One of the studies in Southern Africa conducted by O'laughlin (2008) claims that it cannot be assumed that women-headed households are more likely to be poorer than men-headed households, in other words, it does not matter if the household is headed by men or women. O'laughlin claims that the reason behind the common level rural of poverty is the polarization of agrarian production and the marginalisation of smallholder cultivation (2008).

In Huang's study about rural China, it is argued that the feminization of agriculture thesis in China is partially correct (2012). On the one hand, some scholars (Bossen, 2002; Croll, 1983, 1994, 1995; Davin, 1999; Jacka, 1997; Judd, 1994; Ren & Dong, 1997; De Brauw et. al., 2013) argue that feminization of agriculture has been occurring in China (as cited in Y. Huang, 2012, p. 20). On the other hand, other scholars argue that the feminization of agriculture has not been taking place in China as claimed (De Brauw, 2003; De Brauw et. al., 2008). While De Brauw and his friends (De Brauw, 2003; De Brauw et. al., 2008) claim that the feminization of agriculture is occurring neither in feminization of labour nor in feminization of management in rural China, it is argued that "agricultural feminization is indeed occurring in rural China" (De Brauw et.al., 2013, p. 702). Huang suggests that both sides of the debate are correct due to their difference in context (2012, p. 20). From the late 1970s to the late 1990s, the feminization of agriculture in rural China has occurred due to the participation of middle-aged men "from the post-revolutionary baby boomer generation" in non-farming occupations. However, the decisions of young people "from the family planning generation" to find non-farming occupations cause the ageing of the farming population (Y. Huang, 2012, p. 30). Therefore, Huang argues that agriculture in rural China has experienced a change from the "feminization of agriculture" to the "ageing of the farming population" (2012, p. 29). On the other hand, Song and Vernooy remark that women and elderly people have

become key agricultural agents since both debates about the feminization of agriculture and ageing of agriculture are evident and also increasing in China (2017, p. 25).

In the background paper for the world development report 2008 entitled “Feminization of Agriculture: Trends and Driving Forces”, Lastarria-Cornhiel (2006) argues that women’s participation as wage workers or family workers in income-generating activities or cash cropping by broadening and deepening their labour in agricultural production contributes to their empowerment and improves their status in the household. In a similar manner, Upreti and his colleagues argue that women’s roles within the household, community and society are redefined because of political changes such as accession in social affairs, participation in cardamom producers’ group, leadership roles in the community, access to financial resources and improved income generation capacities, and these changes have contributed to women’s empowerment in the case of Nepal, as well (Upreti et. al., 2018, p. 10). In the case of India, Srivastava claims that feminization of agriculture may have an empowering potential for women who have been enchained by patriarchal norms and structures for years while they join the workforce, overcome its challenges and take advantage of its potentiality. Moreover, it is argued that if women’s potential is promoted, gender inequalities are reduced and the collective action of women is strengthened; then, the empowering potential of the feminization of agriculture can be realized in India (2011, p. 358). Another study conducted in Northern Tanzania demonstrates that some women overcome their disadvantaged position through their association with multiple types of collective action groups or networks although the shift to market economy affects the nature of production relations, deepening inequalities in gender relations and the position of women (Manzanera-Ruiz, Lizarraga & Mwaipopo, 2016, p. 143). According to their findings, women in tomato cultivation groups in Northern Tanzania reach a level of individual empowerment, share their awareness of the inequality in the access to cash crops and respond by grouping with women who share similar interests (Manzanera-Ruiz, et. al., 2016, pp. 167-168). Even if they cannot challenge and change the patriarchal agricultural system and market liberalization, the intermediate level of empowerment exists (Manzanera-Ruiz, et. al., 2016, p. 168). In a similar manner, Agarwal argues that individual



women can generate a collective group by working not only for themselves, but also for the larger public good (2014, p. 18).

Bieri states that the feminization of agriculture debate is overgeneralized, the gender dynamics in “what has been referred to as new ruralities” are insufficiently comprehended and the epistemological potential of the debate has also not been explored (2014, pp. 281-287). Chant remarks that feminization contributes to stereotyping simplifications rather than addressing the complexity of gendered experience (as cited in Bieri, 2014, p. 283). It is argued that the feminization of agriculture debate focuses on the quantitative shift between the representation of women and men rather than focusing on a qualitative transformation, such as flexibilization, job security or workloads (Bieri, 2014, p. 287).

Instead of ‘feminization of agriculture’, ‘masculinization of agriculture’ is discussed by some scholars. The argument of masculinisation of agriculture due to accessing off-farm employment of rural women in many of the Western European countries is newly discussed in the rural sociology literature approached by Brandth (as cited in Safiliou-Rotschild, Dimopoulou, Lagiogianni & Sotiropoulou, 2007, p. 409). The masculinisation of agriculture identifies with commercialisation and raised professionalisation of agriculture via new technologies, machinery and skills that women do not easily access (Safiliou-Rotschild et. al., 2007, p. 409). Moreover, Brandth argues that the commercialisation and professionalization of agriculture is the “push factor” that has marginalized women in agriculture while the accessibility of employment outside of the farm is the “pull factor” for women (as cited in Safiliou-Rotschild et. al., 2007, p. 409). According to Edris (1999, p. 38), displacement and marginalization of women because of increasing masculinization of agriculture is one of the well-known facts about women in agriculture in Asia-Pacific. Edris (1999) argues that the modernization of agriculture, which refers to the development of agricultural technology and commercialization of agriculture, causes marginalization of women’s work and displacement of women’s labour owing to limited employment opportunities for women.

Different from the feminization of agriculture debate mainly discussed in Asia, Africa and Latin America; politics of food, alternative agriculture, ecofeminism and

reconstructing gender identity are also discussed by many scholars in order to understand rural women's lives. To understand the notion of empowerment of women in agriculture, Wright and Annes (2016) are focused on the subject of sustainable agriculture in North America, differing from scholars who approach from the angle of feminization of agriculture. According to Wright and Annes, "the growth in alternative or sustainable agriculture has opened opportunities for women to not only resist the hegemony of conventional farming system but to engage in agriculture via avenues historically denied them" (2016, p. 548). Trauger sees "sustainable agriculture as new spaces of empowerment and resistance" (as cited in Wright & Annes, 2016, p. 549). In a similar manner, Hall and Mogyorod (2007) claim that alternative tendency towards organic farming carries the potential to change gender relations in agriculture. However, it is argued that women make significant progress only if some changes take place on the topic of production which is significant for women's involvement and power sharing. As a criticism on alternative and organic agriculture, the feminist perspective is still missing and the alternative/sustainable agriculture debate needs to involve a feminist perspective according to Allen and Sachs, (as cited in Chiappe & Flora, 1998, p. 373). It is argued that without women's standpoint, the sustainable agriculture paradigm is incomplete. Therefore, narratives of women, which express their partial and situated standpoints on sustainable agriculture, indicate a commitment to social change that links action to their vision (Chiappe & Flora, 1998).

Allen and Sachs (2007) focus on gender relations in the contemporary agri-food system in their study entitled "Women and Food Chains: The Gendered Politics of Food". It is argued that women have little power to control resources and hold decisions in the food industry and also on food policy although women carry out the majority of food-related works and spend an important part of the day occupied and preoccupied with food. Furthermore, these responsibilities of women contribute as a key component to their exploitation, oppression and their resistance (Allen and Sachs, 2007, p. 15). Avakian and Haber have demanded a "new field of feminist food studies" and stress that "the connections between women's food work in the labour market, women's responsibility for food-related work in the home and their relationship with eating must be studied and adequately theorized" (as cited in Allen

& Sachs, 2007, pp. 1-2). Moreover, in Dolan's study (2004) on the fresh vegetable commodity chain, which links Kenyan producers with United Kingdom consumers, it is argued that the commodity chain is dependent upon the gendered and insecure forms of employment it creates while it provides significant employment opportunities in Kenya. According to Ramamurthy (2000), patriarchal ideologies of gender and control of women's labour have been central to socioeconomic transformations embedded in the globalization of the agri-food system. Ramamurthy (2000) approaches the agrarian political economy and feminist theory together and suggests a methodology:

feminist commodity chain research that not only locates, and therefore incorporates 'women' in empirical analysis but extends the analysis by allowing space for rethinking how women's experience of globalization are linked, negotiated, contested, resisted, and changed so that the very categories 'women' and 'work' are reconstituted (Ramamurthy, 2000, p. 552).

Gidarakou (1999) argues that a limited number of studies focus on young people's, and especially women's, perceptions and attitudes towards agricultural employment and living in rural areas. Gidarakou's study (1999) focuses on young women's attitude towards agricultural employment and the choice of living in the country in Greece. The findings of her study indicate that young women prefer to move to urban or semi-urban areas rather than farm employment (Gidarakou, 1999, p. 157).

Chen (2004) focuses the division of labour between the mother-in-law and daughter-in-law in rural China to understand work arrangements among them and states that work arrangements occur as a result of the changes in the sexual division of labour, not due to patriarchal relations. According to Chen, the daughter-in-law's position did not change when the mother-in-law lost her power as the "deputy patriarch" in the household and the male member of the household do not have to adjust their roles and are still the biggest beneficiaries (2004, p. 577).

Helene Oldrup focuses on the reconstruction of gender identity in Danish agriculture in her study published in 1999. Oldrup (1999) argues that the need for labour on the farm has reduced because of the modernization process in Danish society; thus, many of the women work in the labour market and their employment is an important part of their identity. The focus of her study is on women who live in rural areas, but

particularly women who are working in the labour market instead of working on agriculture, and who only help with the work on the farm from time to time in order to understand their identity (Oldrup, 1999, p. 344). According to Oldrup, women's identities change over time because of their experiences, backgrounds and resources with which they interpret their situations, so no single identity exists among them (1999, p. 355). Lauretis states that the "category of 'women working off the farm' is also a fluid and flexible category, which refers to differences between women as well as in women" (as cited in Oldrup, p. 355). Therefore, women who are working outside the farm while living on a farm share the same dilemmas even though they do not interpret them in the same way; therefore, the situation gives women a collective identity (Oldrup, 1999, p. 356).

From a different point of view, the study conducted in Greece focuses on rural women in local agri-food production and questions women's perception of their business as supplementary for their family income or as a point for their professional career (Anthopoulou, 2010). Another study is focused on the relationship between gender self-perception and agriculture (Smyth, Swendener & Kazyak, 2018). This study inquires how and why women get into, stay and leave agriculture and how women's presence affects themselves and their families (Smyth et. al., 2018). They argue that in spite of women's involvement, agriculture has long been involved with masculinity (Smyth et. al., 2018, p. 673). Saugeres approaches gendered discourses of embodiment in French agriculture and argues that maintaining and the legitimization of women's subordinate position as farmers depend on the discursive representation of women's and men's bodies in agriculture (2002). In a similar manner with Smyth and her friends (2018), Saugeres argues that women who work in agriculture find themselves marginalized in modern agriculture since agriculture is still defined as an essentially masculine field where socially constructed masculine characteristics are valued (2002, p. 641).

Bina Agarwal (1992, p. 119) states that "ecofeminism in the West, and especially in the United States conceptualizes the link between gender and environment primarily in the ideological term". Agarwal (1992) offers the term "feminist environmentalism" as an alternative formulation to ecofeminism and this alternative

approach must be transformational instead of welfarist (p. 151). According to Agarwal, feminist environmentalism as an alternative transformational approach would “concern both how gender relations and relations between people and the non-human world are conceptualized, and how they are concretized in terms of the distribution of property, power, and knowledge, and in the formulation of development policies and programs” (1992, p. 153).

The data from the study in Kastoria shows that feminization of agriculture spreads to commercial agriculture in large farms and it is argued that women farmers constitute the basis not only in Kastoria, but also in Greek agriculture since the proportion of active women farmers is high (Safilidou-Rotschild et. al., 2007, p. 420).

Ravazi (2009) focuses on the contributions of feminist scholars to agrarian studies in her study entitled “Engendering the Political Economy of Agrarian Change”. According to Ravazi, feminist studies has questioned some of the dominant orthodoxies in agrarian studies by way of conceptualizing households and their link with economic and political structures, deepening the analysis of rural markets and understanding the role and limitations of various institutional arrangements for the management of resource (2009, p. 197).

### **2.3. The Structure of Agriculture in Turkey**

In order to divide agriculture in Turkey into periods as before and after 1980, the significant methodological point is integrated as both similarities and differences in its scope (Ecevit et. al., 2009, p. 49). From this perspective; similarities, differences and significant aspects of agriculture in Turkey of both the periods before and after 1980 will be summarized; however, the period after 1980 will be detailed as compared to the period before 1980 due to the scope of this study.

Ulukan (2009) classifies the period before the 1980s in Turkey’s agriculture on the ground of Turkey’s classification as follows; the first period is social construction process and agricultural structures (1923-1939), the second period is the war economy period (1939-1945), the third period is integration with the restructured world economy (1945-1960), and the last period is import substitution accumulation

period (1960-1980). In accordance with Ulukan's classification (2009), some significant aspects of agriculture before 1980 will be highlighted.

In the first period, social construction process and agricultural structures (1923-1939), agriculture was determined as the primary sector to provide development and, thus, policies to raise agricultural production were implemented. In accordance with this aim; implementation of land reform, public production farms, cooperatives and village institutes were introduced respectively (Günaydın, 2010, p. 161).

In war economy period (1939-1945), conditions of war economy accelerated capital accumulation due to agriculture (Köymen, 2009). The significance of war economy period (1939-1945) is about land reform that was implemented in 1945 as "Çiftçiyi Topraklandırma Kanunu". As a result of the implementation of land reform, publicly owned land or some marginalized lands were distributed to the landless or small landowners instead of the landlords' lands (Aydın, 2018, p. 230).

In integration with the restructured world economy period (1945-1960), Marshall Aid Plan is central in order to understand the new economic model, which differs from the 1930s import substitution industrialization model's (Günaydın, 2010) focus on agriculture in Turkey. As a result of this, with the use of modern inputs, especially tractors, mechanization and capitalization of agriculture have accelerated and, thus, agriculture has entered a widespread and rapid development process (Aydın, 2018; Günaydın, 2010). Establishment of individual property in agricultural land (Keyder, 1993) marks the importance of this period.

In the last period of Turkey's agriculture before 1980, import substitution accumulation period (1960-1980), the import substitution industrialization strategy has been adopted as the economic policy to be implemented. This strategy shift refers to the transition from capital accumulation in agriculture to industry. At the end of the 1960s, high yielding seeds of the Green Revolution have been tried in Turkey (Keyder & Yenal, 2018, p. 106). The state has altered its common agricultural policies into intensive agricultural policies. According to Keyder and Yenal (2018), intensive agriculture has been realized with the increased use of chemical inputs in agriculture and mechanization of agriculture in the 1970s.

In Turkey's agriculture, 1980 is a critical point of agricultural transformation since neoliberal policies implemented after the 1980s are quite opposite to the developmentalist policies implemented in the past. The transition from national developmental policies to neoliberal policies come into being with 24 January 1980's decisions. Aydın (2018, p. 221) argues that, the main objective of the policies which are implemented after 1980 is the internalization of agriculture under the control of international agricultural and industrial corporations with a close relationship with International Monetary Fund (IMF), World Bank (WB) and World Trade Organization (WTO). Günaydın (2010) divides the period after 1980 of agriculture into three sub-periods: the first sub-period is in between 1980-1989, the second is in between 1990-1999, and the last sub-period refers to after 2000.

The significance of the first sub-period, from 1980 to 1989, is the effects of the reorganization of agricultural public administration. Reorganization of agriculture is important in terms of its effects on the agriculture sector. Even though the Republic of Turkey Ministry of Agriculture was founded in 1924, the most comprehensive reorganization about Ministry of Agriculture was made in 1985 (Günaydın, 2010, p. 163). In 1989, agricultural policies were changed, thereby encouraging foreign capital inflows.

The second period, between 1990 and 1999, differ from the previous period in terms of four aspects. The first aspect is the corporatization of agricultural state economic enterprises. Even if the background of the corporatizations is laid in the sub-period of 1980-1989, the first agricultural corporatization occurred in 1993 and the corporatization of Agricultural State Economic Enterprise (KİT) has been realized. The second one is the growth of internal terms of trade in favour of agriculture by means of actions of labour unions. The third characteristic of this period is about the consequences of the 1994 crises; for example, the number of supported agricultural products has dropped from 26 to 9 after the crises. And the last one is about the Agricultural Agreement signed under the WTO and Customs Union Decisions with the EU as the external determinants of agricultural policies (Günaydın, 2010, p. 164).

In the last sub-period, the period after 2000, a new transformation in agriculture in line with neoliberal policies has been realized. Agreements with IMF, World Bank,

WTO and the EU as major actors in the neo-liberal transformation of agriculture provide a basis for 2000's agricultural policy in Turkey. Agriculture and food sector have experienced a rapid change after 2000 in the world and Turkey particularly. In 2001, the Agricultural Reform Implementation Project (ARIP), issued by World Bank, was enacted as a substantial point for neo-liberalization of agriculture. According to Aysu (2008), adjustment of base prices according to world market conditions, privatization of the Agricultural State Economic Enterprise (KİT), dissolution of the Association of Agricultural Sales Cooperatives (TSKB), stabilization of support prices in Turkish lira, privatization or closing of the Agricultural State Economic Enterprise, implementation of direct income support instead of support policies and abandonment of guarantee of product purchase are within the scope of ARIP. The focal point of ARIP is implementing market conditions to agriculture. Direct income support is presented within the scope of ARIP instead of input subsidies and support prices policies. Emre claims that it is not possible to apply DIS which is not applied in any country to a sector where 40% of the employment is in the agricultural sector and where there is no registration system, like Turkey (as cited in Karkiner, 2006, p. 26).

Within the scope of this study, changes in agricultural relations with neoliberal implementation in the Black Sea region should be summarized. Hazelnut, tea and tobacco dominated by petty production are common in the region. While there were more than 100,000 tobacco producers in the Black Sea region until 1989, it declined to 30,000 in 2006 due to the changes in 1984 when transnational corporations entered tobacco sector and today tobacco production is completely dominated by the capital (Eren & Büke, 2016). According to the data for FAO statistics, Turkey is the world's number one manufacturer in hazelnut production<sup>5</sup>. However, studies show that the return to labour obtained by hazelnut production cannot ensure the reproduction of household structures of producers (Ecevit & Ecevit, 2002; Eren & Büke, 2016). According to Eren and Büke (2016), privatization of Agricultural Sales Cooperatives lies behind this situation because hazelnut producers are mainly left at

---

<sup>5</sup> Turkey's average production of hazelnut is 539,991.29 tonnes from 1994 to 2017. Italy is the second manufacturer in the World with an average 112,25.13 tonnes of hazelnut in the same time period.



the mercy of firms and merchants who are intermediaries of TNCs as a result of the privatization of Fiskobirlik<sup>6</sup>. In addition, tea production started in the 1930s in Turkey and almost 65% is produced in the Eastern Black Sea region. Eren and Büke (2016) illustrate that neoliberal transformation in tea production is relatively slow compared to tobacco and hazelnut productions. In 1984, tea production was opened to the private sector with the 3092 Law of Tea and the state monopoly in tea production was ended. Although, Çaykur<sup>7</sup> was included in the scope of privatization under the commitment given to the IMF and WB in 2001 (Eren & Büke, 2016), the privatization has not occurred until today.

All in all, it is argued that in addition to the abandonment of state support, by entering the agricultural relationship on both national and global basis with direct and indirect way the capital has strengthened its hegemony over the agricultural relations after 1980 in agriculture. Moreover, the liberalization policies implemented after 1980 are not only about production relations, they also cover the whole society and have critical consequences on rural relations in particular (Ecevit et. al., 2009, pp. 52-53).

According to three criteria, ownership of means of production, usage of labour and land ownership to classify rural households, Boratav (1995, pp. 211-213) identifies eight categories as (1) capitalist farmer, (2) wealthy farmer, (3) wealthy peasant, (4) middle peasant, (5) small peasant, (6) poor peasant, (7) agricultural worker, (8) renter in rural Turkey. For Boratav, petty commodity production is involved particularly in the middle peasant and small peasant categories (1995, p. 214). Petty commodity producer is a category in which the heterogeneity is apparent in its phenomenological existence while homogeneity is apparent in its real existence (Özuğurlu, 2013, p. 80). Özuğurlu theoretically describes differentiating peasant household categories as follows: (1) household type forming of surplus population, (2) peasant based worker, (3) traditional small peasant, (4) traditional petty commodity producer, (5) new petty commodity producer, (6) traditional and new capitalist farmer. According to

---

<sup>6</sup> Fiskobirlik, which is founded in 1938 is a part of the Hazelnut Agricultural Sales Cooperatives.

<sup>7</sup> General Directorate of Tea Enterprises, in short Çaykur, is one of Agricultural State Economic Enterprise in Turkey.

Özügurlu (2013, p. 102), it is important to underline that the theoretical conceptualization is limited to villages characterized by petty production and that are chosen for this aim.

The main production unit was small peasantry in Turkey's agriculture until 1950 (Karkiner, 2001, p. 19). However, Keyder (1988) underlines that despite the prevalence of peasant relations, it should be noted that petty commodity producers were few in number and region-specific before 1950 in Turkey. The prevalent production unit changed from small peasantry to petty commodity production in time in order to adapt to changing market conditions. Özügurlu (2013, p. 80) indicates that the peasantry has been subjected to the determination of capitalist market relations with each element of internal differentiation since the 2000s. Bernstein clarifies how small peasants turn into petty commodity producers with these words,

Peasants become petty commodity producers when they are unable to reproduce themselves outside the relations and processes of capitalist commodity production when those relations and processes become conditions of existence of peasant farming and are internalized in its organization and activity (Bernstein, 2003, p. 4).

Agriculture in Turkey mainly depends on petty commodity production which relies on household production and subsistence production based on women's unpaid family labour at present (Ecevit, 1994; Boratav, 1995; Karkiner, 2006; FAO, 2016). According to Keyder (1993, p. 173), petty commodity production is still based on the predominance of unpaid family labour and the income derived from household production that is using the means of production owned by the family. Although small peasantry also depends on family production, the difference lies in ownership rights; in other words, petty commodity producers possess all means of production (Keyder, 1988). Ecevit claims that petty commodity production includes both commodity and non-commodity relations even if it is a form of production or simple reproduction structure (1999, p. 4). Keyder (1993) summarizes the positions of PCP within new economic relations,

Small producers find themselves in a competitive economy where they must make rational decisions and accumulate in order to survive. In the Marxist version, peasants are said to become petty commodity producers situated in and dominated by a capitalist social formation. Through self-exploitation,

community reliance and sheer tenacity when it comes to property, petty commodity producers are able to survive, although they are unable to hold on to the value they create (Keyder, 1993, p. 174).

Changing conditions in agriculture with the implementation of neo-liberal policies affect conditions of PCP; for instance, it has strengthened the tendency towards dispossession. Non-commodified form of labour is still important in order to preserve the existence of PCP in rural areas (Ecevit et. al., 2009, p. 52). According to Karkiner (2006, p. 25), PCP households that maintain their existence on the basis of subsistence production, household labour and seasonal work have entered into a negative process due to structural adjustment policies implemented in Turkey's agriculture.

According to Aydın, in order to eliminate the negative effects of structural adjustment policies, PCP households are developing survival strategies to maintain their existence as a unit of production and reproduction (2018, p. 205). Those survival strategies lead to the exploitation of family labour and unequal relations in the sexual division of labour; therefore, it is argued that 'survival strategies have been privatized' (Aydın, 2018, p. 216). Aydın (1987) specifies that PCP can increase their productivity by intensifying their labour and using new technologies in agriculture. In a similar manner with Aydın (2018), Ecevit (2007, p. 346) argues that the pressure to disseminate production forces PCP to integrate with capitalist relations via devalorization of family labour through intensification and extension of labour time while PCP manufactures production and reproduction with more and more commodity relations. According to Ecevit, either petty commodity producers maintain their lives at subsistence level or they enter the process of dissolution or dispossession even if they devalorize their labour (2007, p. 347).

Bernstein has developed the argument of 'reproduction squeeze' which refers to the relation between the small peasantry and capital. According to Bernstein,

while it is impossible to generalise about the impact of globalization on differentiated peasantries, it is likely that in this current phase of imperialism, most poor peasants confront an increasing simple 'reproduction squeeze', as indeed do the great majority of the poor in both South and North (2013, p. 13).

In a similar manner with Bernstein, Özuğurlu argues that PCP can only survive by deepening its existence in the capital and thus it is the ‘petty commodity production trap’ of the capital (2013, p. 116). According to Özuğurlu (2013), the presence of the trap stands for the penetration of transnational capital into agriculture.

In this part, similarities and differences among periods of Turkey’s agriculture are summarized in order to base them as a methodological concern. In brief, on the one hand, the intervention of the capital in agricultural relations and the changing role of the state are differences of those two periods of Turkey’s agriculture. On the other hand, non-commodity family labour is continuous before and after 1980. In the following part, the focus will be on women as the main actors of non-commodity family labour and the situation of rural women in Turkey will be examined.

#### **2.4. The Situation of Women in Rural Turkey**

Ecevit (1994, p. 91) argues that women’s social situation and agricultural structures should be approached within conceptual integrity in countries like Turkey so as to analyse women’s social location within the scope of agricultural structures. Ecevit (1994) conceptualises the relations about rural women’s social situation in agriculture in order to understand in which agricultural relations specificities of women’s rural location take place. Those conceptual relations are as follows; (1) the role of women in the process of production, reproduction and commoditisation, (2) the changing specificities of women’s labour in different areas of use, (3) the social immobility of women’s labour, (4) the patriarchal control of women’s labour, (5) the ideology of invisibility and worthlessness of women’s labour, (6) the oppression on the intensification and the extension of labour time of women’s labour, (7) the unequal workload of women, (8) the location of women in the sexual division of labour, (9) the poverty of women and children and their lower socio-economic status, (10) the contradictory position that women are forced to live within the cycle of household, (11) the obstacles that women are faced with in the process of political structure and politicisation, and (12) the role of women in ideological and cultural structure (Ecevit, 1994, pp. 96-97). Ecevit’s conceptualization of rural women according to social and economic structures has significance for a feminist analysis

of rural women, particularly in Turkey. Therefore, this conceptualization will be used as a guideline in this study.

Non-commodity family labour is the main characteristic of petty commodity production which is the common form of production in agriculture, as it is indicated in the previous part of this study. According to Ecevit, the main characteristics of the use of women's labour in petty commodity production are determined by the following elements of small commodity production: patriarchal organization of PCP, the traditional sexual division of labour, the inheritance structure of the land, and socialization of girls and boys (1999, p. 196). Non-commodity family labour mainly refers to women's non-commodity labour in both production and reproduction spheres. Ecevit (1994) claims that PCP is based on predominantly commoditized spheres which are production and reproduction spheres where women play determining roles. Kandiyoti (1985) underlines the difference between production and reproduction spheres; production is to denote the production of exchange values only and the reproduction is to correspond to the social reproduction of the labour force. According to Kandiyoti,

Although the only compelling connection between the female sex and reproductive activity is in the sphere of biological reproduction, it is a fact that women are also quite uniformly allocated those tasks which are directly connected to the maintenance and reproduction of the labour force such as cooking, cleaning, child care, care of the sick and aged, etc. However, especially in the case of rural women, the distinction between productive and reproductive work often seems to be somewhat artificial in terms of women's concrete burden. It is easy to recognize, for instance, that the process of reproduction includes a large number of productive tasks geared to the household's own consumption, such as animal care, agricultural work, weaving and petty trade, alongside food preparation, carrying water, collecting firewood etc. (1985, p. 16).

Women's non-commodity form of rural labour in both production and reproduction is conceptualized through its significant role in the survival of petty commodity production. Women's position as an unpaid family labourer is reinforced within the structural adjustment policies implemented in agriculture since the 1980s. The data (TÜİK, 2018) shows almost 80% of women in agriculture are unpaid household labourers; on the other hand, this ratio is nearly 19% for men in 2018. According to Aydın (2018), women who were responsible for the production of household labour

force, such as housework, childcare, cooking or elderly care under normal circumstances, were forced to take the burden of survival strategies of PCP after the 1980s. Therefore, the burden of women has increased in the unequal household division of labour and the already existing inequalities in the household have been reinforced (2018, pp. 214-215). Morvaridi (1993) argues that the integration of agriculture in the market economy causes the intensification of women's labour, extra burdens for women and working more hours and under worsening conditions. In a similar manner with Morvaridi, Ecevit (1994) claims that rural women extend their labour in both commodity and subsistence production in and around their house and on the field, especially in agriculture and in some other areas of non-agricultural activities in the rural within the scope of the survival strategies of PCP (p. 95).

Morvaridi (1992) analyses the gender relations in Turkey's agriculture, examining the impact of technological changes on rural women. According to Morvaridi (1992), the low status of rural women as an unpaid household labourer is maintained through the social relations in their household and intensified under cash crop production. Moreover, women's contribution to the market economy remains unrecognized since women work as unpaid household labourers (Morvaridi, 1992, p. 585). When women's labour contributes to household income and accumulation, women are exploited. Kandiyoti (1985) interrogates why and how women become subordinated as 'women', as 'rural women', as 'poor women' or as 'third world women' and thus analyses the effects of rural developments in rural production systems on women.

The transition of agricultural policies in Turkey affects agricultural product composition and construction of labour beside population change in rural and urban areas. As a consequence of this transition, while men become workers with the effect of low wages, the structure of the female labour force participation in rural is also affected (Candan & Ünal, 2013). Candan and Ünal explain that the effects of sexual division of labour in agriculture are observed and this division of labour is mainly based on women's labour (2013, p. 95). This process is seen by the FAO as 'feminization of agriculture' observed in many underdeveloped countries like Turkey. In a similar manner, Karkiner (2006, p. 27) claims that agriculture is an area which is abandoned by men; thus, it causes feminization of agriculture in Turkey.

According to Üçeçam Karagel (2010), growing women's labour in agriculture from 1990 to 2000 is explained by the decreasing men's labour in agriculture and the increasing number of women who work in agriculture even though some significant differences exist among regions. With a different interpretation, Ecevit (1994, p. 95) points out that the feminization of both production and reproduction takes place with self-exploitation of women within their household.

Candan and Ünal (2013) examine the transition from national developmental policies to neoliberal policies; in other words, from import substitution to structural adjustment and liberalization in agriculture, and women's labour in their study. Their main argument is women's unpaid household labour and unsecured labour as an agriculture labourer is a reflection of the policies that have driven small and medium-size family businesses to poverty after the 1980s (Candan & Ünal, 2013, p. 93). According to Candan and Ünal, agricultural employment policies under the control of capitalism cause rural poverty in Turkey; as a result, women's poverty and exploitation of women's labour increase (2013, p. 100). Furthermore, Ecevit and Ecevit (2002) examine dispossession in agriculture and commoditization of family labour as a struggle with rural poverty in the example of hazelnut production. According to their study, there are two ways of resistance of rural poverty. The first is the intensification of household labour that mostly refers to the intensification of women's labour and minimises production costs, and the second is long-term seasonal work (Ecevit & Ecevit, 2002). The first survival strategy of PCP burden women's labour by intensifying and extending their labour. While intensification and extension specify women's labour in production, the minimisation of production costs via producing significant commodities for production within the household by using women's unpaid labour refers to women's labour in reproduction.

According to Kandiyoti (1988, p. 278), Turkey is one of the countries in which classical patriarchy has held its place. The key features of the reproduction of classic patriarchy depend on the patrilocal extended household that is prevalently associated with the reproduction of peasantry in agrarian societies (Kandiyoti, 1988, p. 278). Morvaridi (1993) focuses on cash crop production in Kars by way of questioning the relationship between gender and household management in agriculture. Morvaridi

(1993) argues women's unpaid labour is exploited under culturally shaped patriarchal control and the exploitation of women is perpetuated under the structural adjustment policy implemented in agriculture since it marginalizes women's labour in production and their access to economic resources. According to Morvaridi's case study in Kars, men exclude women from the control of the household resources and the decision-making process on resource use within farming households although women are responsible for vital labour tasks within the production (1993, p. 93). Along similar lines, Gündüz Hoşgör and Smits (2007) remark that the modernization of agriculture via technological changes tends to reproduce and intensify sexual division of labour within the rural household to the disadvantage of women. While the change from traditional to modern farming tends to increase men's power, the gap in the level of knowledge and training of women is widened (Gündüz Hoşgör & Smits, 2007, p. 2). In addition, Alkan (2018, p. 119) argues that the role of women in the household is particularly active in labour intensive production processes in agriculture whereas it is passive in education, access to agricultural inputs and property, marketing and decision making processes.

In addition to the exclusion of women from economic resources, the decision making process in the household, technological knowledge and training, Kocabicak (2018) examines the reason behind the exclusion of women's landownership in Turkey and its implications for feminist strategies. According to Kocabicak (2018), gendered land ownership leads to a gender-based division of labour and patriarchal exploitation of women's labour in small and medium-size farms. Exclusion of women from landownership has an important consequence for the range of patriarchy and capitalism, state formation, civil society, and the cultural and religious conditions (Kocabicak, 2018, p. 116). Kocabicak (2018, p. 123) argues rural women have been excluded from landownership by the Turkish civil code (1926-2001) while the lack of alignment between divergent feminist agendas weakened women's overall capacity to challenge the gender discriminatory legal framework.

Ecevit and Ecevit (2002) illustrate that petty commodity production and its articulation of wage labour have theoretical importance in order to understand the capitalist character of agricultural relations. According to their study which is based



on hazelnut production in the Black Sea region, it is argued that petty commodity production structure on the basis of family labour maintains its existence only with the articulation of wage labour. In both rural and urban areas, major issues about labour force participation of women in Turkey are reviewed in Özbay's study (1995). Özbay argues that even if the shift is extremely slow, the proportion of women working in agricultural sector has declined while the proportion of women working in non-agricultural occupations has increased according to data from population censuses from 1955 to 1990 (1995, p. 8). In addition to this argument, the general claim of the study is that official statistics about women's labour force are insufficient since they reflect the formal sector that is mostly absorbed by men while women are mainly engaged in the unregistered informal sector (Özbay, 1995, pp. 4-9). Women are obliged to engage mainly in informal, flexible and cheap labour due to their lack of resources. Moreover, Suzuki Him and Gündüz Hoşgör (2019) reveal that rural women who are conventionally unpaid household labourers have begun entering into non-agricultural work because of the declining household incomes in the recent years. It is argued that non-agricultural wage work has been a significant survival strategy of farming households for a long time. Men went to work for wages in the period of agricultural modernisation while women intensified their labour on the farm; however, today, women more often work in non-agricultural works (Suzuki Him and Gündüz Hoşgör, 2019).

On the other hand, rural women's wage employment as informal, invisible, flexible and cheap gives them a space of autonomy in some cases. Hoşgör and Suzuki Him (2016) have conducted a study in the Western Black Sea region of Turkey to examine the relationship between globalization and rural women's wage labour in the production of 'rapana venosa' (veined rapa whelk), which is one of the sectors that rural women are particularly employed in in the Black Sea region. It is argued that global production chain of 'veined rapa whelk' depends on rural women's labour which is flexible, informal, invisible and cheap (Gündüz Hoşgör and Suzuki Him, 2016). Gündüz Hoşgör and Suzuki Him (2016, p. 128) argue that women develop new strategies to constitute a space of autonomy through their wage work in the production of 'rapana venosa'. Another case study of Suzuki Him and Gündüz Hoşgör (2017) in the mountain villages in the Western Black Sea region of Turkey

focuses on the feminization of rural labour and young women's dis/empowerment. Suzuki Him and Gündüz Hoşgör argue that the feminization of wage labour has transformed the relationship between father and daughter particularly. According to the study, although "wage labour liberated rural daughter's productive labour from patriarchal family, it is not enough to free her dependency on familial protection in classic patriarchy" (Suzuki Him & Gündüz Hoşgör, 2017).

Ilcan (1994) analyses the relationship between seasonal migration, subsistence production and peasant relations in rural Turkey. In seasonal agricultural employment, the sexual division of labour is significant for the existing gender hierarchy. According to Ilcan (1994, p. 567), migrant agricultural workers are men, not women, even if one or two members of the household work as seasonal agricultural workers. It is argued that women's responsibility for subsistence production reasserts a form of gender hierarchy, rendering women the subjects of a tradition (Ilcan, 1994, p. 574). Karkiner supports with the argument that women's position as unpaid household labourers is strength and the possibility to change their position into wage workers becomes unfeasible because of differentiation and the exploitation of women's labour (Karkiner, 2006, p. 25).

Altınpınar and Gülçubuk (2003) analyse the labour and life conditions of mobile women agricultural labourers in one of the districts of Ankara. Mobile women agricultural labourers are under heavy responsibility for their domestic roles in addition to their agricultural works. On the one hand, they are trying to fulfil the daily needs of their family; on the other hand, they work to contribute to their family economy (Altınpınar & Gülçubuk, 2003, p. 59). Altınpınar and Gülçubuk (2003) underline the main problems of mobile women agricultural labourers as wage conditions, social security, house conditions, vital needs, education and health care.

From a different perspective, agritourism in the context of sustainable development and the role of rural women is studied in three villages of the Kalecik district in Ankara (Akpınar, Talay, Coşkun & Gündüz, 2004). Conditions behind the participation motives of rural women in agritourism activities and possible social and economic implications of agritourism on rural women's lives are examined in this study (Akpınar et. al., 2004). According to the study, women's responsibilities as

mothers and wives have priority in their lives and, thus, women do not contribute to and participate in agro-tourism activities because of their status within the family (Akpınar et. al., 2004, p. 485).

#### **2.4.1. The Situation of Women in Rural Black Sea**

According to TÜİK's classification in NUTS<sup>8</sup> level 1, Turkey is divided into twelve statistical regions and Samsun is located in the Western Black Sea region<sup>9</sup> according to this classification. The average agricultural land in the Western Black Sea region (45%) is above the country average (35%) (OKA, 2012). As a result, agriculture is significant in this region. While the employment ratio (42,2%) in agriculture is above the country average (23,6%), the ratio (18,8 % in the industry; 39% in the service sector) is below the country average (26,4% in the industry; 50% in the service sector) in other sectors (TÜİK, 2014).). In the Western Black Sea region, 54% of the women were employed in the agricultural sector, 37% of women were employed in the service sector and 8 % of women were employed in the industry sector in 2018 (TÜİK, 2018). Those statistical data show that agriculture is the primary sector in which women are mainly employed. Moreover, almost 90% of women who work in agriculture are unpaid household labourers in the Black Sea region, according to data from TÜİK (2018).

In their study, Gündüz Hoşgör and Smits (2007) outline the main features of the region. Because of its physical features that consist of high mountains and forests, the coastline is isolated from the rest of the region. Therefore, the village structure is different from the other countryside villages in Turkey; for example, houses are distant from each other and it causes the main social community to be restricted to the extended family and relatives rather the village itself (Gündüz Hoşgör & Smits, 2007, p. 5). The situation of rural women who live in the Black Sea region is shaped by geographical circumstances alongside social and cultural circumstances. Moreover, one of the significant points for the region is that men work in non-farm occupations much more than anywhere else in Turkey and also they work away from

---

<sup>8</sup> Three levels of Nomenclature of Territorial Units for Statistics (NUTS) exist in Turkey.

<sup>9</sup> This region is labelled as TR8 in NUTS Level 1.

their home (Gündüz Hoşgör & Smits, 2007, p. 19). As a result, women are responsible for agricultural work and the reproduction of their household while men are away due to the sexual division of labour. In the Black Sea region, women have carried out intensive agricultural works, particularly region specific products which are hazelnut, tea and tobacco, from past to present beside subsistence production and husbandry as an integral part of their daily life.

In addition to unpaid household labour, women also work as day labourers in other fields mainly in their village. In the production of hazelnut, women's labour as day labourers is common due to the characteristics of hazelnut production. Hazelnut production requires intensive and extensive labour since the harvesting time is limited. In connection with the decline of household incomes because of the changes that have occurred in agriculture specific to PCP households, women have moved towards working in non-agricultural works. However, in the case of the rural Black Sea region, the position of women's employment in non-agricultural works is quite limited because of the sexual division of labour within their household. Women are responsible for agricultural works, husbandry and reproduction of their household while men are responsible for earning a livelihood for their family and, thus, work in paid employment. Gündüz Hoşgör and Suzuki Him (2016, p. 118) argue that women are eligible for paid work only if the workplace is within the village boundaries, colleagues are from the same village, and/or trips to and from the workplace are provided via male members of the village based on their study in the Western Black Sea region. According to the study which is conducted in Samsun, Alkan (2018, p. 121) goes further to argue that even if women have employment opportunities outside of agriculture, they cannot be employed in a paid and socially secure manner.

When women's position within the social structure of rural Turkey, and particularly in the Black Sea region, is summarized, the result sheds light on the existing literature in order to understand the relations which women are a part of. According to Karkıner (2006, p. 24), women's paid labour, unpaid family labour, the sexual division of labour, subsistence production and relation with the soil arise as a construct of women's oppression in agriculture. However, women's weak position in basic structural relations makes them powerful within the feminist epistemology

since it provides the epistemological advantage of women through women's experiences on the basis of the Feminist Standpoint Theory (Karkiner, 2006, p. 30). Rural women's epistemological position through the Feminist Standpoint Theory will be discussed in the following part.

## **2.5. Feminist Standpoint Theory: Towards the Analysis of Rural Women**

In this thesis, the general theoretical framework of the study, namely the Feminist Standpoint Theory, and its theoretical significance will be clarified in order to analyse rural women's situation. In this part of the study, firstly, I will focus on the paradigmatic position of the FST. Secondly, I will constitute a general framework of the Feminist Standpoint epistemology. In order to engage in deeply, knowledge and politics that lie at the core of the FST will be discussed respectively in consideration of the main concepts of the FST. I prefer to approach the Feminist Standpoint epistemology and Feminist Standpoint methodology separately; therefore, Feminist Standpoint methodology will be examined in Chapter 3.

The FST emerged in the late 1970s and early 1980s as a theory situated in feminist critical theory by questioning the relationship between "production of knowledge" and "practices of power" (Harding, 2004; Harding, 2009). FST deals with the inseparability of knowledge and power relations, in other words, epistemology and politics. The standpoint as a concept is described as a morally and scientifically preferable ground for women's interpretation and explanations of both nature and social life (Harding, 1986, p. 26). The nature of the relationships among people and how these relations are "constituted, structured, investigated and understood" are a principle political, ethical and epistemological concern for the FST (Ramazanoğlu & Holland, 2002, p. 98).

The paradigmatic position of the FST is neither in modernity nor in postmodernity due to its methodological, epistemological and ontological inquiry. Haraway indicates that in order to live in meanings and bodies which have a fortune for a future instead of denying meanings and bodies, we need "the power of modern critical theories of how meanings and bodies get made" (2004, p. 85). Although the FST does not totally reject the understanding of modernity, it strongly criticizes

modern and Western scientific thoughts owing to their ahistorical, incoherent, dualistic, androcentric and sexist characteristics (Harding, 2004; Narayan, 2004; Crasnow, 2009). On the other hand, the FST does not take a position in postmodernity either since the principles of post-modern thinking are not compatible with some basic assumptions of the FST, most importantly about politics. It could be claimed that while the FST criticizes modernity within the modernity, it also benefits from postmodernity; thus, the FST is positioned in contemporary modernity. According to Ramazanoğlu and Holland (2002, p. 103), the FST does not have to reject postmodern thoughts, or ignore criticism of modernist understandings; however, taking the productive freedoms from postmodernity does not extinguish the problems of what kind of connections are made or refused among knowledge and power, or among ideas, experience and reality. On the one hand, having a position in contemporary modernity is quite tough; while on the other, it offers a quite broad area to criticize social theory with respect to two major paradigms: modernity and postmodernity.

What makes the feminist standpoint a theory rather than a thought lies in its epistemology, methodology and ontology. The FST offers a new agenda. Epistemologies have diversified and differences between epistemologies are quite complex since every particular epistemology offers its own rule. Subjectivity debates in FST are quite central as an epistemological criticism towards modernity. According to the FST, objective knowledge claim depends on rationalist, universalist and essentialist assumptions of modernity and the FST criticises by arguing that there is no objective knowledge, knowledge should be subjective because of its specificities. Moreover, stressing the importance of subjectivity and its integration within the FST also emphasizes the criticism of the structural understanding of modernity. Epistemology goes hand in hand with methodology and ontology. Ontological criticism of the FST focuses on the body, self, subject and the individual. Ramazanoğlu and Holland indicate that,

Different ontologies offer different beliefs about social existence...There are also more complex beliefs about the interrelation of bodily differences and their social forms that indicate how difficult it is to understand the interactions of ideas, bodies and their physical and social environments.

Feminist can have different ontological beliefs about the nature of reality and the objects of their research (2002, p. 12).

Methodological criticism is based on the unit of analysis and consequently the dichotomic understanding of modernity. The paradigm of modernity in social theory explains social relations in dichotomic terms. From the perspective of the FST, gender based analysis of modernity turns into gender-biased analysis because of the men and women dichotomy. Dichotomic understanding of modernity results in ignorance of difference among women themselves, not all women are included in the analysis since modernity is based on white, western and middle class women. The dichotomy is reductionist; men determine women, West determines East, “superior” determines “inferior”. Collins (2004, p.110) argues that dichotomic understanding of oppositional differences consistently implies a relationship between superiority and inferiority and this hierarchical relationship binds political economies of domination and subordination. Therefore, the specificities of subjectivities also in relation with methodology alongside epistemology offers better grounds for a starting point. The FST criticizes rationalist, structural, functionalist and critical realist epistemologies owing to their deterministic, dichotomic, rational, essential and universal assumptions.

### **2.5.1. Feminist Standpoint Epistemology**

The feminist standpoint epistemology originates in Hegel’s dialectic of the master and the slave and in the analysis and elaboration of Hegel’s analysis in the writings of Marx, Engels and Lukacs. As Harding indicates, many of the early feminists drew on Marx, so the standpoint theory had an earlier history in Marxian thought and, besides, the FST revives, improves, and disseminates Marxian thoughts (2004, p. 3). Hartsock develops a ground for feminist historical materialism on the ground of Marx’s historical materialist approach. Hartsock argues,

The power of the Marxian critique of class domination stands as an implicit suggestion that feminist should consider the advantages of adopting a historical materialist approach to understanding phallocratic domination... A specifically feminist historical materialism might, in addition, enable us to expand the Marxian account to include all human activity rather than focusing on activity more characteristic of males in capitalism (1983, p. 283).

According to Marxian thought, the subject of knowledge should be the standpoint of the proletariat, the subordinate class, the oppressed and the exploited class in order to achieve truth, a deeper and more adequate understanding of society instead of the standpoint of the dominant, ruling class in the bourgeois society. In analogy with Hartsock's argument, the FST's main epistemological assumption is that the subject of knowledge should be women with reference to the standpoint of the proletariat in Marxian account. Furthermore, Harding refers the arguments of all leading figures to the FST, such as Hegel, Marx, Engels and Lukacs;

In brief, their argument is that men's dominating position in social life results in partial and perverse understanding whereas women's subjugated position provides the possibility of more complete and less perverse understanding. Feminism and the women's movement provide the theory and motivation for inquiry and political struggle that can transform the perspective of women in a 'standpoint', a morally and scientifically preferable grounding for our interpretations and explanations of nature and social life (1986, p. 26).

Epistemological inquiries of the FST will be elaborated in two of the following sub-sections; the first is knowledge production and the latter is political stand. The FST assumes the inseparability of knowledge and politics; therefore, it is quite hard to separate knowledge and politics. For this reason, those concepts have been intertwined in some aspects. However, I believe that this will enrich the questioning in this study and strengthen the FST's epistemological assumption that knowledge and politics cannot be separated. Knowledge production and political stand will be discussed in the following part in detail with respect to the subject of knowledge, specificities of subjectivities, standpoint of the oppressed, collective subject, collective consciousness, and experience.

#### **2.5.1.1. Knowledge Production**

To begin with the grounds for knowledge production, "start[ing] thought from marginalized lives" and "tak[ing] everyday life as problematic" provide epistemologically advantaged starting points for the FST. These are epistemologically advantaged assumptions as a starting point since "starting from women's lives will generate less partial and distorted accounts not only of women's lives but also of men's lives and of the whole social order. Women's lives and



experiences provide the grounds for this knowledge” (Harding, 2004, p. 128). From the feminist standpoint perspectives, some social situations provide better grounds to start knowledge claim and thus starting from women’s lives via problematizing their everyday life is the key to understanding women’s social situations. However, it does not mean that one particular starting point is recommended to start thought. There is no single and ideal women’s life in order to start thought, in other words, there is no single feminist standpoint (Harding, 2004; Haraway, 2004). At this point, the subject of knowledge debate gains significance and a question arises: ‘Who is the subject of knowledge’?

From perspective of the Feminist Standpoint; the subject is conditional, locational, situational, contextual, empirical, embodied, constituted, contingent, relative, reflexive and self-reflexive. Harding conceptualizes the subject of knowledge as embodied and socially located, and claims that the subject of knowledge is not substantially different from the object of knowledge (Harding, 2004, p. 133). From Harding’s perspective, the subject of knowledge cannot be distinct from the object of knowledge. Harding conceptualizes the subject of knowledge debate with the concept of ‘strong objectivity’ in order to maximize the objectivity of the socially situated knowledge claim of the Feminist Standpoint approach. According to Harding,

strong objectivity requires that the subject of knowledge be placed on the same critical, causal plane as the object of knowledge. Thus, strong objectivity requires what we can think of ‘strong reflexivity’...The subject of knowledge must be considered as part of the object of knowledge (2004, p. 136).

Strong reflexivity stresses the impossibility of value-free impartial knowledge from the feminist standpoint perspectives. In a similar manner, Haraway argues that objective vision is possible only from the partial perspective; therefore, feminist objectivity is not about transcendence and splitting subject and object, it is about the limited location and situated knowledge (2004, p. 87).

Considering the thought that marginal lives provide better grounds for certain kinds of knowledge, giving an epistemologically privileged position to the standpoint of women underlines that both the subject and object of knowledge are women.

However, women as a subject and object are not homogenous, unified and dichotomic, rather they are heterogeneous and multiple from the Feminist Standpoint's perspective. Differences among women depend on women's experiences including their emotions and embodiments, and their daily lives. Harding (2004) argues that different women's lives provide the best resources to achieve different knowledge and reality, so the claim that women's lives provide a better starting point for the thought about gender system is not the same as the claim that women's own lives are the best starting point. Furthermore, differences among women make women's knowledge politically, epistemologically and methodologically advantaged and privileged.

#### **2.5.1.2. Political Stand**

Standpoint theorists argue that 'good politics' can produce 'good science' by way of engaging in epistemology and politics for a better account of the world (Harding, 2004; Haraway, 2004). The FST aims both for 'better knowledge' and 'political action'. Therefore, 'starting thought from marginalized lives' and 'taking everyday life as problematic' as the main arguments of the FST offer a ground for both generating less partial and distorted knowledge and empowering oppressed groups by valuing their daily lives and experiences and developing "oppositional consciousness" (Collins, 2004; Sandoval, 2004). It is argued that the subjects of knowledge who matter are not individual subjects but collective subjects, or groups (Hartsock, 2004, p. 244). A standpoint is constitutive of a constituted by a collective subject that emerges and changes through history (Weeks, 2004; Narayan, 2004). The standpoint of a subject refers to the collective subject and Harding stresses the significance of multiple subjects due to the liberatory potential of the FST stating that

the logic of multiple subjects leads to the recognition that the subject of liberator feminist knowledge must also be the subject of every other liberatory knowledge project. This is true in the collective sense of 'subject of knowledge', because lesbian, poor, and radically marginalized women, and therefore all feminists will have to grasp how gender, race, class, and sexuality are used to construct each other. It will have to do so if feminism is to be liberatory for marginalized women, but also if it is to avoid deluding dominant group women about their/our own situations (2004, p. 134).

The liberating potential of the FST also depends on aiming to reach collective consciousness. FST argues that knowledge is partial, situational, conditional, and subjective; therefore, the knowledge is not universal women knowledge. The FST underlines the importance of differences among women while it stresses the importance of the collective character of the subject as women. Collins clarifies that groups share their history based on their shared location in the relation of power; however, it does not mean that neither all individuals within the group have the same experiences nor that they interpret them in the same way (2004, p. 249). Women's differences depend on their different characteristics, emotions, experiences. Specificities of subjectivities lie behind the differences according to the FST. Harding claims that the differences among women's experiences cannot be a source of division and weakness; rather these differences can be 'scientific and political' resources if we learn how to manage them (as cited in Jaggar, 2004, p. 63). Moreover, according to Smith, beginning from different women's experiences told in women's words is an indispensable political moment in the women's movement (2004, p. 265).

The Feminist Standpoint Theory maps how social and political disadvantages can be turned into an epistemological, methodological and political advantage. In the twelve theses on Feuerbach, Marx (1997) claims "philosophers have hitherto only interpreted the world in various ways; the point is to change it". Considering this point, Hartsock argues that searching the truth is about understanding power relations; however, the point of understanding power relations is to change them (2004, p. 244).

In brief, knowledge production and political stand provide a productive ground for the epistemological debate of the FST. Therefore, epistemological questions with respect to the relationship between knowledge and politics have been explained. In the following part of the study, the relationship between the FST and rural women as subjects will be developed.

### **2.5.2. Rural Women as Subjects of Knowledge and Political Action**

The Feminist Standpoint Theory is a valuable epistemological and methodological tool in order to analyse what kind of social relations women are a part of in rural areas. Although women's role has a central importance in rural Turkey, their position is marginalised. This study aims to enable rural women to speak about their daily lives and experiences from their subjective positions. In the light of this aim, I started to problematize rural women's 'marginalized lives' and 'everyday life' with respect to the FST. At this point, it is significant to understand how those women perceive the situations in every aspect from their standpoints.

Rural women's daily cycle includes production and reproduction activities such as agriculture, husbandry and housework. Women are responsible for both household and agricultural work; therefore, their labour is one of the significant aspects of their lives in rural areas. However, the debate on labour is different from the essentialist understanding of modernity. Labour is defined as one of the many constitutive links between social relations and subjectivities (Weeks, 2004, p. 184). Women's wage labour, unpaid household labour and the sexual division of labour are parts of women's subjectivity in the rural. According to Naples (2000), "women's complex and changing relationships to the natural environment and to powerful political and economic forces [...] undermine their abilities to sustain their households and communities". Although women's labour is intensive and vital, their position is marginal due to social relations. According to Rose,

Labour is not just activity that directly produces capital, but activity that produces society itself, including the networks of sociality and the subjects they sustain. These are constitutive practices that, whether waged or not, are socially necessary. Yet despite its importance, this labour is often invisible and many of the skills developed in and through these practices are naturalized and undervalued (as cited in Weeks, 2004, p. 185).

Rural women's marginalised position makes them methodologically and epistemologically powerful subjects. Their subject position provides a ground to understand less partial and distorted social relations in the rural.

Every woman in a village identifies their life different from each other due to their subjectivities that are multiple and unique. Jaggar (2004, p. 64) claims that a representation of reality from women's standpoint must draw on the diversity of all women's experience. Although women's experiences and interpretations are different, they share a common history based on their shared location in relation to power. Rural women as collective subjects have their own collective consciousness and political power.

## **2.6. Summary**

In this chapter, the theoretical framework of the study is presented based on the relationship between the existing literature on the study subject and the Feminist Standpoint Theory. At first, the situation of rural women especially in Asia, Africa and Latin America is explained; secondly, the historical background and changing relations of agriculture in Turkey are clarified in order to understand the current social relations in the rural. Then, the situation of rural women in Turkey, specifically rural women in the Black Sea region, is examined. Lastly, epistemological arguments of the Feminist Standpoint Theory on the grounds of knowledge and politics are discussed.

## **CHAPTER III**

### **RESEARCH METHODOLOGY: FEMINIST STANDPOINT METHODOLOGY**

#### **3.1. Introduction**

Methodology and method do not indicate to the same phenomenon. On the one hand, method is a collection of techniques and procedures to gather research materials so as to understand social relations. On the other hand, methodology indicates to the theory and analysis of the research process and the relationship between knowledge and actual reality (Harding, 1987; Ramazanoğlu and Holland, 2002). The method of this study is based on qualitative research method and multiple qualitative techniques were used during the fieldwork, specifically in-depth interviews, participant observation and direct observation. As I indicated in the second chapter, the Feminist Standpoint Theory generates the theoretical foundation of this study. The theory is constituted of the harmony of particular epistemology, ontology and methodology. Therefore, Feminist Standpoint epistemology, ontology and methodology provide the epistemological, ontological and methodological ground for this study. While Feminist Standpoint epistemology and ontology are discussed in the second chapter, Feminist Standpoint methodology as a methodological ground of this study is the one of the main concerns of this chapter.

In this chapter, both the methodological ground of the study and the research process from the field to the analysis will be introduced. In the beginning of the chapter, the main methodological inquiries of the FST and of being positioned as a feminist researcher will be specified. And then, detailed information about the research process will be presented in consideration of the qualitative techniques which are used throughout the study, how the particular village was selected, the profile of the

determined village, experiences from the field, the profile of participants and the process of the analysis.

### **3.2. Feminist Standpoint Methodology**

Feminist Standpoint methodology is not independent of epistemology, and ontology; therefore, methodological arguments of the FST intersect with epistemological and ontological arguments at some points. Feminist Standpoint methodology strongly criticizes modernist understanding of science which is based on the Enlightenment way of thinking and it develops various methodological approaches to producing women's knowledge. Ramazanoğlu and Holland (2002) outline the major methodological challenges of the FST to Enlightenment thought; (1) reason and scientific method, (2) the concept of knowing self, and (3) the claim of universality and exclusionary practices of modern science.

Firstly, the Enlightenment way of thinking is based on modern scientific thought which is dependent on Cartesian dualism. From Descartes' perspective, the dualism between mind as a conscious being and matter as an object of knowledge is the base for every kind of explanation about reality (Ramazanoğlu and Holland, 2002, p. 27). The dualist understanding is embedded in modern scientific thought in the shape of mind and body, culture and nature, man and woman. Women are taken as the side of the oppressed in this dualist thinking; man represents mind and woman represents matter. The FST challenges the dichotomic understanding of modernity by rejecting the binary opposition, by approaching to unreason, emotion, feelings and subjectivities. Harding (1987, p. 7) argues that the idea of universal men does not exist, there is only culturally different men and women, and then men's eternal companion women also vanish.

Secondly, the researcher is positioned as a knower which is an authority, expert and mostly man in modernity. Contrary to modernist thinking, the researcher is not positioned as the knowing self from the perspective of the Feminist Standpoint. The knowing self is socially situated, located and constituted and, thus, the knowing self could not be a fixed self. Whoever is the object of knowledge should be a subject of knowledge, two sides of knowledge production are actually in the same line. In

addition, the FST rejects the hierarchical organization between the researcher and researched. It is argued that the research process is fed by experiences, emotions and feelings of both the researcher and researched; therefore, the relationship between the researcher and researched should not be hierarchical.

Thirdly, Modern scientific thought marginalizes women from knowledge production by identifying man as the subject of knowledge. In modernity, women are positioned in a dominated and oppressed position; however, women's knowledge is not produced by themselves. The science which is androcentric produces knowledge on behalf of women. On the other hand, FST argues that the standpoint should be marginal lives in order to produce less partial knowledge, marginal lives are women's lives in the sense of feminist knowledge. The FST argues that the knowledge should come from experiences including emotions and embodiments of women. Experiences of women are diverse due to specificities of every woman as a subject; therefore, universal and objective women's knowledge is impossible.

According to the FST, the interpretation of truth claims dependent on subjectivity is multiple although the truth claim is singular. Haraway's metaphor of the 'greasy pole' (as cited in Ramazanoğlu and Holland, 2002, p. 61) clarifies the position of the FST in the truth claim by exploring the notions of partial vision and situated knowledge. Absolute truth and absolute relativism are located on the two sides of the pole. On the one hand, the absolute truth side represents an Archimedean point and truth as accumulative; on the other hand, absolute relativism represents multiple truths and incommensurate validity (Ramazanoğlu and Holland, 2002, p. 62). The FST is located neither in absolute truth nor absolute relativism; it is positioned in an intermediate position. From the Feminist Standpoint's perspective, truth is socially constructed and contingent, reality is constraining, knowledge is embodied and knowledge production is political.

As I indicated in the previous chapter, the FST provides a ground to produce 'socially situated knowledge' by starting thought from marginalized lives, which is women for the FST, and problematizing the everyday lives of women. Harding argues,



Androcentric, economically advantaged, racist, Eurocentric and heterosexist conceptual frameworks ensured systematic ignorance and error about not only the lives of the oppressed, but also about the lives of their oppressors and thus about how nature and social relations in general worked (Harding, 2004, p. 5).

In order to problematize everyday life, the unit of analysis is women, who are in a marginalized and oppressed position in modernist thinking. The standpoint of women provides an 'epistemic advantage', in Hegelian and Marxist terms, as a truer consciousness by aiming to voice women, to attribute an awareness of women's uniqueness, and to turn women's differences into advantages (Farganis, 1994, p. 31). Furthermore, women as a unit of analysis are not unitary, homogenous and coherent subjects, but they rather refer to multiple, heterogenous, contradictory and incoherent subjects (Harding, 2004, p. 134). Specificities of subjects refer to diversity of experiences. Smith argues that "experience is a method of talk" (2004, p. 265) so multiple experiences of women provide multiple standpoints.

It may be required for a woman to be interviewed with a woman to understand women in a social research project (Reinharz, 1992, p. 23). In a similar manner, the FST claims that both the researcher and researched should be women since all women share experiences of being women. Even though their experiences of being a woman are various due to their subjectivities, the reality of the notion of being a woman is the same since being a woman is socially constituted. The identities of the researcher and researched are formed by gender and, thus, both the researcher and researched look at the world through women's eyes (Farganis, 1994, p. 21). The FST necessitates a reflexive approach based on the relationship between the researcher and researched.

### **3.3. Finding Position as a Feminist Researcher**

Research process is a kind of relationship between women who are the researcher and researched, and the relationship between the researcher and researched is not hierarchical, rather it is interactional from the feminist standpoint. The feminist researcher includes and shares her experiences and emotions as a means of connecting with her respondents and building a non-hierarchical relationship between them (Campbell & Wasco, 2000, p.786). In my research process, generating

non-hierarchical and reflexive relations with women sometimes was quite hard because of my academic identity. When they concluded their words, they added that “you know better than me though because you are the one who is the well-educated” as a last word. In this kind of situations, I have been explaining that all of their stories and thoughts are valuable and unique; and also, I have been sharing my experiences, thoughts or feelings about the subject which we discussed in order to maintain non-hierarchical relations among us.

From the viewpoint of the FST, the research process cannot be free from the researcher’s experiences, emotions and feelings; and thus, the researcher’s social location affects the position of the researcher in the research process. The concept of ‘reflexivity’ is used to question the presence of the researcher as a subjective being. To find a position in the research process as a feminist researcher is connected to researcher’s background. Ramazanoğlu and Holland define the ‘reflexivity’ as an interrelation among politics and epistemology;

Reflexivity generally means attempting to make explicit the power relations and the exercise of power in the research process. It covers varying attempts to unpack what knowledge is contingent upon, how the researcher is socially situated, and how the research agenda/process has been constituted (Ramazanoğlu and Holland, 2002, p. 118).

Harding also argues that the notion of ‘strong objectivity’ has a strong relation with ‘strong reflexivity’ (2004, p. 136). Harding’s conceptualization of ‘strong objectivity’ is located neither in objectivity nor in the subjectivity debate, this concept underlines the paradigmatic position of the FST. Therefore, ‘strong reflexivity’ as a source of ‘strong objectivity’ also stresses the differences of the researchers.

A notion of strong reflexivity would require that the object of inquiry be conceptualized as gazing back in all their cultural particularity and that the researcher, through theory and methods, stand behind them, gazing back at his own socially situating research project in all its cultural particularity and its relationship to other projects of his culture (Harding, 1991, p. 163).

The notion of reflexivity provides a ground for a discussion over which knowledge claims are made, for whom, why and within what frame of reference (Ramazanoğlu and Holland, 2002, p. 119).

### **3.4. Process of Data Generation**

Feminist research stands for more than the process of data generation, it means a journey. In this journey, feminist researchers question the different realities and understandings among women, both the researcher and researched. Listening to women's stories from their own voices in order to understand women's realities, qualitative methods are the main sources of feminist research. Reinharz (1992, p. 197) argues that using multiple methods in the research process enables feminist researchers to connect past to present, knowledge to action, personal behaviour to social framework; in addition, feminist researchers enlighten unexamined or misunderstood experiences by using multiple methods. For this reason, I prefer to use multiple qualitative techniques in this study. In-depth interviews, participant observation and direct observation are the techniques that are used.

Conducting an interview provides a ground to develop an interaction between the researcher and researched. According to Reinharz,

Interviewing offers researchers access to people's ideas, thoughts, and memories in their own words rather than in the words of the researcher. This asset is particularly important for the study of women because in this way learning from women is an antidote to centuries of ignoring women's ideas altogether or having men speak for women. Some feminist researchers have gone to great lengths in this regard by carefully recording and analysing women's speech (Reinharz, 1992, p. 19).

In this study, in-depth interviews are based on semi-structured questions. According to Reinharz, using semi-structured interviews are principle for feminist research in order to succeed to interact with their respondents in data generation about the respondents' lives (1992, p. 18). Participants of this study were divided into two different groups; the first group refers to the experts who are working in the Forestry Samsun Directorate of Food, Agriculture and Livestock (Samsun İl Tarım ve Orman Müdürlüğü), and the second group refers to women who live in the Akçatarla village. Therefore, two different in-depth interviews were organized. The first group's interview was based on semi-structured questions about the general structure of agriculture and policies. The second group's interview was based on semi-structured questions about women's lives and their own experiences since the main aim of this

study as a feminist study is to engage in and understand women's own experiences from their perspectives. Besides semi-structured questions about women's lives and experiences, basic household information was generated with demographic questions.

During the expert interviews, I made direct observation and collected official documents about the structure of the town and agriculture. Moreover, women invited me to their routinized meeting activity, called "Gün" and I attended some of them during my visits. In some days, women got busy with husbandry or agricultural work so I accompanied them and sometimes helped them in their works. Therefore, I also had the chance to make participant observation during my village visits.

#### **3.4.1. Deciding the Field: Akçatarla Village**

As I indicated in the introduction chapter, Çarşamba, which is one of the districts of Samsun located in the delta plain formed by Yeşilırmak, is the focus area of this study. Although the focus area was decided beforehand, I did not decide on a particular field where I would conduct the case study. With the aim of deciding the particular area of my field, I arranged a meeting with an agricultural engineer who is working in Çarşamba Country Food, Agriculture and Animal Husbandry department with the help of my father's relative who is retired from this institution as a veterinarian.

In the beginning of this study, I decided to focus on hazelnut and kiwi fruit production together in order to question the neo-liberal transformation of agriculture in Turkey with respect to changes on the basis of products. According to official data, Samsun is in the third place in hazelnut production and in the fourth place in kiwi fruit production. However, the agricultural engineer informed me about the production of the kiwi fruit in Samsun. He indicated that the producers of kiwi are not in considerable amount and that Samsun is in the fourth place in ranking although there is a limited number of producers. In the Çarşamba district, there is one large kiwi fruit garden and this garden produces the great majority of the kiwi fruits in Samsun. After this information, I specify that my interest is only on hazelnut production. At that point, it is important to underline in almost every village in the

Çarşamba district hazelnut is produced. The reason why I chose the village depends on the fact that the basic source of income is still agriculture and hazelnut production has been dominant from past to present. Therefore, I also prefer the village located in the Çarşamba plain in order to provide an opportunity to compare the effects of agricultural transformation on the basis of products. After a long conversation, agricultural engineer advised me two villages that suited my interest. Before my final decision, I visited two of the villages and met with their headman. After visiting the villages, I informed my supervisor about my observations and impressions. And then, we decided that Akçatarla village is the exact area of this study due to the reasons I mentioned above.

Akçatarla village is located in the north of Çarşamba plain. The village is 50 kilometres away from the Samsun city centre and 15 kilometres away from the Çarşamba town centre. This village consists of nine neighbourhoods and it is one of the biggest villages in the Çarşamba district. Neighbourhoods in the village are far away from each other and, thus, the houses which are located in different neighbourhoods are disconnected. Therefore, finding houses is sometimes impossible because of the geographical and physical conditions of the village. According to the data of the Turkish Statistical Institute (2018), the population of Çarşamba is 138.840 and the population of Akçatarla is 806. Moreover, the headman indicated that 270 households live in the Akçatarla village. Both the agricultural engineer and headman stress that people of different ethnicities live in this village, especially Circassian, Laz and Turk. Since the village is located in the Çarşamba plain, it has fertile ground and its production capacity is high. Therefore, the main livelihood of the Akçatarla village is agriculture. According to the agricultural engineer who is responsible of the Akçatarla village, hazelnut production in the plain is not approved and encouraged, almost every household has a hazelnut orchard in the village. Moreover, the proportion of hazelnut orchards increases in time even if planting of hazelnut legally is not approved in this village.

### 3.4.2. Entering the Field

I preferred to conduct my field before the period that necessitates intensive labour of women<sup>10</sup> because the intensive work load would affect the possibilities of the interviews. When I made a schedule for this study, I decided that it would be better that I turned back to Ankara when I completed the interviews in the field. I started my field study at the beginning of April 2019 and completing the interviews took one month. I visited the village almost every day except the day of Çarşamba bazaar which is set up on Wednesdays. Therefore, I arranged some expert visits on Wednesday or I stayed at home to make transcriptions.

As I previously indicated, I got help from a relative of mine who was working in the Çarşamba Country Food, Agriculture and Animal Husbandry department in the past to make an appointment with an expert who is currently working in this institution. Before I visited the institution, my relative introduced me and my study to his ex-colleagues; therefore, I realized that this introduction obviously had a positive impact on my study. I easily reached experts and the manager of Çarşamba Country Food, Agriculture and Animal Husbandry department. They all kindly welcomed and helped me during my study.

Before I started my field study, I visited to headmen of the Akçatarla village and informed him about this study. Moreover, the agriculture engineer who works in Çarşamba Country Food, Agriculture and Animal Husbandry department called him before I went to the village and invited him to cooperation. I think that this call had a positive effect on the headmen; therefore, starting the field was easier than I supposed. In my first day at the village, the headmen of the village introduced me at the coffeehouse of the village where men gather every day. There is only one coffeehouse in the village and it is located at the centre of the village. I also introduced myself and the study to the keeper of the coffeehouse and then I conducted my first interview in the village with the mother of the keeper of the coffeehouse. I thought that knowing the family of the keeper of the coffeehouse at

---

<sup>10</sup> The workload is more intensive in August because of harvesting; however, workloads of women related with hazelnut increases. From April onwards, women respectively work in fertilizer dressing, agricultural spraying, disbudding and harvesting phases of hazelnut production.

first would have a positive effect on my study in this village since all the men spend most of their time in this coffeehouse, they even spend more time in there than in their home. I thought that showing men that I am not a threat was one of the basic points in order to maintain my field study in an appropriate way. Once men rejected me to talk to their wives, I would never get into most of their homes since many of the women do not want to argue with their husbands due to the strong patriarchal relations in the village. Even if women challenged their husband and accepted me to talk, the tension in the village would be high during my visits and also, I did not want to affect women's lives negatively. I was going to visit the village over and over for a month; therefore, I wanted to build a relationship with the villagers depending on their trust and consent.

#### **3.4.2.1. Interview Process with Experts**

Before I went to Samsun for my field study, I made a phone call to Samsun Directorate of Provincial Agriculture and Forestry in order to inform them about my study beforehand. I had a conversation with one of the experts who is working in the Crop Production and Plant Health Branch and I made an appointment to visit her to make an interview. Actually, she advised me to start the field study from the Çarşamba Country Food, Agriculture and Animal Husbandry Department since my study area is primarily their responsibility. Therefore, I visited the Çarşamba Country Food, Agriculture and Animal Husbandry Department at first. I was planning to visit her after completing the expert interviews in the Çarşamba Country Food, Agriculture and Animal Husbandry Department.

As I stated above, I had expert interviews on various days according to my field schedule. I started with the expert interviews with the agriculture engineer who helped me decide on the exact field of this study. The snowball technique was used to determine the participants of expert interviews. More than half of the expert interviews were conducted in an isolated environment within the institution; however, some of them were conducted next to the experts' roommates. There was only one interview where the respondent and his roommate answered the questions at the same time; however, this situation did not affect the interview negatively since both of them think from similar point of views and, actually, I think that the

contribution of the participant's roommate are significant for this study. During one of the interviews, the director of the district came to the room and listened to answers of the expert and then participated in the interview process. I felt uncomfortable since I think the director affected the direction of the interview and the participant negatively, so I suggested the director to have an interview with him separately. After this suggestion, the director let me and the respondent talk privately by leaving the room. All expert interviews were recorded with the consent of the experts but almost all of them did not want to give their names because of their position within the institution.

#### **3.4.2.2. Interview Process with Women**

I started to interview with women in the village with the mother of the keeper of a coffeehouse. The keeper of a coffeehouse took me to their residence and introduced me to his mother. When I entered into the house, the mother put a plate on the table for me and said that “you eat first and then we can talk about whatever you want”. This warm beginning affected me positively during the field. After the interview with the mother of the keeper of a coffeehouse, she called her grandson and she told him to take me to her neighbour's home. In this home, women gathered to have a “Gün” and invited me to join them. This gathering has a special meaning for me since all the women whom I met that day became my village family.

Almost all people welcomed me warmly into their homes and shared their food and life stories. Almost in every home, women prepare traditional foods with fresh ingredients from their garden and make tea, which is one of the essential and special items during meetings in the Black Sea region. During the field, I stayed at my family's home in Samsun city centre so I travelled more than 100 kilometres in a day with my car. When some women learnt that I had driven to Samsun city centre during our conversation, they welcomed me warmly into their home to stay at night. When they welcomed me at their home, their first question was “where are you from?”. Hence, one of the significant points about my field study is my Çarşamba origin since it helps me to break the hierarchy between myself and the women who live in the Akçatarla village. In the women's eyes, my position in the field is always changing; a sister, a daughter, a friend, a university student, an academician;



however, the common point for women is that we are both coming from the same origin. The identity of the researcher is not constant; it changes depending on the positionality, locationality, situationality of the researcher. Patricia Hill Collins argues that dichotomous oppositional differences consistently indicate to hierarchical relationships of superiority and inferiority that mesh with political economies of domination and subordination (2004, p. 110). It should be noticed that the transitional and inconstant character of the researcher is the criticism towards the dichotomic understanding of modernity, because the position of the subject within the hierarchical relationship is neither dominant nor dominated.

In addition to the first question that women ask me in the beginning of our conversation, the second question is always about marriage. In almost every conversation, women asked me about “you wear a ring so I guess you are married, aren’t you?”; therefore, being a married woman in the village also helped in breaking the hierarchy among us. In every house, we talked about the marriage stories of both mine and theirs.

Some outstanding memories from the field made me feel that I touched their heart and succeeded in maintaining a non-hierarchical relationship with them. One of the women said that “I love you so much and do not want you to go before dinner” and invited her neighbours to her house to meet and interview with me. One another memory from the field is about one of the young women. When I interviewed her, her grandmother said “stop interviewing and have a little chat with each other” and the young woman replied to her grandmother saying, “what a nice chat we already have, you do not understand grandma”. And I also want to share one other memory which has convinced me that I was following the right way in the field. I and three women from the village were chatting together; I interviewed two of them and the other woman was the woman who never interviewed me. One of them said that “you are like a psychologist to us” and the other woman said to her friend who never interviewed with me that “those who talk to her are relieved”.

Two of the women who were also my participants became my volunteer assistants and guides, as well as friends. They play the gatekeeper role during my field study; they live in different neighbourhoods in the village and thus do not know each other

adequately. Without their help, I could not have even found my way in the village. Households are usually relatives in the same neighbourhood; therefore, when I entered a house in the neighbourhood, I accessed others with the help of the women that I initially visited and interviewed. With the help of the women whom I interviewed, I accessed other women easily. Therefore, technically speaking, snowball technique was used to determine the participants.

During my field study, only one woman rejected to have an interview. Actually, the daughter of the woman refused me to have an interview with her mother. I preferred to visit women from early morning to late afternoon since their husbands were not at home in this time period. All interviews took place in at the women's houses; the only difficulty in this situation was that we were usually not alone together. The women in the village were always with other women; such as their daughters, daughter-in-laws, mothers, other distant relatives or neighbours. I paid attention to not having any conversation with, for example, the daughters or daughter-in-laws next to their mothers or mother-in-laws. I paid attention to have conversations with women next to their friends or around whom they felt free, so I think that most of the time this unity enriched my study instead of bringing challenges. In addition, all of the women's interviews were recorded with their consent and the duration of the interviews with the women varies from half an hour to two hours.

### **3.5. Profile of Participants**

As I indicated, there are two groups of participants in this study; the first one is the experts working at the Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry in the region and the second one is the women who live in the Akçatarla village. I have interviewed with a total of 41 participants; 8 of them are agriculture experts and 33 of them are women. The names of the participants kept anonymously and the letters "E" and "W" represent experts and women respectively in the following tables (Table 1. and Table 2). The characteristics of the participants will be outlined separately in the following sub-sections.

### 3.5.1. Introducing the Experts

Expert's interviews were conducted with experts working at Samsun Directorate of Provincial Agriculture and Forestry. In total, eight expert interviews were conducted; one of them was conducted in Samsun Directorate of Provincial Agriculture and Forestry and other interviews were conducted in the Çarşamba Country Food, Agriculture and Animal Husbandry Department.

Five of the experts are women and three of them are men. Their ages differ from 32 to 56. Seven experts are agriculture engineers and one out of eight is an agriculture technician. Many of the experts I interviewed have village origins, only two experts do not have village origins.

**Table 3.1.** Profile of Experts

Interview Number	Sex	Age	Work in Province or District	Position in the Institution	Village Background
E1	Woman	37	Çarşamba District	Agriculture Engineer	No
E2	Man	56	Çarşamba District	Agriculture Engineer	Yes
E3	Man	39	Çarşamba District	Agriculture Engineer	Yes
E4	Woman	38	Çarşamba District	Agriculture Engineer	No
E5	Woman	32	Çarşamba District	Agriculture Engineer	Yes
E6	Woman	55	Çarşamba District	Agriculture Technician	Yes
E7	Woman	56	Samsun Province	Agriculture Engineer	Yes
E8	Man	43	Çarşamba District	Agriculture Engineer	Yes

### 3.5.2. Introducing the Women

As I pointed out, I interviewed with 33 women who live in the Akçatarla village. The most significant criteria is age in order to determine the women. I paid attention to interview with three generations of women; daughter, mother and grandmother in order to understand how rural transformation affects their lives with respect to their experiences in the rural. Rural transformation is an on-going process, therefore I also interviewed with young women. The age range of women is from 15 to 80. I interviewed with age groups between 15 and 80; however, I did not interview women

who are older than 70, except one participant who is 80. The reason is that the interview is quite hard because of their elderliness. After the interview with the woman who is 80 years old, I decided to set an age limit to the participants.

I interviewed with five single women, one engaged woman<sup>11</sup> and twenty-seven married women. Marriage is regarded to be compulsory for having children in Akçatarla village like many parts of Turkey because of the patriarchal culture. Therefore, only married women have children in the village. Among married women, the number of children differs from one to six. However, having less than three children is an exception; one of the women has one child and one of them has two children. Eighteen of the women have three children, two of them have four, two of them have five and two of them have six children. Only one woman I interviewed does not have a child but this case is also an exception; one week after their marriage her husband went away for military service and he was still there.

Women who are older than 25 have not had high school education. Seventeen of them graduated from primary school, three of them graduated from secondary school, three of them graduated from high school, three of them are literate and three of them are illiterate. One woman dropped out of secondary school and one woman dropped out of high school. Women's ages graduated from high school vary from 18 to 21. Only two of the women have graduated from university; one is 23 years old and the other is 25 years old.

Living in extended families keeps its prevailing position in the Akçatarla village and the trend among extended families is living together with the husband's family; therefore, living together with two or three generations is a common phenomenon in the village. Eleven families in this study are nuclear families; however, it should be noted that all of them were extended families and they became nuclear families in time due to the passing of older family members. Household sizes vary from two to eight in the Akçatarla village. When the daughters get married, they leave the house; only daughters who are single stay with their family. Another common phenomenon

---

<sup>11</sup> She defines herself as an engaged woman; therefore, I use "engaged woman" as a category of marital status.

is not all children live with their family. Either due to education or marriage, they leave home. However, it should be noticed that in some families one male child stays with the family even if he gets married.

Only two women stated that their family does not have a non-agricultural income. Thirty-one women indicated that their families have non-agricultural incomes aside to the agricultural income of the family. Many of the women stated that their income is supported by wage labour and/or retirement salary.

Only two women claimed that they do not work in agriculture; one of them is fifteen years old and a high school student, and the other one is a worker in a factory. Agricultural works that women do in the village have a wide range; subsistence farming, husbandry, hazelnut, paddy and greenhousing. Only one woman currently produces paddy. Greenhousing is not quite common in Akçatarla, only three women stated that they do greenhousing. Most common production is of hazelnut in the Akçatarla village; twenty-nine women remarked that their family produces hazelnut. Apart from hazelnut production, husbandry and subsistence farming are quite common. Nineteen women engage in husbandry and sixteen women practice subsistence farming. Agricultural production depends on family labour in the Akçatarla village. Some families hire labourers only when harvesting hazelnut, but it depends on the size of their lands. In addition to the agricultural jobs in the village, five women work as day labourers in hazelnut production from planting to harvesting.

The number of women who have non-agricultural works in and out of the village is quite low; eleven of the women out of thirty-three have non-agricultural incomes of their own. However, it is significant to stress that only one woman works as a registered factory worker. One woman indicated that she has been looking for a job since graduating from university. Four women are sellers in a bazaar located in Çarşamba town centre. One woman sells chickens and eggs within the village upon order and one woman works as an unpaid worker in her father-in-law's market in the village. Four women indicated that they sell hand-embroidered lace upon order.

**Table 3.2.** Profile of Women

Interview Number	Age	Marital Status	Number of Children	Education	Household Size	Agricultural Works Done by Women in the Village	Agricultural Works Done by Women out of the Village	Non-agricultural works in and out of the village	Non-agricultural Income of the Family
W1	80	Married	4	Illiterate	2	Subsistence farming, Animal husbandry, Hazelnut	-	-	Farmer Bağ-Kur <sup>12</sup> (Husband)
W2	39	Married	3	Drop out from Secondary School	5	Subsistence farming, Animal husbandry, Hazelnut	Day labourer in Hazelnut Production	Selling Lace	Wage Labour of Husband
W3	39	Married	3	Literate	5	Subsistence farming, Animal husbandry	-	-	Wage Labour of Husband, Daughter, Son
W4	38	Married	3	Primary School	7	Subsistence farming, Animal husbandry, Hazelnut	-	-	Wage Labour of Husband
W5	18	Single	-	High School	7	Helping her family in Harvesting of Hazelnut	-	-	Wage Labour of Father
W6	50	Married	1	Primary School	2	Subsistence farming, Animal husbandry Hazelnut	-	Selling Lace	Farmer Bağ-Kur (Husband)
W7	53	Married	5	Primary School	2	Subsistence farming, Animal husbandry, Hazelnut	Day Labourer in Hazelnut Production (not always)	-	Farmer Bağ-Kur (Husband)
W8	37	Married	3	Primary School	7	Subsistence farming, Animal husbandry, Hazelnut	-	-	Farmer Bağ-Kur (Father-in-law), Wage Labour of Son
W9	46	Married	3	Primary School	3	Subsistence farming, Animal husbandry	-	Selling Lace	Wage Labour of Husband
W10	38	Married	3	Primary School	5	Subsistence farming, Hazelnut	Day Labourer in Hazelnut Production	-	Wage Labour of Husband
W11	38	Married	6	Primary School	7	Subsistence farming	Day Labourer in Hazelnut Production	-	Wage Labour of Husband, Son
W12	47	Married	3	Literate	4	Subsistence farming, Animal husbandry, Hazelnut	Day Labourer in Agriculture	Seller in a Bazaar	The family is seller in a Bazaar

<sup>12</sup> Farmer Bağ-Kur is a kind of social security for farmers.

Table 3.2. Cont'd									
Interview Number	Age	Marital Status	Number of Children	Education	Household Size	Agricultural Works Done by Women in the Village	Agricultural Works Done by Women out of the Village	Non-agricultural works in and out of the village	Non-agricultural Income of the Family
W13	21	Single	-	High School	4	Helps her family to harvest hazelnut	-	-	Her family is seller in a Bazaar
W14	64	Married	3	Illiterate	7	Subsistence farming, Animal husbandry, Hazelnut	-	-	Owner of Wood Workshop (Family)
W15	55	Married	5	Literate	2	Subsistence farming, Animal husbandry, Hazelnut	-	Selling Egg and Chicken	Owner of Wood Workshop (Family)
W16	55	Married	3	Primary School	3	Subsistence farming, Animal husbandry, Hazelnut	-	-	Retirement Salary (Husband)
W17	60	Married	6	Primary School	3	Subsistence farming, Animal husbandry, Hazelnut	-	-	Retirement Salary (Husband), Wage Labour of Son
W18	34	Married	3	Primary School	7	Subsistence farming, Hazelnut	-	-	Owner of Wood Workshop (Family)
W19	15	Single	-	Secondary School	7	Helps her family to harvest hazelnut	-	-	Owner of Wood Workshop (Family)
W20	20	Engaged	-	Drop out from High School	5	-	-	Worker in a Factory	Wage Labour of Father and Brother
W21	61	Married	3	Illiterate	2	Subsistence farming, Animal husbandry, Hazelnut	-	-	Farmer Bağ-Kur (Husband)
W22	44	Married	4	Primary School	8	Subsistence farming, Animal husbandry Hazelnut	-	Seller in a Bazaar	The family is seller in a Bazaar
W23	18	Single	-	High School	8	Helps her family to harvest hazelnut	-	-	Wage Labour of Brother
W24	33	Married	3	Primary School	6	Subsistence farming, Animal husbandry, Hazelnut, Paddy	-	-	Wage Labour of Husband, Farmer Bağ-Kur (Father-in-law)
W25	23	Single	-	University	8	Helps her family to harvest hazelnut	-	Looking for a Job	Wage Labour of Brother

Table 3.2. Cont'd									
Interview Number	Age	Marital Status	Number of Children	Education	Household Size	Agricultural Works Done by Women in the Village	Agricultural Works Done by Women out of the Village	Non-agricultural works in and out of the village	Non-agricultural Income of the Family
W26	50	Married	3	Primary School	3	Green-housing, Animal husbandry, Hazelnut	-	Seller in a Bazaar	Farmer Bağ-Kur (Husband), Disability Salary of Father-in-law
W27	25	Married	-	University	4	Subsistence farming, Animal husbandry, Hazelnut	-	-	Farmer Bağ-Kur (Grandfather)
W28	50	Married	2	Primary School	4	Subsistence farming, Animal husbandry, Hazelnut	-	-	Farmer Bağ-Kur (Father-in-law)
W29	57	Married	3	Primary School	7	Green-housing, Animal husbandry, Hazelnut	-	Seller in a Bazaar	Farmer Bağ-Kur (Husband), Wage Labour of Son
W30	29	Married	3	Secondary School	7	Subsistence farming, Hazelnut	-	-	Farmer Bağ-Kur (Father-in-law), Wage Labour of Husband, Her family is a seller in a Bazaar
W31	37	Married	3	Primary School	3	Subsistence farming, Animal husbandry, Hazelnut	-	Selling Lace	Wage Labour of Husband
W32	30	Married	3	Secondary School	6	Green-housing, Animal husbandry, Hazelnut	-	-	Salary from Husband (mother-in-law)
W33	42	Married	3	Primary School	4	Subsistence farming, Animal husbandry, Hazelnut	-	Working in Father-in-law's Market in the Village	Market Owner (Father-in-law), Farmer Bağ-Kur (Father-in-law)

### 3.6. Analysing the Data

In the process of data analysis, I used InqScribe software to do the transcriptions of the interviews. After the village visit, I read my field notes at first and then transcribed the interviews myself. It was so helpful that I recorded all of the interviews with the consent of the participants. However, some transcriptions are difficult to understand because of the noise and crowd, especially interviews during which we were not alone. Some days were quite intense for me since I interviewed



all day and participated in some gatherings so I preferred to have a one-day break after those days and transcribed during this off-day. When I came back to Ankara, I completed almost all of the transcriptions of the interviews. After transcription, I underlined common points of the narratives to understand the similarities and differences among them. Later on, I transmitted the transcription of the narratives onto the table without using any special software. That broader table helped me to do more of a systematic reading and locate each narrative on my theoretical framework.

### **3.7. Summary**

The main aim of this chapter is to frame the methodological ground of this study. As I pointed out, the FST constitutes the theoretical framework of this study; therefore, the methodological ground is based on Feminist Standpoint methodology. First of all, I outlined the main criticism of the FST towards modern methodological assumptions and then underlined the methodological contributions of the FST. Moreover, I explained the data generation process of this study with respect to qualitative techniques. Following the generated methodological framework and methods, I introduced my field study in detail in consideration of the deciding process for the village, the profile of the village, information about my respondents and my individual experiences from the field. At the end of the chapter, I presented information about the analysis process of the data generated from the field.

## **CHAPTER IV**

### **ANALYSING THE FIELD: KNOWLEDGE AND POLITICS OF RURAL WOMEN IN AKÇATARLA VILLAGE**

#### **4.1. Introduction**

As I have mentioned in the previous chapters, this study aims to problematize women's distinctive and subjective resistance and/or adaptation characteristics to neoliberal transformations along with the agricultural transformations in the Akçatarla village which is located in Çarşamba, a town in Western Black Sea. From this point on, I am going to analyse and interpret the resistance and/or adaptation strategies of rural women as subjects of knowledge and their subjective experiences in their daily lives. Interviews with agricultural experts beside women's interviews will be provided to problematize the changing agricultural relations and policies deeply.

In this chapter as an analysis and interpretation of the field, the main research problem of the study is going to be analysed in four main sections. In order to interpret the reality of rural women living in Akçatarla village with their subjectivities, structural analysis is necessary. Therefore, the structural analysis of agriculture in general and PCP in particular will be provided in the first instance and, then, the interpretation of this structural analysis with FST's main arguments will be given. The first section is related to politics; in this section, how the changes in agricultural policies are reflected in Samsun, especially in Çarşamba's agriculture and the effects of those changes on rural women will be examined. The second section is related to economy, in this section, resistance strategies of PCP in order to maintain their lives in changing economic relations and women's position in those resistance strategies will be analysed. The third section is related to rural social

relations, in this section reflection of agricultural policy changes on rural social relations in consideration of the experience of rural women in their daily lives and their everyday life politics will be considered. The final section consists of predictions for the future of hazelnut producers in the Akçatarla village.

#### **4.2. Reflection of Changes in Agricultural Policies to Samsun Agriculture**

Agriculture in Turkey has experienced a dramatic transformation with the implementation of neoliberal policies starting from the 1980s, as I indicated in chapter two. Specific to the Black Sea region, Samsun is one of the significant areas in order to understand agricultural transformation. It has Turkey's two of the largest and fertile plains, in which Bafra and Çarşamba are located on the West and the East of the city respectively. Agricultural products in the area are various as a consequence of the location. For example; paddy, tobacco, soybean, green bean, hazelnut are common products in Samsun's agriculture. Moreover, paddy, tobacco and hazelnut are produced prevalently in the region. According to the farmers' registration system (ÇKS) which is the official database of the Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry, there are about 9.000-10.000 registered farmers in Çarşamba including the villages and town centre.<sup>13</sup> In the region, petty commodity production is a common production method. In addition, contract farming is not common in Samsun and the report (OKA, 2018) emphasizes that contract farming practices are carried out in Bafra in a small amount.

##### **4.2.1. Deterioration of Agriculture by the Hands of the State**

As a result of the IMF and WB's patented agricultural programs which abolished agricultural state supports, privatized agricultural KİTs, decentralization of TSKB and aim to reduce hazelnut production in the early 2000s, agriculture has been destroyed by the state (Oral, 2013; Oral et. al., 2013). Neoliberal policies implemented by the state since the 1980s paved the way for the collapse of agriculture. The expert summarizes how agricultural policies of the state have affected agriculture with a lived example from his father's life.

---

<sup>13</sup> According to the interview with an Agriculture Engineer working in the Çarşamba Country Food, Agriculture and Animal Husbandry Department.

E8: My father was born in 1937, let's add 20 years, he was back from the military around 1957-1960s. In those years, the worker's wage in TEKEL is 5 liras, the wage comes to 20 liras when you harvest 3-4 kilos of tobacco in the field. On the one hand, you earn 5 liras; on the other hand, you earn 20 liras in your own business. Now, when we come to this day, agricultural policy of the country is gradually going down.<sup>14</sup>

This example clearly indicates that the balances are reversed in favour of the market. When working in one's own land was more advantageous rather than working as a paid labourer in the 1960s, this situation has been reversed today. The situation of agriculture and the producers in Akçatarla are best explained by a woman who produces hazelnut, engages in greenhousing and animal husbandry;

W26: Support (state support is mentioned) is not for our own product. Agriculture and animal husbandry are collapsed in Turkey due to the import policies. If peasants fight tooth and nail, they live hand to mouth. Let's just say they feed themselves like a wage-labourer. So, it came to this.<sup>15</sup>

They experienced the devastating effect of neoliberal policies in their lives directly or indirectly. Moreover, since the 1980s agriculture in Turkey has been getting worse which is emphasized by all the experts that I interviewed. The reasons behind this situation change depending on their position. The expert asked a question that everyone knows the answer to but some do not raise.

E3: When you go to the producer, the producer says "I am a victim". When you go to the seller in a marketplace, the seller says "I am in a worse situation because I cannot sell at the price I bought". When you go to the consumer; the consumer says "I am buying for a high price". When you look the picture, there is no profit, but someone makes a profit. No one says I make a profit. So, who makes the profit?<sup>16</sup>

---

<sup>14</sup> E8: Babam 1937 doğumlu, 20 yıl daha ekleyelim, 1957-1960'lı yıllarda askerden gelmiş. O yıllarda TEKEL'deki işçinin yevmiyesi 5 lira, tarlada 3-4 kilo tütün çıkardığın zaman yevmiyesi 20 liraya geliyor. Bir tarafta 5 lira kazanmak var, öbür tarafta kendi işinde 20 lira kazanmak var. Şimdi o tarihten günümüze geldiğimiz zaman ülkenin tarım politikası git gide dibe vuruyor.

<sup>15</sup> W26: İşte kendi ürünümüze değil destek, dışarıdan alış-veriş yapıldığı için biraz Türkiye'de tarım ve hayvancılık çökercesine oldu. Köylü böyle hani dişini tırnağını sökerek bir mücadele ederse işte uca uca baş başa yani. Sanki yevmiyeciymiş gibi karnını doyuruyor diyelim. O derece oldu.

<sup>16</sup> E3: Üreticiye gittiğinde üretici ben mağdum diyor. Halciye gittiğinde halci diyor ki ben daha mağdum aldığımı satamıyorum. Tüketicie gittiğinde o da diyor ki ben pahalıya alıyorum. Arada hiç kar eden yok baktığın zaman ama birileri kara geçiyor. Hiç kimse de ben kara geçiyorum demiyor. Peki, kim kara geçiyor?

#### 4.2.2. Changing Land Policy of the State

In Turkey, small landownership is a common form of landownership. Kocabicak (2018) indicates that the prevalence of small landownership in Turkey has remained generally unchanged over the last century and big landownership, which refers to fifty decares or larger, has come to correspond to 6% of the agricultural holdings since the 1950s. In regards to Samsun, the average farm size is 35 decares; on the other hand, the average farm size is almost 14 decares in Çarşamba.<sup>17</sup> Many of the agriculture engineers I interviewed claim that one of the most important problems of agriculture is about farm sizes. An agriculture engineer working in the Çarşamba Country Food, Agriculture and Animal Husbandry Department explained the necessity for state's policy against land splitting.

E3: Our biggest problem is that there are few farmers who have land over 100 decares. The Land Splitting Law (Land Protection and Processing Law) was issued in late 2011 or early 2012. In the past, a man had 10 decares of land; if the man died, the land would be divided into 3 decares if he had three children. After this law, the state says it is not so anymore. It says a man in the village needs at least 10 decares of hazelnuts to live on. When the father dies, if the man has 10 decares of nuts, one of his three sons will have this hazelnut garden and the other two will get inheritance, the state says. After this law, there were some improvements. Is that enough? Certainly not, because we need 100 decares of land, not 30-40 decares of it. The law was a step, but we need something more. We called it land reform but it should have taken place at least 20-30 years ago.<sup>18</sup>

According to Land Protection and Processing Law numbered 5403 dated 2005, 20 decares were defined as the lowest limit to sell a piece of land. However, the last changes made in the Land Protection and Processing Law numbered 5403 occurred

---

<sup>17</sup> According to interview with agriculture engineer working in Samsun Directorate of Provincial Agriculture and Forestry.

<sup>18</sup> E3: Bizim en büyük sorunumuz o zaten, 100 dekar ve üzeri çiftçi sayımız az. 2011 sonlarında 2012 başlarında toprak bölünme kanunu (Toprak Koruma ve Arazi Kullanımı Kanunu) çıktı, yanlış hatırlamıyorsam. Eskiden 10 dönüm yeri vardı adamın, adam ölünce 3 tane çocuğu varsa 3'er dönüm paylaştırılıyordu. Bu kanun çıktıktan sonra devlet artık öyle değil diyor. Bir köyde diyor bir adamın geçinebilmesi için en az 10 dekar fındığa ihtiyacı var diyor. Baba öldüğü zaman 10 dekar fındığın varsa diyor bu üç oğlundan birine vereceksin bu fındık bahçesini diyor, diğer ikisine de miras verecekler diyor. Bu kanun çıktıktan sonra birtakım düzeltmeler oldu. Bu yeterli mi, kesinlikle değil çünkü 30 dönüm 40 dönüm alanlar değil, bize 100 dönüm alanlar lazım. Kanun bir adım oldu ama buna ek bir şeyler daha lazım. Toprak reformu diyoruz biz buna, en az 20 sene önce 30 sene önce olması lazımdı.

in 2014 and 10 decares were defined as the lowest limit for planted lands. An agriculture engineer stresses that the heritage issue is the biggest problem in terms of land protection. Another agriculture expert also indicates that heritage is the reason why lands are shrinking.

E2: Let us say, the property in the recent years, not only in the recent years it has been constantly splitting, the land is constantly shrinking. The reason is heritage. The Ministry works on this issue. Some regions were selected as pilot regions related to the land consolidation. In order to maintain sustainable agriculture, the land must be one-piece; there should be large lands and large agricultural enterprises.<sup>19</sup>

According to the statements of E2, the land reform that E3 mentioned as late intervention has started to be implemented somehow. All agriculture experts I interviewed underlined that land consolidation is the policy that should be realized as a priority among agricultural policies. However, it should be noticed that land consolidation indicates to a critical question; what will the future of small PCP be? The answer of the question underlines the implementation of a land consolidation policy. Even if the policy aims to eliminate PCP and makes big or capitalist farmers dominant in Turkey's agriculture, PCP may protect its existence. However, it should be noted that land consolidation has not been practiced in the Akçatarla village yet; therefore, it is not possible to predict its possible consequences on the hazelnut producers in Akçatarla village.

#### **4.2.3. Dissolution of Tobacco Production: Hazelnut as an Alternative**

In Samsun, tobacco production has dissolved due to the neoliberal policy changes in time, paddy production is losing its prevalence, and hazelnut production is increasing its importance and prevalence in the region. The dissolution of tobacco production due to the neoliberal transformation of agriculture affects the lives of tobacco producers. Many of them had to give up tobacco production; as a result of this, tobacco producers were forced to migrate or had to make product changes. One of

---

<sup>19</sup> E2: Şöyle söyleyelim mülkiyet son yıllarda, son yıllarda da demeyelim hatta sürekli parçalanıyor, sürekli araziler küçülüyor. Nedeni, miras. Bakanlığın bununla ilgili bir çalışması da var, bazı bölgeler pilot bölge olarak seçildi, arazilerin toplulaştırılması ile alakalı. Sürdürülebilir tarımın devam ettirilebilmesi için arazilerin tek parçalı olması gerekiyor yani büyük araziler, büyük işletmeler olması gerekiyor.

the experts I interviewed is from the Bafra district that was one of the significant areas in tobacco production in Samsun. His family came with the population exchange from Greece to Samsun and they were tobacco producers. He told that he actively worked in tobacco production with his family until his family stopped producing tobacco.

E8: If we go back to 1970-80s, the main product in Samsun was tobacco. In 1924, people came to Samsun with the population exchange. The settlements were shaped according to the work they do, theirs was tobacco business. In the past, you bought 1 gram of gold for 2-3 kilos of tobacco. Now the maximum weight of tobacco is 25-30 liras so if you sell 10 kilos of tobacco, you get one gram of gold. Tobacco paid the foreign debts of the Ottoman Empire. Since then, we have wasted tobacco. When the tobacco business was finished, it was all over. We left tobacco production in 1993, we were the only ones in our own village when we left tobacco production. When TEKEL closed down, there was nothing left for tobacco. State's price policy has evolved in the direction of not planting it. Tobacco fields have turned into hazelnut orchards.<sup>20</sup>

From the time of Ottomans, tobacco was a significant export product. Until 1984, Turkey was the only country where TNCs had not entered into the tobacco sector (Eren & B ke, 2016); however, the import of foreign tobaccos was allowed in 1984. From that time on, tobacco production gradually lost its position in agriculture. In 2008, TEKEL's tobacco factories were sold to BAT; and thus, tobacco sector was transferred to TNCs. The implementation of neoliberal changes to agriculture since the 1980s has affected tobacco producers directly. It is not possible to switch to alternative products for tobacco producers since tobacco lands are infertile. However, they have been forced to switch to an alternative product instead of tobacco to provide for their family due to policy changes of the state related to agriculture. They do not have a huge variety of alternative products options because of the infertility of their lands. Whether their land is fertile or infertile does not affect them since they have to produce in order to reproduce themselves. They mostly prefer to plant

---

<sup>20</sup> E8: 70-80  ncesine gidersek, Samsun'da asıl  r n t t n. Samsun'a 1924'de m badiller geliyor. Gelenlerin de iskanı yaptıkları i e g re  ekilleniyor, t t n i i. Eskiden 2-3 kilo t t n ile 1 gram altın alıyormu sun.  imdi t t n n kilosu en fazla 25-30 lira. Yani 10 kilo t t n satarsan bir gram altın alıyorsun. Osmanlının dı  bor larını t t n  demi . O zamandan bug ne biz t t n  bitirmi iz. T t n bitti i zaman her  ey bitti. Biz en son t t n  93'de bıraktık. Biz bıraktı ımızda zaten kendi k y m zde bir tek biz ekiyorduk. Tekel kapanınca artık t t n n bir  eyi kalmadı. Devletin fiyat politikası da bunu ekmeme y n nde geli ti. T t n tarlaları fındık bah elerine d nd .

hazelnut as an alternative to tobacco because of the relatively easy production process of hazelnuts and lower cost pressure compared to other alternatives. Actually, hazelnut is better than nothing for them.

#### **4.2.4. Hazelnut Production Abandoned to the Conscience of the Market**

Policy changes towards the dominant products in the region are not limited to tobacco, the state policies about hazelnut have changed in time, as well. Within the scope of Agricultural Reform Implementation Project (ARIP), the state aimed to reduce the production of tobacco and hazelnut and give support to plant alternative products. An agriculture engineer working in the Çarşamba province for a long time gave an example of the implementations of the Ministry of Agriculture related to hazelnut production within the scope of ARIP.

E2: We carried out a work here in the early 2000s. We tried to cut the hazelnut from the plain and produce alternative products instead; however, it did not work. Why did it not work? They gained 2-3 times more from the hazelnut compared to vegetables. They asked why they should cut the hazelnuts. They said “offer a product that will bring in a better income than hazelnuts then we will cut”. We even gave them money to cut hazelnuts. The government gave it, I mean. The state told them to cut the hazelnuts and grow alternative products. They did that but they poured their products into the Yeşilırmak River. They could not sell what they produced and their products remained in their hands.<sup>21</sup>

In this situation, the state policy was to reduce hazelnut production and produce alternative products instead, according to the market demand. However, it should be noticed that the basis of the policy change was not well established. The state only gave financial support to the producers once in order to direct them to alternative products. Even though the producers cut the hazelnut and produced the alternative products that the state offered, they could not sell their products. Even worse, they lost hazelnut as a source of their income. Even if they planted hazelnut immediately, they would not be able to harvest most probably for five years due to the necessary

---

<sup>21</sup> E2: Biz burada bir çalışma yaptık, 2000’li yılların başlarında. Fındığı keselim ovada, alternatif ürünler yapalım diye bir çalışma yaptık ama tutmadı. Neden tutmadı? Sebzededen aldığı paranın 2-3 katını fındıktan aldı. Ben neden keseyim fındığı dedi. Bana fındıktan daha iyi gelir getirecek bir ürün sunun keseyim dedi. Hatta para verip kestirdik biz. Devlet verdi yani. Devlet kesin fındığı dedi, alternatif ürünler yetiştirin. Yaptılar ama sonra gitti Yeşilırmak’a döktü ürününü. Satamadı, elinde kaldı.



time for growing. As a result of this policy change, the producers became the victims again. Moreover, another agriculture engineer working in Samsun Directorate of Provincial Agriculture and Forestry for almost 30 years underlines that “there is not even an alternative to tea and hazelnut in the Black Sea”.<sup>22</sup> On the one hand, this statement stresses the advantages of the production of hazelnut and tea compared to others for the producers. On the other hand, this statement refers to geographical dimension. Mountain villages are common in the Black Sea region. In mountain villages, which are located in mid-generation and high-generation, producers have almost no alternative than producing hazelnut and tea due to the structural conditions of the province. However, tea production is not the most common option in Samsun due to the structural conditions. In mountain villages of Samsun province, hazelnut is the main product for producers.

Although hazelnut production is important in the province, state policies concerning hazelnut production are problematic. TSKB as a semi-state organization played a mediating role between producers and the state in order to provide modern inputs and loans, and to deal with the purchase, pricing and marketing of products (Aydın, 2018, p. 246). With the law enacted in 2000, legal basis was prepared for the privatization of the factories and production units belonging to farmers' organizations. In addition, this law strongly emphasized that the state stopped supporting policies and product purchase through TSKB.

Specific to hazelnut, Fiskobirlik is the significant example to examine the changing state policies about TSKB. Fiskobirlik used to purchase hazelnuts on its own account from its establishment in 1938 to 1964. After that time, the government has started to make support purchases via Fiskobirlik. According to the Hazelnut Report of 2017 published by the Ministry of Customs and Trade General Directorate of Cooperatives (2018, p. 23), Fiskobirlik has received more than half of Turkey's hazelnut production in the period before 1980; however, support purchases were terminated as a result of the economic stability precautions implemented since 1994. It would not be wrong to argue that price policies in hazelnut were left at the mercy of market in

---

<sup>22</sup> E7: Karadeniz’de çayın ve fındığın şu an alternatifi söz konusu bile değil.

consequence of this policy change. Women, W26 and W33, who are producing hazelnut clearly support this argument with their words.

W26: We are selling our hazelnut to the merchants now. In the early 2000s, we were selling to Fiskobirlik, but now we cannot. Since this government has come to power, it has sold everything.<sup>23</sup>

W33: We fell into the hands of the merchant, everyone plays the game as they wish. If Fiskobirlik takes the hazelnut, the merchant will not have the opportunity. You should not fall into the hands of the merchant. However, you have to stay in the hands of the merchant now.<sup>24</sup>

The state purchased hazelnut through Fiskobirlik in the past; therefore, hazelnut prices were determined implicitly by the state. However, Fiskobirlik was forced to limit its hazelnut purchase after the neoliberal changes in agriculture; therefore, a few producers can sell their hazelnut to Fiskobirlik these days if it makes a purchase. Furthermore, the price of hazelnut is unstable, so producers do not know what to expect after the harvest. An agriculture expert informed me about the necessity of state interventions due to the market conditions against hazelnut producers.

E7: Producers, in particular, criticize the policies of the state. The price of hazelnut is very significant for them. The cost of inputs has increased too much. Fertilizers come from outside, diesel oil comes from outside, everything comes from outside. The price of hazelnut does not satisfy the producer against the cost pressure. The state has withdrawn from the market, leaving hazelnut producers alone with the market in the recent years. When the unjust treatment of producers increased, the state started to make intervention purchases in the last 2-3 years through TMO. The state needs to intervene at this stage because the producers become victims.<sup>25</sup>

Although the state ended the purchase of hazelnut through Fiskobirlik after the law was enacted in 2000, it had to intervene with the purchase of hazelnuts through TMO

---

<sup>23</sup> W26: Şimdi fındığımızı tüccara satıyoruz. 2000'lerin başında Fiskobirlik'e de veriyorduk ama şimdi veremiyoruz. Bu hükümet başımıza geleli her şeyimizi sattı zaten.

<sup>24</sup> W33: Tüccarın eline düştük, herkes dilediği gibi oynuyo. Fındığı Fiskobirlik alsa tüccara fırsat düşmeyecek. Tüccarın eline düşmeyeceksin. Ama şimdi mecburen tüccarın eline kalıyosun.

<sup>25</sup> E7: Üreticiler, özellikle devletin politikalarını çok eleştiriyorlar. Fındıkta fiyat onlar için çok önemli. Girdilerin maliyeti çok arttı. Gübre dışarıdan geliyor, mazot dışarıdan geliyor, her şey dışarıdan. Maliyet baskısı karşısında fındığın fiyatı üreticiyi memnun etmiyor. Devlet piyasadan çekildi, fındık üreticisini son yıllarda piyasayla baş başa bıraktı. Üreticinin mağduriyeti söz konusu olunca devlet müdahale alımı yapmaya başladı TMO vasıtasıyla, son 2-3 yıldır yapıyor. Devletin müdahale etmesi şu aşamada gerekiyor çünkü üretici çok mağdur oluyor.

in the latest years. However, there are some necessities for the producers to sell their hazelnut to TMO. Hazelnut producers have to register in the farmers' registration system and document system registrations beforehand to apply TMO to sell their hazelnuts.<sup>26</sup> However, as I stated before, hazelnut producers do not know whether the state will purchase hazelnut or not at the beginning of the season. In the expert interviews, state's hazelnut policies took up a significant part. One reason for this is hazelnut production is very common in Çarşamba and almost all rural families/households in Çarşamba have hazelnut orchards at any time. Another reason is that six out of eight agriculture experts have rural origins and hazelnut is a part of their lives beyond their professions. Even if they move to the city, either they have hazelnut orchard in their village or their families have hazelnut orchards and they help them. Moreover, experts who have village origins are also producers. Their two different positions provide them with a transition between their identities as agriculture experts and producers. Collins (2004) conceptualizes 'outsider within' status in her article entitled "Learning from the Outsider Within: The Sociological Significance of Black Feminist Thought" and this conceptualization provides a general framework for this argument. Collins (2004) argues that Black women's marginal position in academic settings provides an outsider status; on the other hand, their intellectual being in academia provides insider status. Therefore, outsider within status refers to the special standpoint of Black women within academia. Furthermore, Collins enlarges her argument that "outsider within occupy a special place, they become different people, and their difference sensitizes them to patterns that may be more difficult for established sociological insiders to see" (2004, p.122). Hence, the position of agriculture experts can be interpreted from the 'outsider within' perspective. While they are experts from the point of the producers, they are also producers from the point of other experts who do not have village backgrounds. E3 is one of these "outsider within" who has hazelnut orchards in one of the villages of Çarşamba. He explained the necessity of state intervention as a hazelnut producer rather than an agriculture engineer in the ministry.

---

<sup>26</sup> This information depends on expert interviews in both Samsun Directorate of Provincial Agriculture and Forestry and Çarşamba Country Food, Agriculture and Animal Husbandry Department.

E3: State said that it would take hazelnuts last September, even October. Producers cannot keep harvested hazelnuts from August until October because of their debts we have just talked about. As the state, you have started to buy hazelnuts, do you know who has nuts in October? Merchants have hazelnuts, and if there are some wealthy peasants in the village, they have hazelnuts. Others do not have hazelnuts in October. Hopefully, the state said that they would activate Fiskobirlik hereafter. It is good for us when the hazelnuts are bought by the state, then the price is not in the hands of the merchants. Because when you are dealing with merchants this happens, the price of hazelnuts went down to 6.5 TL last year. This price is terrible for us considering the diesel fuel is 6-7 TL and dollar has increased. We didn't know how many we were going to sell when we were collecting hazelnuts last year because the state didn't buy them and we were stuck with the merchants.<sup>27</sup>

One of the significant points he pointed out is in which conditions hazelnut producers continue the production and another significant point is the necessity of state intervention to the hazelnut purchases. The price of hazelnut is almost vital for hazelnut producers because of the cost pressure. The gap between agricultural products and industrial products which producers have to use in production process are being expanded against agriculture; as a result, the cost pressure on producers gradually increases. When the state does not determine the price for hazelnut purchases, the producers are obliged to obey the price determined by the merchants. The price of hazelnut which is determined by the merchants does not even satisfy the expense of the producers, mostly due to the high cost pressure on the producers. Petty producers have to sell their products even if the price does not satisfy them since they have to pay for the previous year's debts to merchants. The actual situation which PCPs are in is that they are always in debt. Petty commodity hazelnut producers do not keep their products; they have to sell and pay their debt before starting the new production cycle. They mostly sell their products after the harvest; hence, the state intervention to hazelnut last year is a symbolic intervention. W12 as a hazelnut producer supported the argument of the agriculture engineer; "Now, the

---

<sup>27</sup> E3: Devlet geçen sene eylül ayında hatta ekim ayında ben fındık alacağım dedi. Şimdi hiçbir üretici, demin de konuştuk borçlu olduğu için, ağustosta hasat ettiği fındığı ekime kadar taşıyamıyor. Sen şimdi devlet olarak ekim ayında fındığı almaya başladın, ekimde kimin fındığı var biliyor musun? Tüccarın elindeki fındık var, köyde zengin birkaç köylü varsa onların fındığı var. Zaten ekimde diğerlerinin elinde fındık yok. İnşallah, devlet Fiskobirlik'i bundan sonra devreye sokacağını söyledi. Devletin fındık alması bizim için iyi, tüccarın elinde olmaması fiyatın. Çünkü bir bakıyorsun, tüccar, geçen sene 6,5 liraya indi fındık fiyatı. Mazotun 6-7 lira olduğu yerde doların bu kadar arttığı yerde, bizim için korkunç bir rakam. Biz geçen sene fındığı toplarken kaçta satacağımızı bilmiyorduk fındığı çünkü devlet alım yapmadı, tüccara bağlı kaldık.

price of hazelnut has become 18 TL. What is my benefit, I sold the hazelnuts for 8-9 TL”<sup>28</sup>. In consideration of the current situation of hazelnut producers, the state has to intervene either through Fiskobirlik or TMO. Furthermore, the state should announce whether it will make purchase interventions at the beginning of the new season to protect the hazelnut producers against the merchants.

#### **4.2.5. Effects of Structural Adjustment Policies on Rural Women**

Even though most of the studies about rural areas ignore women as a subject, rural women are major actors in rural settings. Women’s labour is significant in both areas; productive and reproductive; hence, policy changes of the state related with the rural affect women’s lives directly. According to Gündüz Hoşgör and Smits’ (2007) study, rural women have been affected in three ways by the state’s policies: (1) through improvements in farming technology and commercial marketing, (2) through migration, and (3) through educational reforms.

As a result of the improvements in farming technology and integration of agriculture to the market economy, PCP need to diversify their labour capacity in order to maintain their lives. Diversified labour capacity emerges primarily as the non-agricultural wage labour of men in PCP families. Dedeoğlu (2000) argues that men leave women behind and migrate to the city for alternative sources of income; and thus, women remain the sole responsible family members for agricultural production as a result of the technological developments in agriculture.

In the case of the Black Sea region, current studies on this issue argue that the feminization of agriculture has been discussed as a result of men’s non-agricultural wage labour outside the village. Parallel with Dedeoğlu’s argument (2000), Gündüz Hoşgör and Smits (2007) claim that rural women in the Black Sea region mostly carry out agricultural activities alone while their husbands are away from home. This phenomenon lost its validity in the last twenty years, specifically in the villages located in the Çarşamba province. One of the agriculture engineers (E7) explains this situation with the increasing wage labour opportunities in cities; “women were left

---

<sup>28</sup> Şimdi fındık olmuş 18 lira. Bana ne faydası var, ben fındığı 8-9’dan sattım.

behind in households in which male members worked as seasonal wage labourers but women have started to go to the city in the recent years. There is a shift towards cities parallel with increasing wage work opportunities”<sup>29</sup>. In consideration of the argument of E7, it can be argued that the situation of men's long-term wage labour away from their home is no longer prevalent in Çarşamba. In every PCP families that I interviewed, either every child has moved to the town centre or cities, or one male child is determined to stay in the village with his family to continue production relations. It should be noticed that young women tended to migrate out of the village through education or marriage; on the other hand, young men tended to migrate through wage work.

Furthermore, increasing men’s participation in wage labour, as a result of the structural adjustment policies on PCP families who stay in the village, deepens the inequalities and exploitation of rural women by increasing the workload of rural women in and ‘around their home’<sup>30</sup>. The effects of Structural Adjustment Policies on rural women will be discussed in the following sections in detail.

#### **4.3. PCP Hardly Maintain Their Lives**

State policy related to hazelnut has changed in time; field-based support has started to be implemented in the latest years. Hazelnut production license is granted to areas above 6% slope by the state and the state is providing field-based support to hazelnuts produced in those licensed hazelnut production areas; therefore, producers who produce in those areas benefit from subsidies. Aside to the field-based supports, producers who produce in the licensed hazelnut production areas benefit from diesel oil and fertilizer supports. The Akçatarla village is located in the Çarşamba plain where the slope is below 6%. Hence, hazelnut producers in Akçatarla do not benefit from the state supports in hazelnut production. Support policies that enable PCP to reproduce on their own rather than raising their living standards (Ecevit & Ecevit, 2002) are not implemented in the Akçatarla village. Although hazelnut production in

---

<sup>29</sup> E7: Mevsimlik olarak çalışmaya giden hanelerde kadınlar geride kalıyordu ama son yıllarda kadınlar da şehre gitmeye başladı. İş imkanı arttıkça tamamen kentlere doğru bir kayış var.

<sup>30</sup> The conceptualization of ‘around the home’ is developed by Ecevit, M. For detailed analysis, see Ecevit, M. (1994). Rural Women in the Small Peasant Economy.

the Akçatarla village is not licenced by the state and the producers in the village cannot benefit from the state support in hazelnut production, almost every family in the village have hazelnut orchards and actively produce hazelnut.

In the Akçatarla village, the main source of income has been agricultural production even if the products have changed in time. As a result of the agricultural rearrangements since the 1980s, the maintenance of PCP's life has been directly affected in the Akçatarla village. It should be pointed out that women's gratitude to God is on the ground of women's answers to questions related with their level of subsistence. In other words, whether they thought that the economic situation of their family is sufficient or not, they always started their words by thanking God. On the one hand, although their family's economic situation is defined as bad by W2 and W11, they are thankful for not being worse. W2 stated that "to be honest, our economic situation is bad. Thank God, I can find a way and eat but there are also those who are in worse situations than me".<sup>31</sup> W11's points are almost the same with W2's words; she pointed out "I thank God for my situation. There are lots of people, jobs and ladies that are doing worse than my condition. I thank God again"<sup>32</sup>. On the other hand, W12 defines her family's economic situation as neither good nor bad; "In the village, there are people who are doing better than us and there are people who are doing worse than us. I mean, we thank God. We can feed ourselves rather than starve".<sup>33</sup>

The level of subsistence is diversified according to the differentiation of women's definition of subsistence level, as well as differentiation of PCP. Parallel with this argument, one exact definition of subsistence level is not possible, it depends on how women define the subsistence level for/of their family. This situation is expressed by W25 stating that "it (income) suffices scarcely. Let's say, it suffices only enough to

---

<sup>31</sup> W2: Durumumuz kötü doğrusunu söylemek gerekirse. Ben yine Allah'a şükür bulup yiyebiliyorum ama benden düşkün olanlarımız da var.

<sup>32</sup> W11: Ben kendi halime şükrediyorum. Ne insanlar var. Ne işler var. Ne hanımlar var. Ben yine halime şükrediyorum.

<sup>33</sup> W12: Bizden daha iyisi de var, bizden daha kötüsü de var köyde. Halimize şükrediyoruz yani. Aç kalmaktansa kendimizi doyurup idare ediyoruz.

feed yourself but you cannot feed yourself too much. For example, if you want to eat meat 2-3 times a week, you cannot do it”<sup>34</sup>. On the other hand, W15 expressed the subsistence level for her family with these words: “We had one car and one tractor in the past. We have three tractors and 2 cars now. You cannot fill one for 150 TL. You cannot subsist yourself unless you have an additional work elsewhere”<sup>35</sup>. Furthermore, the common point in women’s words is that their income suffices them by means of the resistance strategies that differentiate among PCP; also, the subsistence level depends on the capacity of resistance strategies. This argument is best summarized by an agriculture engineer stating,

E1: If they live in the village, they do not only produce hazelnuts. Surely, they have an additional income. At the very least they have a retirement salary or an additional job. Hazelnuts alone may be enough but it varies according to the living standards.<sup>36</sup>

In the case of land as accumulation, it should be stated that hiring land to produce more than the capacity of their own land is not the case in the Akçatarla village. However, some PCP families cultivate the land of peasants or relatives who do not cultivate their lands or even live in the village without any payment. In some cases, they benefit mutually. For example, W4 stated that she takes care of her neighbour’s new hazelnut orchard until the hazelnuts grow. In the meantime, she cultivates corn in this garden. When the hazelnut grows, she leaves the garden to her neighbour who does not live in the village. In the Akçatarla village, the tendency to extend lands is limited. Most of the PCP families do not have the capacity to purchase lands to improve their production capacity. Their labour capacity is not sufficient compared to the land size, so they have to hire labourers to cultivate the large lands. Compared to the inputs and the cost of hiring labourers, the value of the products does not meet the expenses. Therefore, their tendency is towards not extending their land in order

---

<sup>34</sup> W25: Ucu ucuna yeter. Ama şey mesela karın tokluğuna diyeyim ama çok da doyuramazsın yani. Mesela bir haftada 2-3 kere sofranda et olcaksa onlar olmaz.

<sup>35</sup> W15: Eskiden bir araba bir traktör vardı. Şimdi üç traktör iki tane araba var. 150 liraya bir tanesini dolduramıyosun. Başka yerden ek iş yapmazsan kendini götüremezsın.

<sup>36</sup> E1: Eğer köyde yaşıyorsa sadece fındık yapmıyordur, mutlaka bir ek geliri vardır. En kötü bir emekli maaşı vardır ya da ek bir işi vardır. Tek başına fındık yeterli olabilir ama yaşam standartlarına göre değişir.



to preserve their existence. On the other hand, some PCP families tend to buy new lands as a result of heritage. The main motive is the concretion of the land. On the other hand, some PCPs tend to sell their land to buy new lands. The motivation behind this is the closeness of lands because the distance increases the cost of production.

In the Akçatarla village, the accumulation capacity of PCP is limited. Their accumulation capacity is closely related to their subsistence economy. It is significant to indicate that when PCP makes savings, on the one hand, they tend to improve their production capacity through other means of production such as buying land. On the other hand, they tend to improve their standards of living through such activities as repairing their home. This situation is best explained by a woman that I interviewed with;

W33: There was no lower floor of this house, here. When you have investments and money, you spend what you have. We purchased land, a car, a tractor; we did lots of things. You have money but you also have work to do, you spend. For example, we bought an apartment and then we sold it because it was small and bought a new one. We purchase lands and plant hazelnut. This land's size is 15 decares<sup>37</sup>. This year, the hazelnut will yield if God bless.<sup>38</sup>

In addition to such improvements, education and marriage of their children are two other important expense causes for PCP. However, some women tend not to consider marriage and education as a result of their accumulations.

W17: We never had any savings. We built a house, built a barn, held weddings, prepared the trousseau, organized the invitations. We never had any savings. I did not see any money saved up somewhere, honey. The kids got married, so we had expenses. We got three brides, we spent little or a lot depending on our situation.<sup>39</sup>

---

<sup>37</sup> “Kesim” is used in Samsun province instead of decare. One “kesim” corresponds to three decares.

<sup>38</sup> W33: Bu evin aşağısı yoktu, burası. Var yatırımın paran, olanı harcadın. Yer aldık, araba aldık, motor aldık, bir sürü şey yaptık. Paran oluyo yanında ama yapacağın iş de oluyo, harcıyosun. Mesela daire aldık, sonra sattık küçük diye, başka aldık. Bir yer aldık fındık diktik içine. 5 kesim yer. Bu sene Allah nasip ederse fındık olursa verime geçecek.

<sup>39</sup> W17: Birikimimiz hiç olmadı. Ev yap, ahır yap, kız düz, düğün yap, davet yap. Hiç birikimimiz olmadı. Ben kenarda hiç para görmedim tatlım. 3 tane gelin aldık, azdan çoktan kendimize göre para harcadık.

However, it should be noted that the accumulation is not constant for PCP. It is closely related with the situation of the market during the year. Moreover, it should be underlined that the accumulation stories of women are mostly from 10-20 years ago. Since the early 2000s, the situation of PCP, who produce hazelnut especially, goes hand in hand with their debts. The hazelnut production is affected by the structural adjustment policies of the 1980s. Hazelnut is the main source of cash for PCP and is sold on an annual basis. It is often necessary to borrow for the new period since cash from the sale of hazelnuts is spent on the repayment of debts from the year before (Ecevit & Ecevit, 2002). On the one hand, from an expert's perspective, E7 has clearly examined the situation of PCP who produce hazelnut;

E7: Small producers are indebted to merchants for buying their inputs. Therefore, most of the small producers are obliged to work with merchants since they buy their inputs from the merchants when they harvest their products. Let's suppose that I am a small producer and I will buy fertilizer. The most significant one is the fertilizer and the most expensive input is also the fertilizer. And I get an advance from the merchant to get it or the merchant is already a fertilizer seller at the same time. I will get it from the merchant. Now, the producer does not have much of an option for the price. The producer needs to harvest the crop and pay off his debt somehow.<sup>40</sup>

On the other hand, from women's perspective, A2 who is a hazelnut producer in the Akçatarla village underlined the situation of PCP, parallel with the argument of E7.

W2: If you ask how your income is, the answer is well. However, the farmer is always in debt. For example, everything you purchase is with debt. When you harvest hazelnuts and sell in the time of hazelnut, you pay your debts with the money you earn from the hazelnut harvest.<sup>41</sup>

When hazelnut producers sell their products, they pay their debts before starting the new production period. And then, they become indebted again to sustain their

---

<sup>40</sup> E7: Küçük üreticiler girdilerini almak için tüccarlara borçlanıyorlar. Dolayısıyla da ürünlerini aldıkları zaman zaten tüccardan girdileri temin ettikleri için birçok küçük üretici tüccara bir nevi mecbur oluyor. Diyelim ki, küçük üreticiyim ben gübre alacağım. En önemlisi, en büyük girdi de gübre. Onu alabilmem için de avans alıyorum tüccardan ya da tüccar zaten aynı anda da gübre satıcısı da oluyor. Ondan temin ediyorum. Şimdi dolayısı ile fiyat konusunda çok tercihi olmuyor. Üreticinin ürünü hasat edip borcunu bir şekilde kapatması gerekiyor.

<sup>41</sup> W2: Gelirin nasıl dersen borç olmasa iyi. Ama çiftçinin hali hep borç. Mesela aldığın her şey borç. Fındık zamanı fındığını topla sat, aldığın parayı da borca veriyosun zaten.

production. They reproduce themselves within this loop. At this point, Bernstein's argument of "reproduction squeeze" should be taken into account.

Poor peasants are subject to a simple reproduction squeeze as capital or labour, or both. Their poverty and depressed levels of consumption (reproduction as labour) commonly express intense struggles to maintain their means of production (reproduction as capital), loss of which entails proletarianization (Bernstein, 2003, p.5).

In parallel with Bernstein's argument, Özügürlü (2003, p. 116) argues that small peasantry continues its existence by deepening its commitment to the capital. And this commitment is the trap of the petty commodity production of the capital. The rearrangement of agricultural relations has shown its effects in the Akçatarla village especially after the 2000s. These rearrangements directly affect the PCP in the village. One of the hazelnut producers who is the husband of W14 in Akçatarla has explained their situation in the best way;

When you think about the product, we had to give up many things. Hazelnuts are the only things in the hands of the Black Sea. We call millet, you say corn. We plant corn; we plant in larger decares, in larger lands but they always make a loss. When it comes to the way we work, girl, I am not saying this for you, but maybe the people living in the city might say that the peasant is lazy and relaxed. Yes, peasant is lazy and relaxed but when I do not get money for my work, why should I work for the oil owner, agriculturalist? I am hungry but I am not working. Girl, the circumstances are very heavy. One kilo of fertilizer has reached 140-150 thousand liras. That is one bag of fertilizer, how much is enough? Maybe you have money and you may have bought it easily but you should also ask me. Maybe I bought a tractor, I paid for my child's wedding or helped my children. When this time comes, you find yourself in a shortfall. Did the peasant not have any money in the past? The peasant's money has been gone since 2000, girl. It has gone and it is over.<sup>42</sup>

---

<sup>42</sup> Husband of W14: Ürün dediğin zaman çok şeyler bırakmak mecburiyetinde kaldık. Sadece Karadeniz'in elinde fındık kaldı. Bizde darı diye geçer sizde mısır diye geçer. Mısır ekiyoruz, dönümlerce arazilerce kesimlerce ekiyorsun bakıyorsun hep zarar. Şimdi çalışma tarzına gelince kızım, senin için demiyorum ama belki şehir içerisinde yaşayanlar diyebilir ki köylü tembel ve rahat. Evet, köylü tembel ve rahat ama yaptığım bir işin karşılığını almayınca ben niye benzinciye petrocüye tarımcıya ziraatçıya çalışayım? Aç duruyorum çalışmıyorum. Kızım, şartlar çok ağır. Gübrenin kilosu olmuş 140-150 bin lira. 1 torba gübre bu ya, ne kadar yere yetcek. Belki senin paran vardır sen rahat almış olabilirsin ama bir de bana sor. Traktör almışımıdır, çocuk evlendirmişimdir, çocuğuma yardım etmişimdir. Bu zamanlar gelince açık vermek mecburiyetinde kalıyosun. Ha köylüde para yok muydu, köylüdeki para 2000 yılından bu yana kaçtı gitti kızım. Bitti de gitti de.

In order to maintain their existence, resistance strategies of PCP get stronger in the Akçatarla village. In other words, reproduction of the household is only possible with the diversification of resistance strategies in which women's labour is indispensable.

Furthermore, it should be noticed that PCP is not a unified category, it diversifies in itself according to land size, labour use and means of production. According to Özügürü's (2013) conceptual definition of differentiating peasant household categories, six peasant household categories are as follows; (1) surplus population household, (2) peasant based worker, (3) traditional small peasantry, (4) traditional petty commodity producer, (5) new petty commodity producer, (6) traditional or new capitalist farmer. PCP can be conceptualized through Özügürü's classifications; however, differences among PCP and its classification are not the subject of this study.

#### **4.3.1. Resistance Strategies of PCP**

When the policy changes mentioned in the previous sections gave their results in the 2000s, PCP in Akçatarla developed a great number of resistance strategies. As one of the resistance strategies and maybe the key strategy, they changed the major agricultural products as result of the rising input prices as well as decreasing the value of their products. The change from labour intensive products to region specific product, which is not so intensive, enables to differentiate the labour of the members of PCP families. Although some changes have occurred in the use of family labour, family labour in PCP has kept its indispensable position. Furthermore, the significance of subsistence production has not diminished in the case of the Akçatarla village, its significance has even increased. One of the agriculture experts summarized the current situation of the hazelnut producers in the Akçatarla village and their strategies against their situation;

E2: Today, one ton of hazelnuts is 15.000 TL. I am calculating approximately, 5000 TL of it is expense, so how long will the family of four live on with 10.000 TL and how much will the family invest? Are they going to marry their child off, are they going to buy land or are they going to do something different? Small farmers are surely doing something extra. Like doing animal husbandry, as much as they can. They are also getting

additional income. Or as I said, they work in any kind of insured work. This is an additional income to the hazelnuts.<sup>43</sup>

Diversification of agricultural products and differentiation of labour are represented as strategies of the PCP to provide an additional income by the agricultural expert; however, both of them are examples of resistance strategies of PCP in the Akçatarla village beyond a strategy to provide an additional income.

#### 4.3.1.1. Changing Agricultural Products

The main products of the village have been mainly vegetables in the past since the production capacity is pretty high and the land is fertile due to the specific location of the Akçatarla village in the Çarşamba plain. However, the rearrangement of agricultural relations since the 1980s affects the production choices of PCP directly in the Akçatarla village especially in the 2000s. PCP families in Akçatarla village gave up producing vegetables over time as a result of the rising input prices, as well as decreasing the value of their products, and transformed their land into hazelnut orchards in time.

W15: Why did it change to hazelnut, honey? The cash. They changed to hazelnut around the Çarşamba neighbourhood. It is expensive, diesel oil is expensive, pesticide is expensive, fertilizer is expensive, seed is expensive. All agricultural machinery in the courtyard are expensive. It depends on financial power. Pesticides are used in hazelnut but not the others. We produced paddy in the past. When we did that, the weed disappeared upon applying pesticides. But now you have to apply pesticides three times, five times. When you calculate my fatigue is the only thing left to me. When you apply pesticides and use fertilizer, you get efficiency from the hazelnut as long as God allows. Moreover, producing hazelnuts is easier, the others are hard, honey. Their expense is too much and we cannot cover their expenses. It does not sustain itself. You always make a loss.<sup>44</sup>

---

<sup>43</sup> E2: Bugün 1 ton fındık 15 bin lira. Yuvarlak hesaplarla söylüyorum, bunun 5 bin lirasını masrafa çıktığında 10 bin lira ile 4 kişilik bir aile ne kadar geçinebilecek ne kadar yatırım yapabilecek? Çocuğunu mu everecek, tarla mı alacak, farklı bir şey mi yapacak? Küçük çiftçiler mutlaka yanında ekstra bir şey yapıyor. Nedir, hayvancılık yapıyor yapabildiği kadar. Onlar da ona ek gelir oluyor. Ya da dediğim gibi sigortalı herhangi bir işte çalışıyor. Fındığa ikinci bir ek gelir oluyor.

<sup>44</sup> E15: Fındığa neden geçildi tatlım, toplu para. Bu çarşamba civarı geçti genelde. Pahalı; mazot pahalı, ilaç pahalı, gübre pahalı, tohum pahalı. Avludaki bütün ziraat aletleri pahalı. Maddi güce bağlı. Fındıkta da ilaç var ama diğerleri gibi değil. Eskiden çeltik yapıyorduk. Onu yaptığımız zaman ilacı bir kere at, ot gidiyordu ama şimdi 3 sefer 5 sefer atman lazım. Hesapladığın zaman benim yorgunluğum bana kalıyor. Fındıkta ilacın at gübresini at, Allah'tan bir şey olmadığı sürece oluyor.

There are lots of reasons behind the change from producing vegetables such as millet, green beans, eggplant, tomato to hazelnut. Selling vegetables is continuous; in contrast, hazelnut is sold on an annual basis. On the one hand, when hazelnut producers sell their products to merchants, they take the cash in advance. On the other hand, when they sell their products to Fiskobirlik or the state through TMO if they purchase that year, hazelnut producers take the cash within at least one month. It is important to acquire cash for PCP to pay their debts before starting a new season. It is significant to emphasize that producing hazelnut is less risky than vegetables. As W15 indicated, hazelnut production is adversely affected only at the time of natural disasters such as hail fail and heavy rain. Taking into consideration that the harvesting season of hazelnut is in August, the possibility of such meteorological events is quite low in comparison with the production of vegetables.

In addition, input costs are lower in hazelnut production compared to vegetable production. The situation of paddy production is quite similar to the production processes of other vegetables. W15 stressed that they have to use pesticides 3-5 times in a year now owing to the changing structure of seeds when they produce vegetables. This situation causes double pressure on the producers. The first is cost pressure due to the high costs of inputs and the other one is labour since they have to intensify their labour. PCP use family labour in order to reduce the cost pressure in every stage of the production. If they want to decrease intensification of their family labour, they have to hire day-labourers.

W14: We gave up producing vegetables and are currently giving weight to hazelnut. If you ask me why, honey, our children were here then. Our children have moved to İstanbul, we are alone now. We cannot produce all the products. You have to employ day-labourers for all vegetables, then it does not work. Now the wage of the day-labourer is 100 TL for a day, dear. We are producing hazelnuts rather than giving a day-labourer 100 TL.<sup>45</sup>

---

Birde fındık daha kolay oluyor, ötekileri ağır oluyor tatlım. Onların masrafı çok oluyor kaldıramıyoruz. Kendini kurtarmıyor.

<sup>45</sup> W14: Sebzeleri bırakıp fındığa ağırlık verdik şimdi. Neden dersen tatlım, o zaman çocuğumuz çocuğumuz burdaydı. Şimdi çocuğumuz çocuğumuz İstanbul'a gitti, biz yalnız kaldık. Hepsini yetiştiremiyoruz. Hepsi birden yevmiyeye bakıyor, o zaman da olmuyor. Şimdi bir yevmiye olmuş 100 milyon canım. 100 milyon ona verceğine en iyisi fındık yapıyoruz.

The significance of women's and children's labour in terms of family labour in PCP is obvious in the words of W14. Production of vegetable is labour intensive so PCP have to work with almost all the members of the family to decrease the production costs. In addition, the agricultural expert working in the Çarşamba province for years indicated that family labour is critical for PCP families. Hazelnut provides an opportunity to the members of PCP families to work at non-agricultural works since the intensive labour is only necessary in hazelnut harvesting that necessitates one month of labour at most.

E7: They work in certain periods so they prefer (hazelnut). And family labour is in hazelnut. This is the case in farming, if the power of the family gets into the work, it's a bit more economical, not that it brings money, but it can be more profitable if the family works. Without this, the costs naturally increase when you get all the services from outside.<sup>46</sup>

However, the size of PCP families is getting smaller compared to pre-2000s and the aging trend has begun to be observed in the rural Black Sea. As a result of this, PCP have two options; one is hiring day-labourers and the other is changing the range of the products. In the Akçatarla village, almost all PCP families preferred to change the product range. Moreover, some of them have diversified their products depending on their labour capacity or capital accumulation.

W29: Our main product is a vegetable; hazelnut is additional. If you are going to do something, you do it with the money from the hazelnut. The money from the vegetable goes as it comes. It does not accumulate but you buy fertilizer, diesel oil, food for the family and the forage of animals. We are buying all of them with the money from Samsun. You keep the work going with hazelnuts.<sup>47</sup>

It should be pointed out that the woman mentioned the greenhouse when she stated that their main product is vegetable. In the Akçatarla village, vegetable production is

---

<sup>46</sup> E7: Belirli dönemlerde işçilik yapıyorlar o yüzden tercih ediyorlar. Birde fındıkta aile işçiliği. Çiftçiliğin genelinde böyledir, eğer ailenin gücü o işe girerse biraz daha ekonomik, para değil ama, ailenin o işi yapmasıyla biraz daha karlı hale geçebilir. Bu olmayınca, bütün hizmetleri dışardan satın aldığında doğal olarak maliyetler de yükseliyor.

<sup>47</sup> W29: Temel olan sebze, fındık ek. Bir iş tutacaksın fındığın parasıyla tutacaksın. Sebzenin parası gelen gidiyor. Birikmiyor, ama gübresini alıyorsun, mazotunu alıyorsun, evin yiyeceğini, hayvanın yiyeceğini alıyorsun. Bunları hep Samsun parasıyla yapıyoruz canım. Fındıkla da bir iş tutuyorsun işte.

mostly reduced to subsistence production; however, some PCP families built greenhouses to keep the vegetable production. Only three women out of thirty-three claimed that they engage in greenhousing at present. The most significant aspect is they have to have a capital accumulation to build a greenhouse. Therefore, when we consider the situation of the PCP, it is obvious that the number of PCP who have the capacity to build a greenhouse is small. Three PCP families, W26, W29 and W32's families, do greenhousing in the Akçatarla village and sell their products in a bazaar. When W29 talked about the money from Samsun, she referred to the money that they earn from the bazaar. Their strategy is to articulate different products and different commodity relations.

PCP families decide on the range of products to maintain their existence. Flexibility of PCP enables resisting by changing agricultural products based on the current situation. Therefore, it can be argued that the flexibility of PCP makes it resistant. However, it should also be noticed that family labour, particularly women's labour makes PCP flexible.

W7: You should not trust hazelnut, you cannot subsist with only hazelnut. Hazelnut sometimes makes money, sometimes does not. 30 kg of hazelnuts from 30 decares of land was harvested in one year in the past. It never happens, it happened that time. Whatever brings in money, we produce it at that time.<sup>48</sup>

W7 claimed that product change is not enough to satisfy the reproduction of the family; therefore, PCP always have to articulate resistance strategies. In that sense, it can be said for all PCP families in the Akçatarla village that after they turned from producing vegetables, which is a labour intensive product, to producing hazelnut which is less intensive compared to vegetables, there have been some differences in the use of family labour even if family labour in PCP keeps its prevailing position.

---

<sup>48</sup> W7: Fındığa da güvenmeyeceksin, sadece fındıkla da olmuyo. Fındık bazen getiriyo bazen getirmiyo. Bir senesi 10 kesim yerden 30 kilo fındık oldu. Hiç olmaz, o zaman oldu. Ne zaman hangisi para getiriyosa onu yapıyoruz.



#### 4.3.1.2. Differentiation of Labour

When PCP families were producing vegetables before the 2000s, all of their family members were participating in the agricultural production. Although they have changed the main product, family labour is still central for PCP in the Akçatarla village. However, some differences have occurred in the use of family labour. Moreover, there are also differences in the use of labour among men and women in PCP families. As I indicated above, vegetable production is labour intensive but it does not mean that hazelnut production is not. Hazelnut production is also labour intensive but vegetable production is more intensive compared to hazelnut since the intensive labour in production ranges is required during the whole year in vegetable production whereas intensive labour is only necessary during the harvesting season in hazelnut production.

Harvesting season of hazelnut takes one month; therefore, PCP have to hire day-labourers if they have larger hazelnut orchards and limited labour power in their family. The sooner they harvest hazelnut, the easier it is to preserve the quality of the hazelnut which is a determinant when they sell the hazelnut. The family of W14 and W15 are sister-in-laws and their hazelnut orchard is joint. Their family runs a wood workshop in the village and male members actively work there. Therefore, they hire day-labourers during the harvesting time of hazelnuts apart from the women of the family. They bought a hazelnut harvesting machinery to be used for the first time this season.

W14: We cannot collect because it is too much. Until now, we hired day-labourers but now we have bought a machine, hazelnut collecting machinery. We will collect with it from now on. If God allows, we will collect with the hazelnut collecting machinery. We will collect hazelnuts from the ground under the trees and our husbands will collect with the machinery.<sup>49</sup>

They are planning to reduce production costs in hazelnut in the long term by buying the machinery. Older male members are going to work with female members of the family and younger male members will continue their productive work in their

---

<sup>49</sup> W14: Toplayamıyoruz çok olduğu için. Şu ana kadar hep günlükçü aldık ama şu andan sonra makine aldık, fındık toplama makinesi. Onla toplayacaz artık. Allah izin verirse bu sene onla toplayacaz. Ocakların dibinde kalanları biz kendimi kıvrıycaz, eşlerimiz de makineyle toplayacak.

family wood workshop. This way, they bring back non-commodity family labour into hazelnut production with the articulation of the capital through production. Furthermore, they diversify their family labour between women and men, younger men and older men. However, it should be noticed that women are going to perform labour intensive works. Although older men are going to work in hazelnut harvesting, they are going to collect hazelnut with hazelnut collecting machinery. Therefore, it can be argued that women perform the labour intensive works while men perform the capital intensive works in hazelnut production. According to Morvaridi (1992, p. 572), while capital intensive agricultural tasks are the responsibility of men, labour intensive tasks are left to women traditionally. In addition, male members of PCP deal with the marketing of the hazelnut although women work in every phase of hazelnut production intensively.

Some PCP families articulate hazelnut production with greenhousing, as I discussed in the previous section. Both products are labour intensive and performed on the basis of women's labour. However, it is impossible that women work in both so they have to hire day-labourers. W32 is one of the PCPs who engages in greenhousing and produces hazelnut, as well. Woman's labour is also positioned in greenhouse production, which is more labour intensive than hazelnut. This way, PCP reduce production costs by using women's labour in more intensive production processes.

W32: We employ day-labourers while pruning and harvesting hazelnut. We always hire day-labourers for hazelnut since we cannot keep up. We are working in the greenhouse, we do not hire day-labourers for it. We cannot work in both at the same time. Therefore, we hire day-labourers in hazelnut production.<sup>50</sup>

It should be noticed that when W32 used 'we' as the subject, she mentioned her mother-in-law and herself. Specific to W32's family, men are also working in agriculture. However, men and women perform different tasks although both are working in agriculture. Their family's accumulation capacity is high and they possess various agricultural machineries, such as spraying machine and corn forage

---

<sup>50</sup> W32: Fındığın bahçelemesinde (Çarşamba yöresinde fındık budamak) bir de toplamasında günlükçü alıyoruz. Genelde alıyoruz çünkü işe yetişemediğimiz için. Serada biz çalışıyoruz, seraya işçi almıyoruz. İkisine aynı anda yetişemiyoruz. O yüzden fındıkta günlükçü alıyoruz.

harvester. According to the woman's words, men in their family are working with those machineries in their lands, as well as working outside for a fee. Although men are also working in agricultural works, it can be argued that women are the ones who use intensive labour in production.

Working in agricultural production with all the family members is not the case anymore for most of the PCP families in the Akçatarla village. In extended families, men participate in wage labour if they do not diversify agricultural production. Therefore, agricultural production is left for the responsibility of women. If they diversify agricultural production, labour of women and men are diversified according to the specificities of their labour use in PCP families.

Moreover, it should be noticed that many of the PCP families in the Akçatarla village have farmer Bağ-Kur, which is the name of retirement salary of the farmer. According to an agriculture expert (E3), "the process of retirement in the village began only in the 2000s". It can be clearly argued that all PCP families in Akçatarla have an additional income whether it is retirement pension or wage labour. W18 claimed that "If you produce vegetables, you pay as much as you earn. Therefore, there is no choice but to work outside".<sup>51</sup> The point that is underlined by the woman is that it is a necessity to diversify the labour use for PCP families in any way whether it is be wage labour or not. In the Akçatarla village, only three families do not have a member who has a retirement pension or non-agricultural wage labour; however, it should be noticed that all three families are sellers at a bazaar; thus, they turn their animal products to commodity and get additional income to hazelnut production.

In some families, women are also working as day-labourers in hazelnut production, as well as in other agricultural production in their village. Women's opportunities are limited in their village and sometimes in surrounding villages as day-labourers. It can be argued that women are confined to agricultural works as unpaid family labourers or day-labourers. Their opportunity to become a wage labourer is limited and is

---

<sup>51</sup> W18: Sebze yapsan ne kadar geliri varsa o kadar da gideri var. O yüzden dışarıda çalışmaktan başka çare yok.

almost non-existent. Therefore, it can be claimed that in PCP families, women's labour use is not as diversified as men in the Akçatarla village.

W10: I would like to work in an important job, for example. You know, you need to earn a lot of money. I cannot work because there is nothing here. In the village, there is no job opportunity. Why would I not work if there were jobs? We all work if we have a job opportunity. If I worked, I could help my husband. It is not enough when one person works.<sup>52</sup>

In this case, W10 works as a day-labourer in hazelnut production and her husband works as a wage labourer outside the village. She also does subsistence farming and hazelnut production in the village. She claimed that both her productive and reproductive works and her husband's wage labour are not enough for their family of five so she wants to work as a wage labourer to support her family's income. However, the situation of W10 reveals that women are trapped inside the village. The opportunity of diversification of women's labour use is limited compared to men.

On the other hand, the tendency of women to work as day-labourers in agricultural production is not observed among men, rather men have the tendency towards avoiding being an agricultural wage labourer and prefer being non-agricultural wage labourers in the village, in Çarşamba and in Samsun. When I asked the woman if her husband was working, W14 explained why wage labour is so important for their family.

W4: Yes, he worked at a repair shop and gas station; he is working in a market now. He did not have much time at home. My husband likes to work in agriculture actually but he cannot since he does not have time. He has to work outside. There is not much income in the village. When you work as a wage labourer, you get insurance; however, when you work in the village, nothing has any worth. Let's say you worked in the village, you cannot pay the pension liability; how can you pay it? We only have hazelnut, there is nothing else.<sup>53</sup>

---

<sup>52</sup> W10: Ben mesela büyük bir işte çalışmak isterim. Hani bol para kazanmak lazım. İş yok çalışmıyorum, köyde iş imkanı yok. İş imkanı olsa niye çalışmayım. İş imkanımız olsa çalışırız. Bende çalışmış olsam eşimin bi tarafından yardımcı olurum. Bir kişiyle olmuyor işte.

<sup>53</sup> W4: Evet, tamirhanede benzinliklerde çalıştı; şimdi de markette çalışıyo. Evde pek hayatı olmadı. Eşim bahçede çalışmayı seviyo aslında ama vakti olmadığı için çalışmıyo. Mecburen dışarda çalışması gerekiyo. Köyde çok gelir yok. İşte çalıştığın zaman sigortan olur ama köyde çalıştığın

#### 4.3.1.3. Subsistence Production

Subsistence production has always been the basic type of production in the Akçatarla village. Even if they have been integrated into the commodity relations, they have still been producing their basic needs. One of the reasons is, of course, related to the geographical location of the Akçatarla village, which is not so close to the town centre. Moreover, public transportation is very rare in the village and not all families have private cars. As I mentioned in Chapter Three, Akçatarla consists of nine neighbourhoods and the distance between neighbourhoods is far. There is one small market at the centre of the village; however, most of the women cannot easily access this small market. The other reason is that PCP families' income does not sustain the reproduction of the family without the articulation of various resistance strategies.

As I discussed in the previous sections, the resistance of PCP depends on the unpaid women's labour owing to its reproduction capacity. Although the main product has changed in time, women's labour preserves its significance since women are the major actors in both production and reproduction; therefore, it keeps its prevailing position in PCP families. In the current situation, subsistence production does not lose its importance, its importance even increases in the Akçatarla village.

W32: We are trying hard to do our best. We are also going to sell our products to the bazaar, two times a week in the summer. There is no additional salary in this house. If he worked outside, he would not have that much income; maybe he would be less tired physically. But let's say he earns minimum wage, he has three children. It is difficult to maintain a family with three children with a minimum wage but it may be possible in the village. You maintain your family when you produce something, produce your own food. However, it is quite hard when you think about the city.<sup>54</sup>

The main factor behind the maintenance of the PCP family is subsistence production. PCP families maintain their existence with lower income only when they produce

---

zaman hiçbir şey para etmediği için. Diyelim köyde çalıştın sigortayı ödeyemezsin, nerden gelirin olacak da ödeyeceksin. Sadece fındık başka bir şey yok.

<sup>54</sup> W32: Fazlasıyla yapmaya çalışıyoruz elimizden geleni. Yetiştirdiğimiz ürünleri pazara satmaya da gidiyoruz, yazın haftada iki. Bu eve dışarıdan bir maaş girmiyor. Maddi açıdan bu kadar geliri olmazdı dışarıda çalışsa, belki fiziksel olarak daha az yorulurdu. Ama asgari ücret diyelim, üç tane çocuğu var. Üç çocuklu aileyi asgari ücretle zor çevirir ama köy yerinde belki olabilir. Bir şeyler yetiştirip, kendi yiyeceğini yetiştirip geçinirsin ama şehirde düşündüğün zaman biraz zor.

their own food through family labour. In other words, it is possible only with subsistence production. However, subsistence production is not enough on its own to maintain the existence of PCP. Subsistence production also needs to be articulated with wage labour or any other source of income beside hazelnut.

W33: I do animal husbandry, produce hazelnut, do subsistence farming, run a market. What can I do more? There's nothing more I can do. Everything is with money now. If you do not have additional income or do not get extra help from outside, you cannot maintain.<sup>55</sup>

It should be stated that subsistence production is the responsibility of women in PCP families. Women's labour in the village diversifies within the boundary of subsistence production, agricultural production and, in some cases, day-labour in agriculture. Women have to sustain subsistence production for the reproduction of their family alongside all of their other works. Moreover, it can be argued that it is women's labour that makes PCP resistant; if women withdraw their labour from production and reproduction, PCP cannot maintain its existence anymore.

#### **4.3.2. Feminization of Production and Reproduction**

As I discussed in previous sections, resistance strategies of PCP diversify on the basis of sexual division of labour. Both producing vegetables and hazelnut are labour intensive; therefore, unpaid family labour is the common point for both. In PCP families, unpaid family labour is positioned mostly as unpaid women's labour after 2000s. As a result of the implementation of neoliberal policies in Turkey's agriculture, the structure of family labour has changed. In many of the PCP families, men have been non-agricultural wage labourers in the Akçatarla village. Only in the three families who greenhousing, men also get involved in agricultural production. However, labour intensive tasks are performed by women in the family whether they produce only hazelnut or make engage in greenhousing additionally. An agriculture expert whose family is also hazelnut producers explained how sexual division of

---

<sup>55</sup> W33: Ahır yapıyorum, fındık yapıyorum, yiyeceğimi yapıyorum, bakkal yapıyorum. Daha ne yapabilirim? Daha yapabileceğim bir şey yok. Her şey parayla artık. Ek gelir yapmayınca, dışarıdan ek yardım bi şey yapmadıkça mümkün değil götüremezsin.

labour is formed in production when men do not work at non-agricultural works outside;

E3: Men work in easy tasks. Working with machinery makes work easier. Tell him to hoe, he will not but tell him to hoe with the machinery, then he will. Tell him to milk the cow, he will not but tell him to milk the cow with machinery, then he will. It is about oppression, women's oppression.<sup>56</sup>

In the Akçatarla village, men left agricultural works mostly to women's responsibility as a result of their non-agricultural wage labour. Even if they are not a part of the production process, men are involved in administrative tasks. Although women perform the great majority of productive works, they have little power in decision-making and control only few resources (Patricia & Carolyn, 2007). Ecevit (1994) argues that men expand their involvement in the administrative tasks in the agriculture and resume monopolizing their control on property and kinship relations. This situation is best explained by W25 with an example from her family.

W25: For example, they don't ask the woman when they sell. The woman does not have a salary but she works harder and gets more tired than him. But my father sets the price when they sell, he never asks my mother. My mother grows the products but my father sells. My mother can do that but she is blamed in our society. My mother is blamed if she sells when my father is alive.<sup>57</sup>

According to Kandiyoti, the continuation of agricultural production can only be maintained by more intense exploitation of women (as cited in Dedeoğlu, 2000, p. 161). Women's intensive labour is not limited to agricultural works; rather women perform all reproductive works aside to agricultural works. As a result of this, women's overall work burden increases (Cornhiel, 2006). Mübeccel Kıray, as one of the leading scholars in sociology in Turkey, indicates that reproduction activities are entirely the responsibility of women and there is not much change even if they work

---

<sup>56</sup> E3: Erkekler işin kolayını yapıyor. Makine ile yapmak işi kolaylaştırıyor. Adama ufak bir çapa yap de yapmaz ama makine ile çapala de çapalar. İnek sağ de sağmaz ama makine ile sağ de sağlar. O ezilme ile alakalı. Kadının ezilmesi ile alakalı.

<sup>57</sup> W25: Mesela bir satış olduğunda bayana sormuyorlar. Bir bayanın maaşı yok mesela, ama o ondan daha çok yapıyor, yoruluyor. Ama satarken fiyatı babam belirler, anneme hiç sormaz. Annem bakar ama satınca babam satar. Onu da yapabilir aslında ama toplumumuzca ayıplanır. Babam dururken annem gidip satsa ayıplanır.

in paid employment (as cited in Dedeoğlu, 2000, p. 166). In the Akçatarla village, women's paid employment is not the case, only one woman works as a factory worker in the town centre. However, women work as unpaid family labourers in every phase of the production in the village. Animal husbandry, hazelnut production, subsistence farming and, in some cases, greenhousing are the main production activities of women in the Akçatarla village. Their shift never ends in the village.

W2: Women's work in the village is harder. Women have to take care of the garden, the barn, the henhouse. All kinds of work belong to women in the village. The cropland, garden, everything... Women work harder than men. When men wake up in the morning, they go to work. Chores at the house, the garden and barn are left to women.<sup>58</sup>

W27: Men are usually outside. They immediately go outside after eating meal; the life in the village is like this. In the village, men work outside the house until the mealtime but women do not, women have some responsibilities to do. There are no different duties in the village that men are responsible for, women do what men do but men do not do all the work that women do. When there are women in the house, they always do the housework.<sup>59</sup>

The survival of PCP is dependent on women's unpaid family labour in both production and reproduction spheres. However, within the changing agricultural relations in the Akçatarla village, women's labour is diversified in itself. Before 2000s, women actively worked in vegetable production which is a labour intensive production on a daily basis; however, women left vegetable production after that time and are involved in hazelnut production, which is labour intensive on a seasonal basis. When the main product became hazelnut in Akçatarla village, women's intensive labour in hazelnut production became limited to specific periods, especially harvesting hazelnut necessitates more intensive labour considering all the stages of hazelnut production. From November, when pruning ends, to April, when fertilizer

---

<sup>58</sup> W2: Köyde kadınların işi daha ağır. Kadın bahçeye gitcek, ahıra gitcek, kümese gitcek... Her türlü şey kadınlara ait köyde. Tarla, bahçe, her şey... Erkeklerle göre daha çok çalışıyo kadınlar. Erkekler sabah kalkıyo, doğru işe gidiyo. Evin, bahçenin, ahırın yükü kadına kalıyo.

<sup>59</sup> W27: Erkekler genellikle dışarıda oluyor. Direkt yemeği yedikten sonra aşağı iniyorlar zaten, bu şekilde oluyor köy hayatı. Köyde yemek saatine kadar aşağıda çalışıyorlar ama kadınlar öyle değil, kadınların yapması gereken bazı sorumluluklar var. Köyde erkeklerin sorumlu olduğu farklı bir iş yok, erkeklerin yaptığı işi kadınlar da yapıyor. Ama erkekler kadınların yaptığı bütün işleri yapmıyor. Evde kadın olduğu zaman evin işlerini her zaman kadın yapıyor.



dressing starts, women do not have any work related to hazelnut production. The time schedule of hazelnut production enables women to transfer their labour into more reproductive spheres in and around their home.

Feminization of agriculture debate is not related with the increasing quantity of women in agriculture, rather it is related with the quality of tasks which are performed by women. Intensification and extension of rural women's labour indicates to the feminization debate. Feminization of rural women's labour is not limited to productive tasks, it also includes reproductive tasks; therefore, the feminization of production and reproduction is more inclusive than the feminization of agriculture. Although the number of women who work in production has decreased, women's productive and reproductive labour have extended and intensified in the Akçatarla village.

Although all women in PCP families work harder in both productive and reproductive works in and around the house, their position within the family also determines their position in the sexual division of labour within the family. Parallel with the argument of Chen (2004), work activities of mothers-in-law and the brides are dependent on each other; however, women's ages and their marital status determine their responsibilities and positions within the sexual division of labour (Ecevit, 1999). Marriage is an important factor which determines women's position within the family. Women's position is determined as a bride no matter how old they are when they get married. Moreover, in the Akçatarla village, all married daughters leave the village and only single daughters live in the village with their families. The most common situation in extended families is living with one male child, his wife and his children.

In the Akçatarla village, sexual division of labour among women is shaped according to the main product. When the main product was vegetables, the brides went to work on the cropland while their mother-in-law stayed at home and did the housework. W14 who is 64 years old told their story when she was a bride in her husband's father's home;

W14: My mother-in-law worked less. I and my sister-in-law would go to the cropland in the cold while my mother-in-law sat by the window. When they were sitting, we would ask, why are we going to the cropland? We, two women, would go to the cropland with my father-in-law, he would carry us to the cropland. We both nailed fences and we drove in a stake. We, two women, have done it all together.<sup>60</sup>

The sexual division of labour was shaped according to the intensity of labour. When the main product changed from vegetable to hazelnut, the sexual division of labour among women has become re-shaped. As I indicated, hazelnut production requires intensive labour during specific periods of time; therefore, the bride has started to be responsible for housework during the time remaining from the hazelnut production instead of her mother-in-law. It should be noticed that all women in PCP families have to work in hazelnut production because of the specificities of hazelnut production. When the bride takes the responsibility of housework, the mother-in-law has the chance to extend her boundary from ‘in the home’ to ‘around the home’. Works around the home are limited to subsistence production. However, the bride is also responsible for subsistence farming together with her mother-in-law. In the previous story of W14, she is positioned as the bride; however, in the following story, her position is changed to the bride to mother-in-law.

W14: I did it all before the bride came to this house. Now, they came; I go to the garden and leave the bride at home. The bride does the housework. I feel better in the garden. I am more relieved since the bride came home. I usually do works around the home. If there is something to eat in the garden, I will give it to the bride. I give her the raw product, she cooks at home. In the village, it is not possible to stay still without doing anything.<sup>61</sup>

Being a mother-in-law provides her with flexibility in the sexual division of labour within the family. However, it should be noticed that both mother-in-law and the bride are responsible for the reproduction of the family even if their location

---

<sup>60</sup> W14: Annemler daha az çalışırlardı. Onlar oturlardı camın kenarında biz (görümcesi ile birlikte) soğukta tarlaya giderdik. Onlar oturuyorlar da biz niye tarlaya gidiyoruz diyorduk. Biz iki kadın kaynatamla birlikte giderdik tarlaya, o bizi götürürdü. Biz frakdı (Çarşamba yöresinde çit) da yaptık, kazık da çaktık. Biz bunları işte iki kadın birlikte yaptık hep.

<sup>61</sup> W14: Gelin gelmeden önce hepsini ben yapıyodum. Şimdi bunlar geldi; ben kendimi aşağı atıyorum, gelini eve koyuyom. Gelin ev işlerini görüyö. Ben bahçede daha iyi hissediyorum kendimi. Gelin eve geleli ben daha rahatladım. Ben genelde aşağıdaki işleri yapıyom. Aşağıda yiyecek bi şey varsa derleyip veririm geline. Ben çiğden veriyorum o bize evde pişiriyor. Köyde avare durulmuyor ki hiç.

changes. From the standpoint of another bride, W8 emphasized that if one works around the house, the other one has to do housework. However, the critical point lies in her words; even if she also works around the house, she has to do housework because nobody else does it if she does not.

W8: We work together with my mother-in law, one of us works in the garden and the other does the housework. Men work outside the house, they do not get involved in the housework. You can have a labourer do the agricultural works but you cannot have the labourer do the housework. Even if we work in the garden, we will still do the housework. Nobody does it if I do not do the housework but it needs to be done somehow.<sup>62</sup>

Furthermore, if PCP families engage in greenhousing beside hazelnut production as a resistance strategy, sexual division of labour among women is shaped accordingly. As it was in the past, the bride works in the greenhouse and the mother-in-law does subsistence production. However, housework continues to be performed by the bride even if she does greenhousing. It should be argued that the mother-in-law works less than the bride regardless of whether their family does additional production to hazelnut or not in the current situation of the Akçatarla village.

Delaney argues in her book entitled “*The Seed and the Soil: Gender and Cosmology in Turkish Village Society*”, no matter how much of the productive work is done by women, the value of women’s work is always secondary even if the amount is considerable in Turkey (Delaney, 1991, p. 266). Although almost all the work related with agricultural production is the responsibility of women in PCP families, their work is always perceived as supplementary to men’s work. The reason behind this perception is women’s work is not defined as work rather it is defined as an activity; furthermore, women in the Third World countries is defined not as workers but as housewives (Mies, 1986). Women’s productive and also reproductive labour is considered as invisible labour which has taken the form of unpaid family labour and/or been represented below its real value (Gündüz-Hoşgör & Suzuki Him, 2016). The perception of women’s productive labour as secondary constitutes the marginal

---

<sup>62</sup> W8: İşleri kaynanamla birlikte yaparız, hangimiz bahçedeysek diğeri ev işlerini yapar. Erkekler dışarda onlar ev işlerine karışmazlar. Gittiğin zaman amele de olsa yaptırıyorsun tarla işini ama ev işini yaptıramıyorsun. Tarlaya da gitsek yine evde biz koşturacağız. Ev işlerini ben yapmasam kimse yapmaz ama yapılması gerek bir şekilde.

position of women within PCP families; furthermore, women's marginal position generates their "epistemic advantage" which is rooted in the methodology of the FST (Crasnow, 2009, p. 191).

According to Delaney (1991), the value comes from women's perceived roles in reproduction which comprises of both the production of children and reproduction of the household, not of the productive works of women. Among PCP families, the production of children and care of elderly are the main reproductive responsibilities of the bride. The value of the bride's labour lies within the reproductive works although she also maintains the productive works of her family. W33 defined being the bride as not easy; although she cares for her family members beside other productive and reproductive work, her labour is not valued somehow because of her position as the bride within the family.

W33: Being the bride is very troubling, especially when you are newly married. You are new, you are a stranger. Even if you catch a bird from the sky, it is not enough; however, you have to manage because you have children. Living alone with your husband is something different. How can I tell you? Everything you do is a mistake, whatever you say is a mistake. After all, the daughter and the bride cannot be the same for sure, being a daughter is different. She has four daughters, none of them are with her. Who will come and give you a sip of water? Everyone is coming and going like a guest. The responsibility of the bride is always different.<sup>63</sup>

Furthermore, the position of young women who are the single daughters of the family is quite different than the bride within the family because of the age and marital status hierarchy. However, almost all young women in the family are daughters of the bride within the scope of this study. Only two young women who are not the daughters of the bride live with their families; one works as a wage labourer in a factory and the other is responsible of all the housework. The position of young women as grandchildren is quite different than the young women who are

---

<sup>63</sup> W33: Gelin olmanın çok sıkıntısı var yani yeni geldiğin zaman hele çok oluyor. Yeni gelmiş oluyorsun, sonuçta elsin ne olursa olsun. Gökten kuş kapsan, olmayacaksa olmuyor ama idare edeceksin mecbur çocuğun çocuğun var. Eşinle kendin olmak çok farklı bir şey olur. Ne diyeyim sana yani ne yapsan suç olur, ne desen suç olur. Sonuçta bir kızla gelin bir olamaz kesinlikle, kız daha farklı olur. 4 tane kızı hangisi var, yanında hiçbiri yok (kayınvalidesini kastediyor). Kim gelip de bir yudum su verecek, misafir gibi gelip gidiyor herkes. Evdekinin (gelinin) her zaman sorumluluğu daha farklı.

the daughters of the mother-in-law. They are positioned as grandchildren in the family rather than the daughters of the bride. As a result of their position as grandchildren, they are free of many of the productive and reproductive works under the protection of their grandmother and/or grandfather. Although young women have to maintain all the productive and reproductive tasks with the other women in their family, young women who are positioned as grandchildren help their family only during the hazelnut harvesting time, except one of them. The only young woman who works in a factory does not work with her mother in and around their house because of her wage labour.

Women's experiences are diversified depending on their positions within the family. Furthermore, it can be argued that the different positions of women in the same family due to their ages and marriage status constitute different standpoints as the mother-in-law, the bride and the young woman. These different standpoints also constitute different experiences in women's lives even in similar situations.

W3: I have been oppressed all this time. I am 39 years old and I got married early. I have always been oppressed. I am one year older than her (pointing to the neighbour). I am not saying that she has not been oppressed, everyone has been oppressed in different ways. If she has worked, she has been oppressed in another way; if she has not worked, she has been oppressed in a different way. Everyone knows their own problems. I have been oppressed in croplands. My arms and feet no longer hold. I have always had trouble and been nervous.<sup>64</sup>

Rural women's constituted experiences as a result of their different standpoints indicates to the multiplicity of women as subjects of knowledge. Rural women's multiple standpoints within their family refer to their situated knowledge that is constituted, embodied, situational and contextual.

---

<sup>64</sup> W3: Bu zamana kadar ezildim ben. 39 yaşındayım bide erken evlendim. Hep ezildim. Ondan (Komşusunu göstererek) 1 yaş büyüğüm. O ezilmedi demiyom, herkes başka türlü ezilmiştir. Çalıştıysa başka türlü ezilmiştir, çalışmadıysa başka türlü ezilmiştir. Herkes kendine göre sıkıntısını kendi bilir. Ben tarlalarda çok ezildim. Kollarım ayaklarım artık hiç tutmuyo. Hep dert, sinir sahibi oldum.

#### 4.4. Women in Rural Social Relations

In the previous sections, the effects of the policies implemented after 1980 on agriculture, the economic structure, and diversified labour use of PCP are examined. Ecevit and his friend argue that it should be foreseen that the liberalization policies implemented after 1980 are not only production oriented, these policies cover the whole society and have serious consequences especially on rural social relations (Ecevit et. al, 2009). In consideration of this argument, in this section, the effects of implemented policies on the society will be problematized specific to daily lives and experiences of the rural women in the Akçatarla village.

##### 4.4.1. Rural as a Way of Life

Policy changes towards agriculture affect not only economic relations but also the social life in the city. Everything in the village is in relation with agricultural production; therefore, the change of the main product directly affects the daily lives of the PCP in the Akçatarla village. When I asked them “what has changed in your life in time”, all of them told their working stories from past to present and concluded with almost the same sentence with W24; “Life is the same, work is the same; they never change. Being women in the village never changes”<sup>65</sup>. With this argument, women stressed that no matter what changes, the intensity of women’s work does not change in the village.

W27: The village is always the same, there is no progress; as if it always stands in the same place. How can I say; only the houses are changing but I think it stands the same. Working is the same, animal husbandry is the same. Life standards are changing a bit; for example, they used to work harder in the past but now we work less. Thoughts also change, there used to be strict rules. The current generation is more conscious of everything. Of course, people change but the lifestyle never changes in the village. Work never changes, there is always work in the village. <sup>66</sup>

---

<sup>65</sup> W24: Yaşam aynı çalışma aynı hiç değişmedi. Köyde kadın olmak hiç değişmedi.

<sup>66</sup> W27: Köy hep aynı, hiçbir gelişme yok, sanki hep aynı yerinde duruyo. Sadece nasıl diyeyim evler değişiyor, ama aynı duruyo bence. Çalışmak aynı, hayvancılık aynı. Hayat standartları biraz değişio, mesela eskiden daha çok çalışıyolarmış şimdi daha az çalışıyoruz. Düşünceler de değişio aslında, eskiden çok katı kurallar varmış. Şuandaki nesil daha bilinçli oluyo her şey için. İnsanlar değişio tabi ama köyde yaşam tarzı hiçbir zaman değişmiyo aynı. İş olarak hiç değişmiyo, köyde hep iş var.

From the argument of this thesis, when women claimed that the life and the workload of women in rural have never changed, they have actually accepted the changes as a result of the neoliberal transformation of agriculture in Turkey. The point of women's words indicates that the change is not actualized on the level of intensity and extensity of their unpaid family labour, but rather on the level of the differentiation of their labour within production and reproduction. Rural women have always worked as unpaid family labourers and their labour has extended and intensified, this is the nature of rural women's unpaid family labour within PCP families. The change is not about the nature of rural women's unpaid family labour, it is about the area where they extend and intensify their labour. In the case of the Akçatarla village, women extend and intensify their labour in the reproduction field rather than production due to the major change in their main agricultural product that is hazelnut from now on. However, it does not mean that women work in agricultural production less than before. Women still intensively work in agricultural production but they have limited opportunity to extend and intensify their agricultural labour in hazelnut production due to the nature of hazelnut production. Women's intensive and extensive labour as unpaid family labour makes PCP resistant; therefore, women have to participate either in production or in reproduction, or in both.

Women always compared their lives with the life in the city to explain what the village means to them. Many of them have ties with the city, either they lived in the city for a while or their children live in the city now. A woman, W11, does not have a hazelnut orchard anymore and her family maintains their life with subsistence farming that is carried out by the woman and the wage labour of the men. They moved to the city before and returned to the village a while ago. When they lived in the city, only her husband and her son worked as wage labourers as is the case now. When I asked her which one she would prefer, her answer was the village.

W11: I prefer to live in the village. In the village, if you have planted something on a small land, such as cabbage, pepper, eggplant, you can fry them when you get up in the morning. We have a stove here and there is natural gas in there. When you pay the bills, it turns on; when you do not pay,

it does not turn on. The village is most beautiful, everything is natural and fresh. We could not live in the city, we returned to our village.<sup>67</sup>

She emphasizes the naturalness of living in the village as a reason for their return. However, the only reason is not the naturalness of the village, of course, W11 also stresses the subsistence opportunities in the village. Their means of subsistence is more limited in the city compared to the village. Furthermore, W14 is a 64 year old woman and her two children live in İstanbul. When I asked her whether she is thinking about moving to İstanbul or not, she answered my question saying that “I never thought about moving into the city. Even if I visit my children, I hardly stay for 10 days. I cannot stay. When the sun shines, the village comes to my mind”.<sup>68</sup> Moreover, two years before, her three children lived in İstanbul but her older son with his family moved to the village in order to help his family mainly in agricultural works. W18 is the daughter-in-law of W14 and they have lived together for two years. Actually, when W14’s son and W18 got married, they lived in the Akçatarla village with their extended family and they moved to İstanbul in the following years. When I wanted W18 to define the life in the village, she compares it with the life in İstanbul. “Comparing to living in İstanbul, I have everything. I pick everything from my garden and cook. In contrast, only if you have money then you can go out in the city”<sup>69</sup>.

The common point of these women’s answers is that they all emphasize nature and subsistence farming. However, the point in women’s answers is about their social space in the village. According to Stirling, migrant women become “more restricted, housebound, segregated and socially isolated when they move to town than they were in the village” (as cited in Erman, 1997, p. 270). Many of them did not work as wage labourers and also do not have any relatives and friends in the city. Their social

---

<sup>67</sup> W11: Ben köyde yaşamayı tercih ederim. Köyde küçücük şu toprağa bir şey ekmiş olsan lahana, biber, patlıcan ekmiş olsan sabah kalkarsın mis gibi onu alırsın eline kızartırsın. Bizim burada sobamız var orda doğal gaz var. Paramı ödediğin zaman açılıyor ödemediğin zaman açılmıyor. En güzeli köy, her şey doğal taze. Şehirde ne yapacaksın. Şehirde yapamadık biz, döndük köyümüze.

<sup>68</sup> W14: Şehre taşınmayı hiç düşünmedim. Çocukların yanına gitsem bile 10 günü zor doldururum yani. Duramıyorum ben. Güneş açtığı zaman köy geliyo benim hemen aklıma.

<sup>69</sup> W18: İstanbul’a bakarak ayağımın altında her şey. Bahçemden her şeyimi kopartırım yaparım. Ama şehirde paran varsa dışarı çıkıyorsun.



space is limited to their home and they are dependent on their husbands socially as well as economically. It should be noticed that even if they participate in wage labour, they usually work in informal sectors without a fixed wage and social insurance. On the other hand, when they live in the village, the boundary of women's space expands to include around the house. Women define a space of freedom in and around their home for themselves. The reason that lies behind women's love of the village is about their space of freedom which they define. Even if most of them are still dependent on their husband economically, they are not dependent on them socially in the village because of their social network. W1 who is 80 years old summarized the importance of the village as a place which provides a space of freedom to women; "I cannot live in the city, girl, I am bored. In the village, I go out of the house, go to the garden, to the flowers, to the fruits; where do I go in the city?"<sup>70</sup>.

It should be indicated that the meaning attributed to the village/city depends on women's experiences of living in the village/city. The knowledge of those who work as wage labourers and those who do not differentiate from each other owing to their different locations. While the reference point is the workplace for one, the home is the reference point for the other; therefore, their knowledge differentiates. Although both of them live in the city for a moment, they experience differently. Differences among women themselves are locational, which points out the cultural differences. Women experience living in the city or town differently due to their different location within general cultural and social relations. How women interpret living in the city or village is closely related to their location because their position within general social relations is different due to their locational differences.

W16 lived in the city for a while and she worked as a wage labourer as long as they lived in the city but they have returned to the village after a while. The most significant point in her words is about social insurance. During our conversation, she sometimes expressed that if she continued to stay in the city, she would have a

---

<sup>70</sup> W1: Ben şehirde duramam kızım, benim içim daralıyo şehirde. Köyde aşağı iniyorum, bahçeye gidiyorum, çiçeklere gidiyorum, meyvelere gidiyorum; orda nereye giderim?

retirement salary. She has preferred to live in the city due to its economic contributions to her life.

W16: When I was a child, I was hoping that God would not grant me to live in the village. I wish I did not hope that, I have been in the village since I was 16. I never like living in the village. I am not afraid of the works in the village but I do not like it anyway. I wanted to move to the city when I was young. I went and worked for some time but I had to leave. We returned to the village. If I worked, I would be retired. You cannot retire in the village. I am not afraid of a job in the world, man's job, woman's job but I do not have a retirement pension. That bothers me.<sup>71</sup>

Another woman who lived in the city for seven years and has returned to the village one year ago claimed that social facilities are limited in the village and women have more limited opportunities compared to men in the village. Although their reference points are different, both W16 and W3 underline the economic opportunities in the city and their significance for their lives.

W3: Social facilities are lacking for everyone. There are lots of working areas for men but there is not any for women. There is nothing for women so when you stay in the village you cannot socialize and always stay the same. I would go if we did not have my daughter's illness. I would move to the city to work, I do not like the village. There is no workspace here, there is not much space to go here. I lived in Çarşamba for 7 years, I always worked, I went to houses to clean as a day-labourer. I wanted to stand on my own feet. When the economic freedom belongs to you, you gain self-confidence. But otherwise, when you depend on men for a living, you feel yourself oppressed. I am illiterate so I depend on men for a living.<sup>72</sup>

One of the significant points of W3 is women's wage labour; she claimed that women do not have wage work opportunities in the village; therefore, they have to

---

<sup>71</sup> W16: Küçük yaşta Allah beni köye nasip etmesin diyodum. Keşke demeseydim, 16 yaşından beri köydeyim. Hiç sevedim. Köyün işinden hiç korkmuyom ama yine de pek sevmiyom ya. Gençlikte taşınmak vardı aklımda. Ben gittim çalıştım bir ara ama sonra öylece kaldı. Bizde kaldık köyde. Çalışsaydım şimdiye emekli olurdu. Buralarda emekli olunmuyo. Dünyada bir işten korkmam adam işinden kadın işinden ama emeklilik yok. İşte bu canımı sıkıyor.

<sup>72</sup> W3: Herkes için sosyal imkanlar eksik. Erkekler için çalışma alanı daha fazla, kadınlar için yok. Kadınlar için hiçbir şey yok o yüzden köyde kaldığım zaman sosyalleşemiyosun hep aynı kalıyorsun. Kızımın hastalığı olmasa giderim. Çalışmak için giderim, sevmiyorum köyü. Burada çalışma imkanı yok fazla bir yer yok. Ben 7 sene Çarşamba'da kaldım, hep çalıştım günlüğe gittim. Kendi ayaklarım üstünde kalmak istedim. Çarşıdayken ekonomik özgürlüğün şahsi kendine ait olduğu zaman öz güvenin kendine geliyo. Ama öbür türlü erkeğin eline baktığın zaman basık kalıyorsun, ezik kalıyorsun. Okumam yazmam da yok erkeğin eline bakıyorsun.

be dependent on her husbands or fathers economically. However, women's wage work will enhance their bargaining power in their family, will provide some economic independence from men, promote self-esteem and give women more decision-making power in their home (Erman et. al., 2002). Another significant point is although women socialize with each other, they are always within the boundary of the village which is constituted by strong patriarchal structures. When she lived in the city, she expanded her social life to the workplace; therefore, the relations in which W3 has been a part of differentiate her definition of the social space.

Women's perceptions related to city or village life depend on their subjectivities and their subjective experiences. Locational, situational, conditional, contextual and constituted experiences of women shape their perception of city or village life differently. Therefore, women's experiences in a city or in a village, and their perceptions of a city life or a village life differentiate from each other depending on their specificities of subjectivities. Different experiences of women enable different perceptions of their lives.

Turkey is a patriarchal Muslim society (Kandiyoti, 1988) and the influence of Islam and the patriarchal structures are stronger in rural areas than in the cities in Turkey (Erman, 1997). Women feel the effects of both in their daily lives in the village. W31 claimed that living in a village and living in a city are different from each other.

W31: Living in a village is different from living in a city. You cannot feel comfortable around the village as in the city. For example, let me say something like this. I do not know how to tell you now. You cannot do what you want. For example, you cannot walk around without a headscarf, they ask "why is she walking around without headscarf?". Living in the village is different than living in the city in terms of gossip.<sup>73</sup>

In the Akçatarla village, Islam dominates the everyday life, especially the lives of women. Parallel with the expression of W31, I never saw a woman without a headscarf even in their garden during my visits. Women always complained about

---

<sup>73</sup> W31: Köyde yaşamak şehre göre değişir. Köyde şehirdeki gibi rahat davranamazsın. Mesela yani, şöyle bir şey söyleyeyim. Nasıl anlatayım bilemedim ki şimdi. İstedğin hareketi yapamazsın. Mesela saçın açık gezemezsin, derler ki vay efendim bu niye saçı açık geziyor falan. Dedikodu bakımından farklı köyde yaşamak ile şehirde yaşamak.

the gossip and rumour in the village and they claimed that every single act can become a gossip fodder in the village. Their life is surrounded by strict gender segregation and a powerful ideology linking family honour to female virtue (Moghadam, 1993, as cited in Erman, 1997).

W5: Men are free here but women are not. For example, we cannot go outside the home wearing a t-shirt, we have to wear a cardigan or something; in short, we are not free. In here, women are not free. Even when a woman talks to someone or her neighbour, it turns into rumour in the village.<sup>74</sup>

When I asked the women about the reasons for the conflicts among women, not even one woman answered differently; they thought that the only reason is rumour. Although all of them are objected to the strong patriarchal structure in the village, some of them continue to maintain in their daily lives. Some women tend to reproduce the patriarchal culture which spreads to their daily life in the village. Parallel with the argument of Bolak (1995), rural women adopt patriarchy “as a cultural script” without being internalized (as cited in Erman, 1998). A woman who is 61 years old told a story from her own life which is quite common;

W21: I never go out without taking permission from my husband, as in the early years of our marriage. I have never gone out without permission for 40 years. For example, I want to go to my mother’s home; I will not go unless he gives me permission. If he does not allow me, there is nothing to do.<sup>75</sup>

However, this situation has started to change in the Akçatarla village; younger women have questioned patriarchy adopted as a cultural script. At that point, it should be noticed that women are not passive objects of patriarchy; rather they are active subjects. Rural women have the potential of “bargaining with patriarchy” which stands for women’s strategies within a set of concrete constraints (Kandiyoti, 1988, p. 274). W2 who is 39 years old claims that “mothers who are 60 years old want what they learned from their mothers-in-law 20-30 years ago from their brides

---

<sup>74</sup> W5: Erkekler burada özgür ama kadınlar öyle değil. Mesela biz tshirtle dışarıya gidemeyiz, üstümüze bi hırka bi şey takmak zorundayız yani özgür değiliz. Burada kadınlar özgür değil. Az birisiyle, kadının bir komşusuyla laf etmesi bile söz olur köyde.

<sup>75</sup> W21: Eşimden izinsiz aşağı inmeme, nasıl evlendiysem öyle. 40 senedir izinsiz aşağı inmiyorum. Annemgile gidicem daha, gönderirse gidicem. Göndermezse bir şey yok.

and daughters now”<sup>76</sup>. However, she pointed out that this situation should be changed and it has started to change.

It should be noticed that this situation is not related to the ages of women, rather it is related to the changing social relations over time. Before the 2000s, men’s seasonal migration to the cities for wage labour was a common phenomenon in the Akçatarla village like in the Western Black Sea region. During that time, women took all the responsibility of production and reproduction on their own. Therefore, women’s social space was limited to in and around their home. However, the product change from vegetables to hazelnut has given opportunities to women to extend their social space and time for themselves. Moreover, members of the families have migrated to the town or city due to increasing wage-labour opportunities or education. This way, women’s social space has enlarged directly or indirectly.

Rural women’s standpoints differentiated among themselves; moreover, the standpoint of younger women and older women in the rural also differentiated among themselves. The difference basically depends on the contextual differences in younger and older women’s lives. Younger women compared to older women in the rural have had more education and a more extended social space due to their education; therefore, their perception of rural life is shaped in accordance with their subjective experiences. As a result of this, women’s locations, situations and conditions which are constituted within their relations give them a bargaining power with patriarchy.

#### **4.4.2. Experiences of Rural Women in Their Daily Lives**

In extended families, the father-in-law and the husband of the woman are at the top of the age-sex hierarchy, then comes the mother-in-law. All decisions concern the family and are made within the family and most of the women are not included in the decision-making process of the family. However, this situation changes when the father-in-law is not alive. In W32’s family, her mother-in-law’s position gained strength when her father-in-law died; “Usually my husband decides, my mother

---

<sup>76</sup> W2: 60 yaşına gelmiş anneler kendi kayınvalidelerinden mesela bundan 20-30 yıl öncesini ne gördülerse hala daha benim gelinlerim kızlarım öyle yapsın istiyolar.

approves. We talk together, but the final decision comes from my husband and mother”<sup>77</sup>. In some cases, even when the father-in-law is alive, the mother-in-law also has power in decision making process in her family. For example, in W32’s family, the position of her mother-in-law is positioned before her husband’s position within the age-sex hierarchy of the family.

W18: My father-in-law and mother-in-law make all decisions. But we make a joint decision; they ask our opinions, they ask my husband’s opinion. However, the final decision comes from my father-in-law and my mother-in-law.<sup>78</sup>

Women get involved in the decision making process differently in the same family depending on their age and marriage status. Moreover, women were not entitled to make decisions about their education and their marriage. W15 who is 55 years old wanted to go to the school when she was at the age of primary school; however, her father never enrolled her to primary school. When I asked if she would like to have gone the school, she answered she wishes that more than anything.

W15: I ran away to the school but there was poverty then. I have little brothers and sisters, they were taking me from the school in order to send me to work as a day-labourer. I was coming home from school crying. I was wondering why my friends were going to the school and why they would not send me to school. They said no, we will earn a living, they said. I was still trying to run away while my little brothers and sisters slept, but they took me back again.<sup>79</sup>

One reason they did not send girls to school is they had to care for their little brothers and sisters when their family worked in agricultural production whether in their cropland or as day-labourers. Another reason is PCP families need more unpaid family labour in the production even if one person in their family cares for the children. Another reason is to marry girls off to keep their “honour”.

---

<sup>77</sup> W32: Genellikle eşim karar verir, annem de onaylar. Birlikte konuşulur aslında ama son karar eşim ve annemden çıkar.

<sup>78</sup> W18: Tüm kararları kayınpederimle kaynanam alır. Ama yine ortak alırız, yine bizim de fikrimizi sorarlar, eşimin fikrini de sorarlar. Ama son karar kayınpederimle kaynanamdan çıkar.

<sup>79</sup> W15: Okula kaçyordum da o zaman fakirlik vardı. Küçük çocuklar vardı, yevmiyeye gideceğiz diye beni okuldan alıyolardı. Ağlaya ağlaya eve geliyodum okuldan. Niye diyodum arkadaşlarım gidiyo da beni niye vermiyosunuz diyodum. Yok diyolardı ekmek parası kazanacağız biz diyorladı. Ben yine çocukları uyutup kaçmaya çalışıyodum, beni geri alıyolardı.

W11: I never wanted to get married, I really would not. My primary aim was to continue to my education. I could not continue to my education, it remained inside me, I feel regretful about it. When two people get together, our people do not approve. Why are you talking to him, you cannot. They saw me and my husband talking, they told my family then the great trouble arose. Why do girls have no right? Young girls have no right. Now it is not like that.<sup>80</sup>

In the Akçatarla village, many of the women who are older than 25 years old have less than secondary school education. Only two women whose ages are 29 and 30 graduated from secondary school; however, the significant point in here is that the implementation of the compulsory education system in 1997 has had a considerable impact on the continuation of education for women who are younger than 34 years old now. It can be argued that women in the Akçatarla village have completed the minimum education level when secondary education was compulsory. However, this trend has changed in time in the Akçatarla village. These women's daughters have higher education than their mothers thanks to their mothers. Almost all women indicated that they wish to have had more education. As a result of their experience, women have supported their children, especially daughters, to continue their education until they graduated from university.

W15: My children always dropped out of secondary school but my daughter who is 14 years old still studies. I will study, mom, she says. I want her to study so much, I say I will fight for you. I tell her to not get influenced by anyone, to not say "I love someone". I want it so much, I am her supporter. I tell her to study, I got your back. I want her to study because I could not. I want it so much, honey. I want her to earn a living in an office work. I also wanted my other children to study but they did not. My oldest son wanted to but my husband did not let him, he said that we have larger croplands. We could not get him to study, that is why I am suffering.<sup>81</sup>

---

<sup>80</sup> W11: Ben hiç evlenmek istemezdim, gerçekten istemezdim. Benim ilk hedefim okumaktı. Okuyamadım sadece içimde kalan o oldu, içimde ukde kaldı. İki insan bir araya geldi mi ters karşılıyor bizim insanlarımız. Sen neden konuşuyorsun konuşmayacaksın. Eşimle beni görüyorlar söylüyorlar ondan sonra kıyamet kopuyor zaten. Neden kızların hakkı yok? Genç kızların hiçbir zaman hakkı yok. Şimdi öyle değil tabi.

<sup>81</sup> W15: Benim çocuklarım da hep orta okuldan ayrıldı ama 14 yaşındaki okuyor. Ben okuyacağım anne diyor. Anam çok istiyorum okusun, ben de peşinde mücadele etcem diyorum ona. Hiçbirine kapılma diyorum, hiç seviyorum ediyorum deme diyorum. Çok istiyorum yani, peşinde yardımcıyım. Oku diyorum, peşinde dirençli durcam diyorum. Okumasını istiyorum, çünkü biz okumadığımızdan. Çok istiyorum tatlım. Böyle bir masa başında bir şey olsun, ekmeğini çıkartsın. Diğerleri de okusun istedim ama onlar okumadılar. Büyük oğlum istedi ama ona da eşim tarla çok dedi. Onu da okutamadık, ondan da karnım yanık işte.

I interviewed with six young women; two of them graduated from university, one of them prepares for the university entrance exam, one of them goes to elementary school, others graduated from high school except one. A young woman who dropped out of high school indicated that she wishes to have completed her education after her working experiences in a factory as a wage worker. She is the only woman who works as a wage labourer in the Akçatarla village.

W20: I dropped out of my education at high school in the first grade but I wish I did not. It is not the same as I thought then. I did not want to continue to my education at that time. I think things would be different if I got educated more, it is not the same as I thought then. Because you work, you see what the work is. But it would be different if you had your own business, profession. I thought that I would sit at home and I would walk around but it did not go like that.<sup>82</sup>

When she experienced working as a factory worker, her thoughts have started to change depending on her subjective experiences. Partial knowledge of women which includes perceptions, emotions and feelings is conditional and contingent; therefore, it changes when the conditions and contingences change.

Women's daily lives have differentiated as a result of the changes in agricultural production in the Akçatarla village. When the intensity of agricultural production reduced, women have tended to work in and around their home. In PCP families that have reduced the production of hazelnut, the relationship with other women in the village is enriching. Specific to hazelnut production, women claimed that their workload is intensive only in summer; however, they often come together in winter even if they have work to do. In winter, they come together with close neighbours every other day. In order to meet other neighbours, they organize a regular meeting, called as "gün" twice a month. When they produced vegetables, they almost did not have time to say hello with their own words. W21 who works in agriculture husbandry, subsistence production and hazelnut production compared her daily life when they used to produce vegetables and now.

---

<sup>82</sup> W20: Lise 1'de bıraktım ama şu an isterdim. O zamanki aklımla şu an ki aklım bir değil. O zaman istemedim okumak. Çok şey farklı olurdu heralde, şu zamanki aklım çok farklı. Çünkü çalışıyorsun çalışmanın ne olduğunu görüyorsun. Ama kendi işin olsa mesleğin olsa daha farklı olur. O zamanki aklımla evde otururum gezerim tozarım diye düşündüm ama öyle olmadı.



W21: We did not have time to visit each other in the past. You could not even see the person passing through the door, there was no time to look outside. Now, when you go out to get bread, you see people. When you visit the neighbour, you see people.<sup>83</sup>

On the other hand, the situation is different for women who have greenhouses. Their work is intensive in both summer and winter. PCP families who have greenhouses are also sellers in a bazaar as a part of their resistance strategies; therefore, their workload is more intensive compared to women whose families do not engage in greenhousing. Women who do greenhousing do not have time for themselves and their social space is limited to their family. They cannot extend their social relations with the other women in the village.

W26: There is no time left. You come from the field tired in the evening, for example, you go directly to bed. We have a meeting but we cannot go because of tiredness. Some of them organize “gün” but I do not. We cannot meet each other because of work in the village.<sup>84</sup>

Differences in women’s daily lives in the village constitute their perception of change in their social lives. The situational and contextual character of partial knowledge shape women’s experience of change.

Women’s unpaid family labour is associated with the pattern of small landownership which is the common landownership form in the Akçatarla village. Kocabicak (2018, p. 116) argues that “gendered landownership gives rise to a gender-based division of labour and patriarchal exploitation of women’s labour within small medium size farms”. In the Akçatarla village, women’s landownership is a rare phenomenon although women shoulder the responsibility of production relations and the survival of the family. Only one woman out of thirty-three stated that she has the ownership of a cropland in the Akçatarla village. Other women do not have any properties

---

<sup>83</sup> W21: Eskiden birbirimize gitmeye zamanımız yoktu. Kapıdan geçeni bile göremiyodun, dışarıya bakmaya vakit yoktu. Şimdi ekmek almaya diye gidiyosun iki insan görüyorsun. Komşuya gidiyosun iki insan görüyorsun.

<sup>84</sup> W26: Hiç zaman kalmıyor. Akşam yorgun geliyorsun mesela tarladan direk yatıyorsun yatağa. Gezmemiz oluyo, gidemiyoz yorgunluktan. Gün yapan oluyo ama ben yapamıyom hiç. İşlerden birbirimizle görüşemiyoz ki köyde.

although they predominantly maintain agricultural production with the other women in their family.

Furthermore, it should be noticed that women's landownership is correlated with women's registration as a farmer in the farmers' registration system. Women farmers have to document their own farmland to register. Although women have the responsibility of production in hand; their husbands, fathers, brothers register as farmers. E3 indicated that registered women farmers' ratio is less than 10% in Çarşamba. Therefore, women's productive labour remains as secondary in official statistics. De Schutter (2013) claims that almost 450 million people are employed as farmworkers worldwide; however, women constitute at least 20-30%. Parallel with the argument of De Schutter (2013), these statistics should be treated as unreliable since women's labour in this sector remains invisible due to their undeclared labour.

#### **4.4.3. Rural Women's Everyday Life Politics**

The solidarity culture in agricultural production disappears in time in the Akçatarla village. In the past, when PCP families produced vegetables as main products, they harvested their product with co-op farming. However, when they change their product from vegetable to hazelnut as a resistance strategy, the co-op farming disappeared in the Akçatarla village. The main reason behind the disappearance of co-op farming is the diversification of the resistance strategies of PCP families. The labour power of PCP families decreases as a result of wage labour and migration; therefore, unpaid family labour meets their needs in production only with difficulty. If the land size is larger than the existing labour power of the family, PCP families have to hire day labourers in hazelnut production. In many cases, co-op farming was replaced with hiring day-labourers for hazelnut production in the Akçatarla village. However, it can be argued that when solidarity in production disappears, solidarity in their social lives rises in importance among rural women.

W21: We used to do co-op farming, there are no vegetables and no co-op farming now. People have hazelnut orchards now and everybody hires day-

labourers for hazelnut production. At the present time, women do not do anything together except sitting.<sup>85</sup>

The point that is underlined by W21 is significant to understand the solidarity among women in their social lives since sitting is not just an act to describe being physically seated but rather it covers women's conversation, sharing, experience, and emotions. They share their experiences in their daily lives with each other when they come together. Rural women are strengthened in solidarity with each other when faced with difficulties in their lives. The story told by W31 indicates to how women gain strength from each other.

W31: My aunt-in-law is my best confidante, she knows me. I have been crying side by side with her. I never forget, I had been married for three months; they called my husband's sister to send me back to my father's home. We do not want you anymore, go back, they said. This is the biggest problem I have suffered in my life. I have always shared everything with my aunt-in-law. When I got married I did not know much about housework. I never forget, I threw a handful of rice into a pot of water and waited for it to turn into a rice dish. I learned by asking, I learned most of it from my aunt-in-law.<sup>86</sup>

Although women's solidarity in production has disappeared, solidarity in reproduction is still significant for rural women in the Akçatarla village. When women were asked about which subjects women help each other out, their answers also referred to reproductive tasks which women perform throughout their lives. The reproductive responsibilities of women have constituted a certain type of solidarity among rural women. Almost all women indicated that they always help each other at the time of weddings, funerals, mawlid and help while preparing a large quantity of food, such as filo pastry for ramadan, canned foods for winter.

W6: We want help when there is something we cannot do on our own. If there is work, we will come together immediately. When we spread the dough, when there is a wedding, funeral, if someone needs help, we come

---

<sup>85</sup> W21: Eskiden imece yapardık, şimdi sebze yok imece de yok. Şimdi herkeste fındık var, ona da herkes günlükçü alıyor. Şimdi kadınların birlikte oturmaktan başka yaptığı iş yok.

<sup>86</sup> W31: Yengem en yakın sırdaşımdır, bilir beni. Çok gidip ağlamışlığım vardır yani. Üç aylık evliydim hiç unutmam; görüncemi çağırdılar beni geri yolluyolar. Artık biz seni istemiyoruz, geri git. En çok çektiğim sıkıntı budur hayatımda. Hep yengemle paylaştım. İlk evlendiğimde pek bir şey bilmiyodum ev işi olarak. Hiç unutmam bir tencere suyun içine bir avuç pirinç atıp pilav olacak diye beklediğimi bilirim. Sorarak öğrendim, çoğunu yengemden öğrenmişimdir.

together. For example, when you knead some dough to spread, you cannot do it alone. One can hardly do anything alone. But when women come together, is one woman the same as ten women?<sup>87</sup>

The statement of W1 who is 80 years old explains the indispensable character of the solidarity among women well; “Women help each other with everything. A person is born connected to others”<sup>88</sup>. The solidarity among women still keeps its prevailing position in reproduction and their social lives although solidarity in agricultural production disappears; even the need for any kind of solidarity has become more and more of an indispensable element of women’s life now.

The women in the Akçatarla village dream about empowering themselves by setting up a business of any kind together with other women. The number of women who dream about opening a bakery in the village is not few. They claimed that they have to create their own job opportunity in the village since they thought that nobody cares about them. In the Akçatarla village, all women touch upon the same point, women in the village do not have a wage labour opportunity so they want to create their own opportunity to earn their own money. Furthermore, some women dream bigger and want to establish a cooperative for women in the Akçatarla village. W33 explained what would have changed if they had an agricultural cooperative and why they cannot establish it considering that it would be so favourable.

W33: For example, I am doing animal husbandry but I do not produce milk and yogurt because I cannot manage. I am selling cottage cheese and cheese very well, I cannot supply my products to my customers. It would be very different, very well if we had a cooperative. I would love to do something like that, it would be different, of course. If someone leads, I can help with anything. There was such a thing, it remained unfulfilled. A few years ago, a meeting was held but it remained unfulfilled. I am a primary school graduate; if I studied more, I would be different. Now, do not ever ask about the thoughts of the elderly, they never think about the future but if I studied more, if I earned my own money, it would be different. I would believe in myself, have some money. I would collaborate with everyone because I would believe in myself. But now that I do not have my own money, I can promise

---

<sup>87</sup> W6: Kendi başına yapamayacağımız bir iş olduğu zaman yardım istiyoz daha çok. Hemen bi şey olsa toplanırız. Yufka açsak, cenazede, düğünde, birinin bi şeyi olsa hemen koşarız. Mesela bi hamur yoğurdun yufka açacaksın, e tek başına olmaz. İnsan tek başına bi şeyi zor başarır. Ama kadınlarla biaraya geldi mi, bir tane el nerde, on tane el nerde?

<sup>88</sup> W1: Kadınlar her konuda yardımlaşırılar. İnsan birbirine zincir doğar.

for what? I cannot, can I? I depend on my husband, fair's fair. People who go to the university are different, people's self-confidence is also different. We are good, thank God but the person who studies will be different, whatever you say to me. If women support each other, if five people come together, cannot they do it? It does not happen like this. We did not study, we do not have the opportunity, we do not have money; it cannot happen. Ideas are needed but money is also needed. For example, you will start something, how will you do it? You will do that with money.<sup>89</sup>

Parallel with the argument of Agarwal, rural women's limited access to resources such as education, wealth and property and their limited control on their labour deepens the gender gap in their economic well-being, social status and empowerment (as cited in Kocabicak, 2018, p. 115). However, at that point, it can be argued that women can generate an alternative way to challenge structural inequalities they face. W11 pointed out if they had political power, it would be different; "We actually need someone to be a pioneer, we need a mukhtar. They choose men as headmen, we need one of us"<sup>90</sup>. Agarwal (2014) argues that women have to shift from being 'women-in-themselves' to women-for-themselves as a collective identity in order to enhance a sense of collective identity for advocating their shared interests and this shift would depend on whether women can overcome the structural constraints they have, and what outside support they have to facilitate this.

At the end of our conversations, I asked women what they would like to change in their lives from past to now in order to understand their perceptions of empowerment

---

<sup>89</sup> W33: Mesela ben inek bakıyorum ama süt, yoğurt yapmıyorum yetiştiremediğim için. Çökelek ve peyniri süper satıyorum, müşterilerime yetiştiremiyorum yaptığım ürünlerimi. Kooperatifimiz olsa çok farklı, çok iyi olur. Öyle bir şey yapalım çok isterim, o zaman çok farklı olur tabi ki. Öncülük yapan olsa yardımcı olurum her konuda. Öyle bir söz geçti, sözde kaldı. Kaç sene önce olsa diye bir toplanıldı ama sözde kaldı. Ben ilkokul mezunuyum; biraz daha tahsilli olsan, insan daha farklı. Şimdi hele yaşlıları hiç sorma, ileriye düşünce hiç yok ama bir okumuş olsaydım, bir kendi paramı kazanan insan olsaydım daha farklı olurdu. İnsan kendine güvenir, parası olurdu. Kendime güvendiğim için her tarafla konuşurdum. Ama şimdi benim kendi param olmayınca, şimdi ben ne adına söz verebilirim. Veremem, öyle değil mi? Eşimin eline bakıyorum ben, doğruya doğru yani. Bir üniversite ortamı görmüş insan daha farklı olur, insanın özgüveni daha farklı olur. Yine iyiyiz Allaha şükür ama okumuş insan daha farklı olur, ne dersin de bana. Kadınlar birbirine destek olsa, bir 5 kişi bir araya gelse yapamaz mı? İşte olmuyor. Okumamız, imkanımız yok, paramız yok, olmuyor. Fikir de lazım ama para da lazım. Ayağa kalkacaksın mesela nasıl kalkacaksın, parayla kalkacaksın.

<sup>90</sup> W11: Aslında bir öncü lazım, bir muhtar lazım. Erkekleri seçiyorlar ya muhtar olarak, bize bizden biri lazım.

by evaluating their entire lives and to have the ‘ability to make a change’ in their lives. Their answers are quite diverse; however, it can be argued by interpreting their answers to this question that most of the women in the Akçatarla village are aware of structural inequalities. Women’s disappointments include education, labour, social life and village culture.

All women I interviewed wish to get further education and become a teacher or an officer and most of them wish they had worked less in the past. Furthermore, women who have daughters also have the same desire for their daughters. I asked them ‘what kind of life would you like your daughter to have?’ and all of them wish for her daughters to have higher education, be financially independent and live a comfortable life. No one mentions their wishes for their daughters as having ‘a good marriage’ or ‘a husband’. Marriage does not have a priority in women's wishes for their daughters’ lives. It can be argued that women who have daughters wish their daughters to be empowered with education and employment. It is also significant that nearly half of the women wish they had not been married since they think that their current situation would have been much better if they had not gotten married in their early ages and if they had had higher education.

Women, especially who are younger than 40 years old, question the dominant patriarchal culture in the Akçatarla village. W25, as being a university graduate indicated that she wants to change the cultural judgements in the village.

W25: There is a thought that women are weaker. For example, when we go out for a walk, my grandmother tells us, do not go out, they shame you, they gossip about you, she says. But I would like to change this common thought in the village.<sup>91</sup>

However, even though the women who are younger than 40 years old wish to change the dominant patriarchal culture in the village, it cannot be the same with the argument that they question the gendered division of labour. For instance, they continue to describe the works in the village as women’s works and men’s works.

---

<sup>91</sup> W25: Bazı görüşler var bide mesela bayan daha şeydir diye. Mesela biz akşam yürüyüşlere çıkınca babaannem bize çıkmayın sizi dağınarlar (Çarşamba yöresinde ayıplamak) hakkınızda şunları söylerler der. Ama ben köydeki bu yaygın fikri değiştirmek isterim.

#### 4.5. What is the Future of Hazelnut Producers?

As a result of the implemented policies, the main product for PCP has changed to hazelnut in the Akçatarla village; however, it does not maintain the survival of the PCP family on its own. This situation causes two consequences in the Akçatarla village as a hazelnut village. The first consequence is many of them have to migrate to the city temporarily or permanently. The demographic profile of the Akçatarla village has changed over time; the average of age constantly increases. Especially, the young members of PCP families do not prefer to live in the village because they realized that no matter how much they work, they cannot get a return for their labour in agricultural production. One of the agriculture engineers I interviewed, E3, argued that if structural problems in agriculture are solved, children of PCP families would live in the city; “if problems related to production in the village can be solved, the child stays in the village at least. Women also stay in the village”<sup>92</sup>. Parallel with the argument of E3, E7 claimed that if structural problems had been solved, one of their children would stay in the village; however, no one wants to stay in the village as a result of division of land now.

E7: There are problems at the point of production, some structural problems. If the structural problems were solved, one of five brothers/sisters would choose the village. For example, my father owned 100 decares of land, now 20 decares are left because of the division. Nobody wants to live with 20 decares of land in the village, that’s the point. There is no one in the village to maintain the village. And everyone in the village has an effort to educate their children. They somehow subsist with farmer Bağ-Kur and 5 decares of land now but they will not be able to subsist tomorrow. I mean, their kids cannot stay there.<sup>93</sup>

However, the point is far beyond the point which is underlined by these two agricultural experts. If structural problems are solved as mentioned by the experts

---

<sup>92</sup> E3: Köyde üretimle ilgili sıkıntılar çözülebilirse, en azında o çocuk köyde kalır. kadın da köyde kalır.

<sup>93</sup> Üretim noktasında sıkıntılar var, bazı yapısal sıkıntılar var. Eğer yapısal problemler çözülsedydi, beş kardeşten bir tanesi köyü seçerdi. Diyelim benim babamın 100 dekar arazisi vardı, bölüne bölüne şimdi 20 dekar kaldı. 20 dekar arazi için de kimse köyde yaşamak istemiyor, mevzu biraz da bu. Köyde köyü kurgulayacak kimse yok. Birde herkesin köyde çocuklarını okutmak ile ilgili çabası var. Bir şekilde onlar biraz çiftçi Bağ-Kur’undan biraz 5 dekar araziden geçiniyorlar şimdilik ama yarın geçinemeyecekler. Onun çocuğu orada kalamayacak yani.

and PCP families' children prefer to stay in the village, I doubt whether they will prefer to work in agricultural production within the current structure of agriculture. I predict that greenhousing will be left by PCP families and the hazelnut will hold its dominant position in the Akçatarla village within the current structuring of agriculture in Turkey. One of the reasons behind this is that young women in the Akçatarla village wish to be educated as much as possible and earn their own money; and hazelnut production provides this flexibility to women since it does not require too much care. The critical point is whether they prefer to stay in the village or not; I argue that most of them will migrate to the town centre or the city. Actually, women have started to go out from the village by way of education or marriage.

E6: Young people usually move. There are not too many young girls in the village. Girls usually go for their education. They usually go for university education and then they do not come back. There are also those who leave for education and who leave for marriage. Android phones in their hands, does the child who sees the other side of the world want to sit in the village? Of course not<sup>94</sup>.

One of the critical arguments is that PCP cannot maintain its survival if women withdraw their labour from production and reproduction. However, I argue that women in the Akçatarla village will not withdraw their labour. Even if they migrate to the town centre of the city, they will keep producing hazelnut. Hazelnut is a way of life for them so they will turn back to hazelnut to harvest even if they migrate. On the one hand, although many of them migrate, a few stays in the village for a while. Rural is a way of life for older family members and they do not want to leave the village; therefore, the oldest son of the family continues to stay with his family in the village to maintain the survival of the family. All in all, the dissolution of PCP via proletarianization and dispossession is not the case in the Akçatarla village for now; and women's unpaid family labour keeps an indispensable position as long as PCP exist whether in production or reproduction.

---

<sup>94</sup> E6: Genelde gençler gidiyor. Köyde çok fazla genç kız da yok. Genelde mesela kızlar okumaya gidiyorlar. Genelde üniversite için çıkıyorlar geri dönmüyorlar. Eğitim için de çıkan var evlenmek için de çıkan var. Elllerinde android telefonlar, dünyanın öbür tarafını gören çocuk köyde oturmak ister mi, istemez.



#### **4.6. Summary**

In this chapter, the aim was to analyse the effect of agricultural transformation in Çarşamba and the distinctive and subjective resistance and/or adaptation strategies of rural women living in the Akçatarla village. Agriculture has always been a major source of income in Akçatarla; however, PCP families living in the village have maintained their lives only through diversification of resistance strategies at present. Rural women have been engaged in various productive and reproductive labours from the very beginning of their lives within PCP families. Their engagement in both productive and reproductive tasks as unpaid family labourers is the main element that makes PCP resistant within changing agricultural and economic relations. Not only economic relations but also rural social relations have been affected as a result of the transformation of agriculture in Turkey. Within the differentiating rural social relations, rural women's daily lives have been the most affected. In the Akçatarla village, women's experiences have diversified in line with their subjectivities.

## **CHAPTER V**

### **CONCLUSION**

#### **5.1. Overview of the Study**

In this thesis, I analysed the changes in women's lives in the Western Black Sea region by focusing on the post 1980s period. To that end, I scrutinized the Akçatarla village as a field where petty commodity production constitutes the main production. Vegetable was the common product before the 2000s in the Akçatarla village; however, vegetable production has yielded its place to hazelnut production since 2000 as a result of the changes in the agricultural policies in Turkey. The main research problem is that women have demonstrated distinctive and subjective resistance and/or adaptation characteristics to neoliberal transformations towards their own lives and family lives over the last few decades. In order to question the research problems of this study, the field study is designed in two parts. In the first part of the case study, I conducted eight semi-structured interviews with agricultural experts who are working in Samsun Directorate of Provincial Agriculture and Forestry and the Çarşamba Country Food, Agriculture and Animal Husbandry Department. In the second part, thirty-three in-depth semi-structured interviews with women living in the Akçatarla village were conducted.

In the first chapter, I presented a brief introduction about the background and scope of the study. I explained the aims and objectives, and the research problems of the study; and then predicted the potential contributions with respect to the theoretical, methodological and practical contributions of the study.

After providing such a framework, in the second chapter, I presented relevant discussions about rural women and rural studies, and the general structure and the historical change of agriculture in Turkey. Furthermore, the theoretical stand of this

study as the Feminist Standpoint Theory was introduced and Feminist Standpoint epistemology was elaborated on along with the relevant concepts of this study in the light of knowledge production and political stand.

In Chapter Three, methodological arguments of the Feminist Standpoint Theory and its methodological criticism through modernity were examined. Moreover, which qualitative research techniques I used, how I decided on the village, the general profile of the village, my subjective experiences as a researcher, the profile of respondents and the process of the analysis were presented.

In Chapter Four, generated data and the analysis and interpretation along with the main findings of the research in consideration of the research problems of the study were presented. The reflection of agricultural transformation on Samsun's agriculture, the effects of neoliberal transformation of agriculture on PCP families living in the Akçatarla village, the effects of rural transformation on women's daily lives were analysed and lastly the future of hazelnut producers with the position of women in PCP families was questioned. The resistance characteristics of women lies in their specificities of subjectivities which point out to rural women's partial knowledge. Rural women continue to work extensively and intensively but it does not mean that they do not resist. On the contrary, they resist the idea of working intensively and extensively as subjects of knowledge and, thus, intensive and extensive labour of rural women is also a way of resistance.

## **5.2. Research Contributions of the Study**

Throughout this study, rural women's position in changing rural relations as a result of the state's policy changes in agriculture is tried to be questioned from the perspective of the Feminist Standpoint Theory. The standpoint of this study has provided various theoretical, methodological and practical contributions; and these contributions will be presented respectively in this section.

### **5.2.1. Theoretical Contributions**

Contrary to the viewpoint of classical rural sociology, rural women are not only object of knowledge but also subject of knowledge within the theoretical framework

of this study since knowledge should come from the oppressed from the feminist standpoint perspective. Subject of knowledge and object of knowledge should be the historically silenced women in feminist epistemology (Jaggar, 2004). Rural women's oppressed position within rural social relations constitutes a marginal position for rural women. However, rural women's marginal position constitutes their epistemic advantages in the FST. Within the scope of this study, rural women's *epistemic advantage* is aimed to be constituted in consideration of the Feminist Standpoint methodology. One of the significant theoretical contributions of this study is the effort to reveal rural women's *epistemic advantage*.

Rural women's knowledge lies within their daily lives and experiences; therefore, theorizing rural women's everyday life is another theoretical contribution of the study. However, rural women as a group is not a unified category so the differences among themselves are significant within the scope of this study. Their specific *location, situation and condition* constitute their *partial knowledge*. Therefore, rural women's *partial and situated knowledge* provide them with particular standpoints. In this study, rural women's situated knowledge is the main source of knowledge production. Moreover, it should be noted that rural women's situated knowledge is not only about individual women, but also about rural women as a *collective subject*. The constitution of the relation between knowledge and politics is one of the significant contributions of this study.

This study is positioned neither in modernity nor in post-modernity; the position of the study is in contemporary modernity as I discussed throughout the study. This position provides a productive area to problematize rural social relations from its intermediate position. The paradigmatic position of this study constitutes another significant theoretical contribution of the study since this position enables the study to question both modernity and post-modernity. And this questioning enriches the theoretical base of the study.

### **5.2.2. Methodological Contributions**

One of the main methodological assumptions of the FST is that the research does not value neutral process. From the feminist standpoint's perspective, the research

cannot be free from the subjectivities of neither the researcher nor the researched. This assumption challenges objectivity as one of the core methodological arguments of modernism. At the very beginning of this research, my position as a feminist researcher shapes the research design of the study; and then, it affects my relations with the women in the field. Practicing *self-reflexivity* throughout the research is one of the methodological contributions of this research.

FST also challenges modernity's hierarchical and dichotomic relations between the researcher and researched. Although my position as a feminist researcher shapes the research design and my relations with women, the relations among us are not hierarchical. In this study, the researcher is not positioned as the knower; on the contrary, rural women have their own knowledge about their social reality. Rural women as subjects of this study have told their own stories with their own voices and with their own words. As a methodological contribution, this study has aimed to understand women's position within rural social relations by listening to women's life stories and experiences in their own voices.

### **5.2.3. Practical Contributions**

Regarding the practical contribution of the study, women's life stories and their different experiences have contributed to enrich their *collective consciousness*. During the field study, some of the women's interviews have turned into group interviews. Women's friends, relatives and sometimes daughters have participated in our conversations and shared their unique stories related to the current discussions. As a result, women's discussions about their daily lives in the village could contribute to generate their collective consciousness within their everyday life politics.

Furthermore, conversations with rural women helped me to position myself as a feminist researcher in the field. Our conversations have meaning beyond providing the data for my analysis, I learned lots of things from them. This unique experience will help me position myself as a feminist researcher in future researches, which are the journeys of a researcher.

### **5.3. Research Limitations of the Study**

Throughout this research, I have encountered several theoretical, methodological and practical limitations. In this section, I will elaborate on these limitations respectively.

#### **5.3.1. Theoretical Limitations**

Contemporary modernity position of the FST, on the one hand, provides the theoretical contributions; on the other hand, it causes the theoretical limitations in this study. As I argued previously, while the FST criticizes the assumptions of modernity, it also does not admit to the assumptions of post-modernity. As a result, this position makes it difficult to acquire a position in the intermediate position of the FST. I was confused when I was using certain concepts about whether I reproduced what I criticized. Haraway's *greasy pole* metaphor can best explain this situation, she uses the description of a "feminist trying to climb a greased pole while holding on to both ends" (Ramazanoğlu & Holland, 2002, p. 61).

Feminist standpoint epistemology and methodology are intertwined in some aspects. In this study, I preferred to approach these two separately; however, it challenged me in many ways because of their intertwined position. To make a distinction between feminist standpoint epistemology and methodology requires a more intense examination. Because of their intertwined position, a clear cut distinction is not possible anyway; however, the boundaries between these two can be tried to be defined.

#### **5.3.2. Methodological Limitations**

Positioning myself as a feminist researcher sometimes challenged me during the field study because breaking the hierarchy between rural women living in the village and myself was not an easy and smooth process. My position as a master student initially constituted a hierarchy among us. They positioned me as the knower and they thought that I know all the answers better than them. Therefore, it was not easy to convince them that they are the ones who know their lives better than me.

They positioned me as an outsider at first sight. When we started to talk about our lives, they learned that I also have Çarşamba origins like them. By this means, my outsider position was replaced with an insider position. Furthermore, although we speak the same language with the women living in the village, our accents are quite different. Even if I understand their way of speaking, I speak differently from them; therefore, this situation caused a tension between positions. Both outsidership and insidership are not static positions so the tension between our positions held its presence during our conversations.

### **5.3.3. Practical Limitations**

My field study coincided with the local elections; therefore, it caused some practical limitations for the field study. At the very beginning of the field, I contacted the mukhtar of the village through Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry; therefore, the mukhtar was nice to me during the first days of my field study. Two days later, I noticed that he gave me wrong information in order not to interview in some houses. I learned later on, the current mukhtar was not liked by most families in the village because of his inappropriate treatments in the local election. Therefore, he misled me to interview those who support him in the local election. At the very beginning of my field study, this behaviour of the mukhtar caused limitations for the study. After I noticed the situation, I tried to eliminate this limitation by continuing to work independently.

Another practical limitation happened during the expert interviews. In my expert questionnaire, there are questions related to the evaluation of experts towards the agricultural policies of the current government. Some of the answers of experts were biased because of their political position.

### **5.4. Recommendations for Future Studies**

As a recommendation I would like to suggest that future researches can also investigate the diversification of women's experiences on the basis of their positions within their family as daughters, brides and mothers-in-law. Their position in the

PCP families can differentiate their experiences so their situated knowledge depending on women's positions within their family can be analysed.

This study may also be conducted in the mountain villages in Samsun where there is limited opportunity to diversify the products and resistance strategies. Their resistance strategies would be different than those who produce in the plain and thus women's experiences living in those villages would be different. Moreover, this study may also be conducted in other regions where hazelnut production is common to see the difference in the lives of PCP, resistance strategies and experiences of women within the family.



## REFERENCES

- Agarwal, B. (1992). The Gender and Environment Debate: Lessons from India. *Feminist Studies*, 13(1), 119-158.
- Agarwal, B. (2014). The Power of Numbers in Gender Dynamics: Illustrations from Community Forestry Groups. *The Journal of Peasant Studies*, 1-20.
- Ajani, E. N., & Igbokwe, E. M. (2011). Implications of Feminization of Agriculture on Women Farmers in Anambra State, Nigeria. *Journal of Agricultural Extension*, 15(1), 31-39.
- Akpınar, N., Talay, İ., Coşkun, C., & Gündüz, S. (2004). Rural Women and Agrotourism in the Context of Sustainable Development: A Case Study from Turkey. *Kluwer Journal*, 6, 473-486.
- Alkan, I. (2018). *Tarım Sektöründe Kadın Emeği: Çarşamba Ovası Gündoğdu ve Damlataş Köylerinde Fındık, Çeltik ve Sebze Üretimi Özelinde Bir İrdeleme*. Ankara: Gazi Kitabevi.
- Allen, P., & Sachs, C. (2007). Women and Food Chains: The Gendered Politics of Food. *International Journal of Sociology of Agriculture and Food*, 15(1), 1-23.
- Altınpınar, T., & Gülçübuk, B. (2003). Ankara İli Polatlı İlçesinde Gezici Kadın Tarım İşçilerinin Çalışma ve Yaşam Koşulları. *Tarım Bilimleri Dergisi*, 10(1), 59-66.
- Anthopoulou, T. (2010). Rural Women in Local Agrofood Production: Between Entrepreneurial Initiatives and Family Strategies. A Case Study in Greece. *Journal of Rural Studies*, 26, 394-403.

- Aydın, Z. (1987). Turkish Agrarian Debate: New Arguments and Old Scores. *New Perspectives on Turkey, 1*, 81-108.
- Aydın, Z. (2018). *Çağdaş Tarım Sorunu: Ekonomik, Politik ve Sosyolojik Kuramlar, Yaklaşımlar, Politikalar*. Ankara: İmge Kitabevi Yayınları.
- Aysu, A. (2008). *Küreselleşme ve Tarım Politikaları*. İstanbul: Su Yayınları.
- Bernstein, H. (2003). Farewells to the Peasantry. *Transformation, 52*, 1-19.
- Bieri, S. (2014). New Ruralities-Old Gender Dynamics? A Reflection on High-Value Crop Agriculture in the Light of the Feminization Debates. *Geographica Helvetica, 69*, 281-290.
- Boratav, K. (1995). Köy Hane Anketlerinden Kırsal Sınıflara. *Toplum ve Bilim*, 210-219.
- Büke, A. (2008). *Globalization, Transnationalization and Imperialism: Evaluation of Sociology of Agriculture and Food in the Case of Turkey* (Master's Thesis). Retrieved from METU Theses Collection.
- Campbell, R., & Wasco, S. M. (2000). Feminist Approaches to Social Science: Epistemological and Methodological Tenets. *American Journal of Community Psychology, 28*(6), 773-791.
- Candan, E., & Özalp Günel S. (2013). Tarımda Kadın Emeği. *Tarım Ekonomisi Dergisi, 19*(1), 93-101.
- Chen, F. (2004). The Division of Labor Between Generations of Women in Rural China. *Social Science Research, 33*(4), 557-580.

- Chiappe, M. B., & Flora, C. B. (1998). Gendered Elements of the Alternative Agriculture Paradigm. *Rural Sociology*, 63(3), 372-393.
- Collins, P. H. (2004). Learning from the Outsider Within: The Sociological Significance of Black Feminist Thought. In S. Harding (Ed.), *The Feminist Standpoint Theory Reader: Intellectual and Political Controversies* (pp. 103-126). New York and London: Routledge.
- Collins, P. H. (2004). Comment on Hekman's "Truth and Method: Feminist Standpoint Theory Revisited": Where's the Power?. In S. Harding (Ed.), *The Feminist Standpoint Theory Reader: Intellectual and Political Controversies* (pp. 247-253). New York and London: Routledge.
- Crasnow, S. (2009). Is Standpoint Theory a Resource for Feminist Epistemology? An Introduction. *Hypatia*, 24(4), 189-192.
- De Brauw, A. (2003). Are Women Taking Over the Farm in China?. *Department of Economics Working Paper Series, William College*.
- De Brauw, A., Li, Q., Liu, C., Rozelle, S., & Zhang, L. (2008). Feminization of Agriculture in China? Myths Surrounding Women's Participation in Farming. *The China Quarterly*, 194, 327-348.
- De Brauw, A., Huang, J., Zhang, L., & Rozelle, S. (2013). The Feminisation of Agriculture with Chinese Characteristics. *The Journal of Development Studies*, 49(5), 689-704.
- De Schutter, O. (2013, September). *The Agrarian Transition and the "Feminization" Of Agriculture*. Paper presented at Food Sovereignty: A Critical Dialogue International Conference, Yale University, USA.

- Dedeoğlu, S. (2000). Toplumsal Cinsiyet Rollerini Açısından Türkiye’de Aile ve Kadın Emegi. *Toplum ve Bilim*, 86, 139-170.
- Delaney, C. (1991). *The Seed and the Soil: Gender and Cosmology in Turkish Village Society*. University of California Press.
- Dolan, C. S. (2004). On Farm and Packhouse: Employment at the Bottom of a Global Value Chain. *Rural Sociology*, 69(1), 99–126.
- Ecevit, M. (1994). Rural Women in the Small Peasant Economy. *Reprinted from Turkish Public Administration Annual 1991-1992*, 17-19.
- Ecevit, M. (1994). Tarımda Kadının Toplumsal Konumu: Bazı Kavramsal İlişkiler. *Amme İdaresi Dergisi*, 27(2), 89-106.
- Ecevit, M. (2007). Ulusötesileşme ve Küçük Köylülüğün Yaşam ve Direnme Koşulları. In C. Gürkan, Ö. Taştan, O. Türel (Eds.), *Küreselleşmeye Güneyden Tepkiler* (pp. 341-349). Ankara: TSBD and Dipnot Yayınları
- Ecevit, M. C. (1999). *Kırsal Türkiye’nin Değişim Dinamikleri: Gökçeada Köyü Monografisi*. Ankara: T. C. Kültür Bakanlığı.
- Ecevit, M. C. (2013). *Rural Sociology: Unpublished Lecture Notes*.
- Ecevit, M. C. (2013-2014). *Sociology of Family: Unpublished Lecture Notes*.
- Ecevit, M. C. (2015-2019). *Seminar Meetings: Unpublished Seminar Notes*.
- Ecevit, M., & Ecevit, Y. (2002). Kırsal Yoksullukla Mücadele: Tarımda Mülksüzleşme ve Aile Emeginin Metalaşması. In Y. Özdek (Ed.), *Yoksulluk*,

*Şiddet ve İnsan Hakları* (pp. 271-289). Ankara: Türkiye ve Orta Doğu Amme İdaresi Enstitüsü İnsan Hakları Araştırma ve Derleme Merkezi.

Ecevit, M. C., Karkıner, N., & Büke, A. (2009). Köy Sosyolojisinin Daraltılmış Kapsamından, Tarım-Gıda-Köylülük İlişkilerine Yönelik Bazı Değerlendirmeler. *Mülkiye*, 33(262), 41-61.

Edris, A. (1999), Agrarian Change and Rural Women: The Malaysian Experience. *Asian Journal of Women Studies*, 5(4), 28-56.

Eren, Z. C., & Büke, A. (2016). Sen Aklini mu Yedun Çocuk? Neoliberalizm, Değersizleşme ve HES Karşıtı Hareketler: Fındıklı Direnişi Örneği. In C. Aksu, S. Erensü & E. Evren (Eds.), *Sudan Sebepler: Türkiye’de Neoliberal Su-Enerji Politikaları ve Direnişleri* (pp. 313-337). İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları.

Erman, T. (1997). The Meaning of City Living for Rural Migrant Women and Their Role in Migration: The case of Turkey. *Women's Studies International Forum*, 20(2), 263–27.

Erman, T. (1998). The Impact of Migration of Turkish Rural Women: Four Emergent Patterns. *Gender and Society*, 12(2), 146–168.

Erman, T., Kalaycıoğlu, S., & Rittersberger-Tılıç, H. (2002). Money-Earning Activities and Empowerment Experiences of Rural Migrant Women in the City in the Case of Turkey. *Women's Studies International Forum*, 25(4), 395–410.

Farganis, S. (1994). *Situating Feminism: From Thought to Action*. Sage publications.

Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations. (2016). *Tarımsal ve Kırsal Geçimin Ulusal Cinsiyet Profili Türkiye: Ülke Toplumsal Cinsiyet Değerlendirme Serisi*. Ankara.

- Friedland, W. H. (1982). The End of Rural Society and the Future of Rural Sociology. *Rural Sociology*, 47(4), 589-608.
- Gidakou, I. (1999). Young Women's Attitudes Towards Agriculture and Women's New Roles in Greek Countryside: A First approach. *Journal of Rural Studies*, 15(2), 147-158.
- Günaydın, G. (2010). *Tarım ve Kırsallıkta Dönüşüm: Politika Transfer Süreci/AB ve Türkiye*. Ankara: Tan Kitabevi Yayınları.
- Gündüz Hoşgör, A., & Smits, J. (2007). The Status of Rural Women in Turkey: What is the Role of Regional Differences. In Moghadam, V. M. (Ed.), *From Patriarchy to Empowerment: Women's Participation, Movements, and Rights in the Middle East, North Africa, and South Asia*. Syracuse University Press.
- Gündüz Hoşgör A., & Suzuki Him, M. (2016). Küreselleşme ve Türkiye'de Kırsal Kadının Ücretli Emegi: Rapana Venosa Üretim Zinciri Üzerinden Batı Karadeniz Bölgesinde bir Vaka Analizi. *Sosyoloji Araştırmaları Dergisi*, 19(2), 108-130.
- Hall, A., & Mogorodoy, V. (2007). Organic Farming, Gender and the Labor Process. *Rural Sociology*, 72(2), 289-316.
- Haraway, D. (2004). Situated Knowledges: The Science Question in Feminism and the Privilege of Partial Perspective. In S. Harding (Ed.), *The Feminist Standpoint Theory Reader: Intellectual and Political Controversies* (pp. 81-101). New York and London: Routledge.
- Harding, S. (1986). *The Science Question in Feminism*. Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press.

Harding, S. (1987). *Feminism and Methodology: Social Science Issues*. Indiana University Press.

Harding, S. (1991). *Whose Science? Whose Knowledge? Thinking from Women's Lives*. Ithaca and New York: Cornell University Press.

Harding, S. (2004). Introduction: Standpoint Theory as a Site of Political, Philosophic, and Scientific Debate. In S. Harding (Ed.), *The Feminist Standpoint Theory Reader: Intellectual and Political Controversies* (pp. 1-15). New York and London: Routledge.

Harding, S. (2004). Rethinking Standpoint Epistemology: What is "Strong Objectivity"? In S. Harding (Ed.), *The Feminist Standpoint Theory Reader: Intellectual and Political Controversies* (pp. 127-140). New York and London: Routledge.

Harding, S. (2004). Comment on Hekman's "Truth and Method: Feminist Standpoint Theory Revisited": Whose Standpoint Need the Regimes of Truth and Reality?. In S. Harding (Ed.), *The Feminist Standpoint Theory Reader: Intellectual and Political Controversies* (pp. 255-262). New York and London: Routledge.

Harding, S. (2009). Standpoint Theories: Productively Controversial. *Hypatia*, 24(4), 192-200.

Hartsock, N. C. M. (1983). The Feminist Standpoint: Developing the Ground for a Specifically Feminist Historical Materialism. In S. Harding & M. B. Hintikka (Eds.), *Discovering Reality* (pp. 283-309). D. Reidel Publishing Company.

Hartsock, N. C. M. (2004). The Feminist Standpoint: Developing the Ground for a Specifically Feminist Historical Materialism. In S. Harding (Ed.), *The Feminist*

- Standpoint Theory Reader: Intellectual and Political Controversies* (pp. 35-53). New York and London: Routledge.
- Hartsock, N. C. M. (2004). Comment on Hekman's "Truth and Method: Feminist Standpoint Theory Revisited": Truth or Justice?. In S. Harding (Ed.), *The Feminist Standpoint Theory Reader: Intellectual and Political Controversies* (pp. 243-246). New York and London: Routledge.
- Huang, Y. (2012). From the 'Feminization of Agriculture' to the 'Ageing of Farming Populations': Demographic Transition and Farming in a Central Chinese Village. *Local Economy*, 27(1), 19-32.
- Ilcan, S. (1994). Peasant Struggles and Social Change: Migration, Households and Gender in Rural Turkish Society. *International Migration Review*, 554-579.
- Jaggar, A. M. (2004). Feminist Politics and Epistemology: The Standpoint of Women. In S. Harding (Ed.), *The Feminist Standpoint Theory Reader: Intellectual and Political Controversies* (pp. 55-66). New York and London: Routledge.
- Kandiyoti, D. (1985). Women in Rural Production Systems: Conceptual Issues. *Problems and Policies*, UNESCO, Paris.
- Kandiyoti D. (1988). Bargaining with Patriarchy. *Gender and Society*, 2(3), 274-290.
- Karginer, N. (2001). *Feminist Analysis of Rural Women in a Village of Turkey* (Doctoral Dissertation). Retrieved from METU Theses Collection.
- Karkiner, N. (2006). Tarımda Kadın ve Bazı Yapısal İlişkiler. *İktisat Dergisi*, 469, 24-30.



- Keyder, Ç. (1988). Türk Tarımında Küçük Meta Üretiminin Yerleşmesi (1946-1960). In Ş. Pamuk & Z. Toprak (Eds.), *Türkiye’de Tarımsal Yapılar 1923-2000* (pp. 163-173). Ankara: Yurt Publications.
- Keyder, Ç. (1993). The Genesis of Petty Commodity Production in Agriculture: The Case of Turkey. In P. Stirling (Ed.), *Culture and Economy: Changes in Turkish Villages* (pp. 171-186). Cambridgeshire: The Eothen Press.
- Keyder, Ç., & Yenal, Z. (2018). *Bildiğimiz Tarımın Sonu: Küresel İktidar ve Köylülük (4<sup>th</sup> ed.)*. İstanbul: İletişim.
- Kocabıcak, E. (2018). What Excludes Women From Landownership in Turkey? Implications for Feminist Strategies. *Women's Studies International Forum*, 69, 115–125.
- Köymen, O. (2009). Kapitalizm ve Köylülük: Ağalar-Üretenler- Patronlar. *Mülkiye*, 33(262).
- Lastarria-Cornhiel, S. (2006). *Feminization of Agriculture: Trends and Driving Forces. Background Paper for the World Development Report 2008*.
- Maharjan, A., Bauer, S., & Knerr, B. (2012). Do Rural Women Who Stay Behind Benefit From Male Outmigration? A Case Study in the Hill of Nepal. *Gender, Technology and Development*, 16, 95-123.
- Manzanera-Ruiz, R., Lizarraga, C., & Mwaipopo, R. (2016). Gender Inequality, Processes of Adaptation, and Female Local Initiatives in Cash Crop Production in Northern Tanzania. *Rural Sociology*, 81(2), 143–171.
- Marx, K. (1997). Theses on Fierbach. In Pierson, C. (Ed.), *The Marx Reader* (pp. 92-93). Polity Press.

- Ministry of Customs and Trade General Directorate of Cooperatives (2018). *Hazelnut Report of 2017*. Ankara.
- Morvardi, B. (1992) Gender Relations in Agriculture: Women in Turkey. *Economic Development and Cultural Change*, 40(3), 567-586.
- Morvardi, B. (1993). Gender and Household Management in Agriculture: Cash Crops in Kars. In P. Sterling (Ed.), *Culture and Economy: Changes in Turkish Villages* (pp. 80-94). Cambridgeshire: The Eothen Press.
- Naples, N. A. (2000). Standpoint Epistemology and the Uses of Self-Reflection in Feminist Ethnography: Lessons for Rural Sociology. *Rural Sociological Society*, 194-214.
- Narayan, U. (2004). The Project of Feminist Epistemology: Perspectives from Nonwestern Feminist. In S. Harding (Ed.), *The Feminist Standpoint Theory Reader: Intellectual and Political Controversies* (pp. 213-224). New York and London: Routledge.
- Newby, H. (1983). The Sociology of Agriculture: Toward a New Rural Sociology. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 9, 67-81.
- OKA (2018). *Çarşamba İlçesi Tarım Sektörü Raporu*. Samsun.
- O’Laughlin, B. (2008). Missing Men? The Debate Over Rural Poverty and Women-Headed Households in Southern Africa. *The journal of Peasant Studies*, 25(2), 1-48.
- Oldrup, H. (1999). Women Working off the Farm: Reconstructing Gender Identity in Danish Agriculture. *Sociologia Ruralis*, 39(3), 343-358.

- Oral, N. (2013). Türkiye Tarımında Üretim İlişkilerindeki Bölgesel Farklılıklar. In N. Oral (Ed.), *Türkiye’de Tarımın Ekonomi-Politiği (1923-2013)* (pp. 411-427). Ankara: NotaBene.
- Oral, N., Sarıbal, O., & Şengül, H. (2013). Cumhuriyet Döneminde Uygulanan Tarım Politikaları. In N. Oral (Ed.), *Türkiye’de Tarımın Ekonomi-Politiği (1923-2013)* (pp. 71-89). Ankara: NotaBene
- Özbay, F. (1995). Women's Labor in Rural and Urban Settings. *Bogazici Journal: Review of Social, Economic and Administrative Studies*, 8, 1-2.
- Özügurlu, M. (2013). *Küçük Köylülüğe Sermaye Kapanı: Türkiye’de Tarım Çalışmaları ve Köylülük Üzerine Gözlemler* (3<sup>rd</sup> ed.). Ankara: Notabene Yayınları.
- Ramamurthy, P. (2000). The Cotton Commodity Chain, Women, Work and Agency in India and Japan: The Case for Feminist Agro-Food Systems Research. *World Development*, 28(3), 551-578.
- Ramazanoğlu, C., & Holland, J. (2002). *Feminist Methodology: Challenges and Choices*. London, Thousand Oaks and New Delhi: Sage Publications.
- Razavi, S. (2009). Engendering the Political Economy of Agrarian Change. *The Journal of Peasant Studies*, 36(1), 197–226.
- Reinharz, S. (1992). *Feminist Methods in Social Research*. New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Safilidou-Rotschild, C., Dimopoulou, E., Lagiogianni, R., & Sotiropoulou, S. (2007). Trends of Agricultural Feminisation in Kastoria, Greece. *Journal of Comparative Family Studies*, 38(3), 409-422.

- Sandoval, C. (2004). U.S. Third World Feminism: The Theory and Method of Differential Oppositional Consciousness. In S. Harding (Ed.), *The Feminist Standpoint Theory Reader: Intellectual and Political Controversies* (pp. 195-209). New York and London: Routledge.
- Saugeres, L. (2002). She's Not Really a Woman, She's Half a Man: Gendered Discourses of Embodiment in a French Farming Community. *Women's Studies International Forum*, 25(6), 641–650.
- Smith, D. E. (2004). Comment on Hekman's "Truth and Method: Feminist Standpoint Theory Revisited". In S. Harding (Ed.), *The Feminist Standpoint Theory Reader: Intellectual and Political Controversies* (pp. 263-268). New York and London: Routledge.
- Smyth, J. D., Swendener, A., & Kazyak, E. (2018). Women's Work? The Relationship between Farmwork and Gender Self-Perception. *Rural Sociology*, 83(3), 654-676.
- Song, Y., & Vernooy, R. (2017). Seeds of Empowerment: Gender Research in the Context of the Feminization of Agriculture in Southwest China. *Gender, Technology and Development*, 14(1), 25-44.
- Srivastava, N. (2011). Feminisation of Agriculture: What Do Survey Data Tell Us?. *Journal of Rural Development*, 30(3), 341-359.
- Suzuki Him, M., & Gündüz Hoşgör, A. (2017). Feminization of Rural Work and Young Women's Dis/empowerment: A Case Study of Mountain Villages in the Western Black-Sea Region of Turkey. *Kadın/Woman 2000*, 18(1), 1-22.
- Suzuki Him, M., & Gündüz Hoşgör, A. (2019). Challenging Geographical Disadvantages and Social Exclusion: A Case Study of Gendered Rural

Transformation in Mountain Villages in the Western Black Sea Region of Turkey. *Sociologia Ruralis*. (In press)

Tamang, S., Paudel, K. P., & Shrestha, K. K. (2014). Feminization of Agriculture and Its Implication for Food Security in Rural Nepal. *Journal of Forest and Livelihood*, 12(1), 20-32.

Ulukan, U. (2009). *Türkiye Tarımında Yapısal Dönüşüm ve Sözleşmeli Çiftçilik: Bursa Örneği*. İstanbul: SAV.

Upreti, B. R., Ghale, Y., Shivatoki, S., & Acharya, S. (2018). Feminization of Agriculture in the Eastern Hills of Nepal: A study of Women in Cardamom and Ginger Farming. *SAGE Open*, 1-12.

Üçeçeam Karagel, D. (2010). Türkiye Kırsalında Tarımda Çalışan Kadın Nüfus (1990-2000). *Uluslararası Sosyal Araştırmalar Dergisi*, 3(13), 254-267.

van der Ploeg, J. D. (1993). Rural Sociology and the New Agrarian Question: A Perspective from the Netherlands. *Sociologia Ruralis*, 33(2), 240-260.

Vepa, S. (2005). Feminisation of Agriculture and Marginalisation of Their Economic Stake. *Economic and Political Weekly*, 40(25), 2563-2568.

Wright, W., & Annes, A. (2016). Farm Women and the Empowerment Potential in Value-Added Agriculture. *Rural Sociology*, 81(4), 545-571.

Weeks, K. (2004). Labor, Standpoints, and Feminist Subjects. In S. Harding (Ed.), *The Feminist Standpoint Theory Reader: Intellectual and Political Controversies* (pp. 181-193). New York and London: Routledge.

WYG Türkiye (2016). *TR83 Bölgesi Rekabet, Sanayi ve İstihdam Açısından Mevcut Durum ve Politika Önerileri Raporu.*

## APPENDICES

### APPENDIX A: HUMAN SUBJECTS ETHICS COMMITTEE APPROVAL

UYGULAMALI ETİK ARAŞTIRMA MERKEZİ  
APPLIED ETHICS RESEARCH CENTER



ORTA DOĞU TEKNİK ÜNİVERSİTESİ  
MIDDLE EAST TECHNICAL UNIVERSITY

DUMLUPINAR BULVARI 06800  
ÇANKAYA ANKARA/TÜRKİYE  
T: +90 312 210 22 91  
F: +90 312 210 79 59  
ueam@metu.edu.tr  
www.ueam.metu.edu.tr

Sayı: 28620816 / 165

26 MART 2019

Konu: Değerlendirme Sonucu

Gönderen: ODTÜ İnsan Araştırmaları Etik Kurulu (IAEK)

İlgi: İnsan Araştırmaları Etik Kurulu Başvurusu

Sayın Mehmet Cihan ECEVİT

Danışmanlığını yaptığınız **Ülkü BATUROĞLU'nun "Türkiye'de Tarımsal Üretimin 1980 Sonrası Değişiminde Kadın Eməğinin Farklılaşması: Fındık Üretimi Örneği"** başlıklı araştırması İnsan Araştırmaları Etik Kurulu tarafından uygun görülmüş ve **154-ODTÜ-2019** protokol numarası ile onaylanmıştır.

Saygılarımızla bilgilerinize sunarız

  
Prof. Dr. Tülin GENÇÖZ

Başkan

  
Prof. Dr. Ayhan SOL

Üye

Prof. Dr. Ayhan Gürbüz DEMİR

Üye

  
Prof. Dr. Yaşar KONDAKÇI (4)

Üye

  
Doç. Dr. Emre SELÇUK

Üye

  
Doç. Dr. Pınar KAYGAN

Üye

  
Dr. Öğr. Üyesi Ali Emre TURGUT

Üye

**APPENDIX B: FIELD GUIDELINE FOR WOMEN INTERVIEWS/KADIN  
MÜLAKATLARI İÇİN SAHA YÖNERGESİ**

Fındık	<p>1-Fındık dendiğinde senin aklına ilk ne gelir?</p> <p>2-Fındık senin için ne ifade eder?</p> <p>3-Fındığın dikim, ilaçlama, toplama, satış gibi tüm aşamalarında hangi işleri hanenizde kimler daha yoğun olarak yapar?</p> <p>4-Bu durumda son 10-15 yıl içerisinde ne gibi değişiklikler oldu? Sence bunların ne gibi sonuçları oldu?</p> <p>5-Sen fındık üretiminin en çok hangi aşamalarına önemli katkılarda bulunduğunu düşünüyorsun?</p> <p>6-Sence fındık üretiminin avantajları ve dezavantajları nelerdir?</p>
Ekonomik Durum:	<p>7-Son yıllarda birikim yapabildiğiniz dönemler oldu mu?</p> <p>8-Fındık ve/veya kivi üretiminin hangi aşamalarında ücretli işçi çalıştırıyorsunuz? Bunu muhakkak yapmanız gerekiyor mu?</p> <p>9-Ailenizin/hanenizin üretim faaliyetlerinden elde ettiği gelir giderlerinizi karşılamaya yetiyor mu?</p> <p>10-Sizce neler yaparsanız veya neler yapılırsa ailenizin/hanenizin yaşam kalitesi artırır?</p> <p>11-Aileniz/haneniz dışından herhangi bir kaynaktan (devlet, banka, akraba, tefeci, vb.) maddi destek alıyor musunuz?</p> <p>12-Sahip olduğunuz arsa/tarla/bahçelerinizde son 10-15 yıl içerisinde ne gibi değişiklikler oldu (alım/satım, kiralama/kiraya verme)?</p>



Aile	<p>13-Köydeki diğer aileleri/haneleri düşündüğünüzde ailenizin/hanenizin durumunu hem ekonomik hem de sosyal açılardan nasıl değerlendirirsiniz?</p> <p>14-Köyde sizin ailenizi nasıl bilirler?</p> <p>15-Başka birisine aileni nasıl anlatırsın? Bana biraz anlatır mısın?</p> <p>16-Ailenizi ilgilendiren kararları genellikle kim alır? (Sen , eşin , ikiniz birlikte yada başka biri mi?)</p> <p>17-Nasıl biri ile evlenmek isterdin/istersin?</p>
Kadın Olmak	<p>18-Köyde kadın olmak nasıl bir şey?</p> <p>19-Bunun sence hem iyi yanları hem de kötü yanları neler? Biraz anlatır mısın?</p> <p>20-Köyde yaşayan kadınları en az üç kelime ile anlatacak olsan hangi kelimelerle anlatırsın?</p> <p>21-Sence kadınlar köyde hangi işlerde çalışmamalılar? Neden?</p> <p>22-Bu köyde erkeklerin yaptığı ama senin ya da diğer kadınların yapamadığı şeyler neler?</p> <p>23-Bu işleri kadınların yapamamasının sebepleri sence nelerdir?</p> <p>24-Genel olarak hanede gelinlerin en çok sıkıntı çektikleri şeyler nelerdir?</p> <p>25-Genel olarak hanede genç kızların en çok sıkıntı çektikleri şeyler nelerdir?</p>
Kadınlar Arası İlişkiler	<p>26-Köydeki kadınlar Sence daha çok hangi konularda birbirleri ile yardımlaşırlar?</p> <p>27-Aralarındaki anlaşmazlıkların, sürtüşmelerin temel nedenleri sence nelerdir?</p> <p>28-İş dışında köydeki diğer kadınlarla ne sıklıkla bir araya geliyorsunuz? Birlikte neler yapıyorsunuz?</p> <p>29-Zamanla bu ilişkilerde nasıl değişiklikler oldu?</p>

	30-Köyde senin tek başına yapamayacağın ama birkaç kadın bir araya gelerseniz yapabileceğiniz şeyler neler olabilir? Bana biraz anlatır mısın?
Öznellik	<p>31-Gün içerisinde kendine ayırabildiğin vaktin oluyor mu? Bu zamanda neler yapıyorsun?</p> <p>32-Yaşantınızdaki en önemli üç sıkıntının neler olduğunu düşünüyorsun? (Ekonomik, psikolojik, sosyal, kültürel, siyasi, dini, etnik vb.)</p> <p>33-Daha fazla eğitim almış olmak ister miydin? Neden?</p> <p>34-Köyde kendini en güçlü hissettiğin zamanlar hangileri idi?</p> <p>35-Sen köyde kendini ne zamanlar güçlü hissedersin?</p> <p>36-Köyde çoğunluğun hiç önemsemediği ama senin önemli gördüğün şeyler nelerdir?</p> <p>37-Annen ile kendini kıyasladığında senin yaşamında annenin yaşamına göre ne gibi değişiklikler olduğunu düşünüyorsun?</p> <p>38-Sen kendini annenden hangi açılardan farklı görüyorsun?</p> <p>39-Kızın ile kendini kıyasladığında yaşamlarınızda ne gibi farklılıklar olduğunu düşünüyorsun?</p>
Köy Hakkında	<p>40-Köydeki yaşamının en çok nelerini seviyorsun?</p> <p>41-Köyde hiç değişmeyen (hiç değişmeyecek olan) şeyler sence nelerdir? Biraz bahseder misin?</p> <p>42-Elinde imkanın olsa köyde neleri değiştirdin? Değişmesini istediğin şeyleri benim için önem sırasına göre sıralar mısın?</p> <p>43-Köyde en çok nelerin değişmesini istersin?</p>
Köy vs. Şehir:	44-Köy yaşantısı ile şehir yaşantısını nasıl karşılaştırırsın?

	<p>45-Köyden ayrılıp şehre veya başka bir yere göç etmeyi düşündünüz mü ya da düşünüyor musunuz?</p> <p>Bu konu hakkında neler söylemek istersiniz?</p>
Değişim:	<p>46-Sence son 10-15 yıl içerisinde köydeki yaşantıda önemli ne gibi değişiklikler oldu? Bu değişiklikler seni ve aileni nasıl etkiledi?</p> <p>47-Son 10-15 yıl içerisinde tarla/bahçe işlerinde ne gibi değişiklikler oldu?</p> <p>48-Geçmiş ile bugünü kıyasladığınızda bu işlerdeki çalışma şeklinizdeki, ürettiğiniz ürünlerdeki veya elde ettiğiniz gelirdeki değişiklikler nelerdir?</p> <p>49-Tarla/bahçe işlerinde artık kimler çalışmıyor? Bu işlerde kimler daha fazla çalışıyor?</p> <p>50-Gelecek 10 yıl içerisinde köyde ne gibi değişiklikler yaşanacağını düşünüyorsun? Bu değişikliklerin sen ve ailen için ne gibi sonuçları olacak?</p>
Ailedeki İş bölümü	<p>51-Sence evde daha çok hangi işleri kimler yapar?</p> <p>52-Tüm işler düşünüldüğünde, sadece kadınların sorumlu olduğu işler nelerdir?</p> <p>53-Tüm işler düşünüldüğünde sadece erkeklerin sorumlu olduğu işler hangileridir?</p> <p>Bu işleri kadınların yapmamasının sebepleri sence nelerdir?</p> <p>54-Tüm işler düşünüldüğünde hangi işleri hem kadınlar hem de erkekler yapar?</p> <p>55-Hangi işleri (ev, tarla, ücretli işçilik veya bu alanların detayları) yaptığında kendini daha iyi hissediyorsun?</p>

**APPENDIX C: FIELD GUIDELINE FOR EXPERT INTERVIEWS/UZMAN  
MÜLAKATLARI İÇİN SAHA YÖNERGESİ**

Fındık Üreticileri:	1-Samsun ve özellikle Çarşamba ilçesindeki fındık üreticilerinin genel profili hakkında biraz bilgi verebilir misiniz? (Mülkiyet, emek kullanım biçimleri vs.)
Fındık:	2-Son 15-20 yıl içerisinde Samsun ve ilçelerindeki fındık üretiminde ne gibi önemli değişiklikler oldu?
Kırsal Alanda Kadın:	3-Samsun ve ilçelerinde kırsal alanda kadın emeğinin en temel özellikleri ve önemi sizce nelerdir? Biraz anlatır mısınız?
	4-Türkiye’de tarımda kadın emeği ile erkek emeği arasında sizce ne gibi önemli farklılıklar var?
	5-Sizce kırsal alanda kadınların en temel problemleri nelerdir?
Hanelerde Meydana Gelen Değişiklikler:	6-Sizce son 15-20 yıl içerisinde Samsun ve ilçelerinde köylü hanelerin yaşamlarında (yaşam standartlarında) ne gibi değişiklikler oldu?
	7-Sizce son 15-20 yıl içerisinde Samsun ve ilçelerinde köylü hanelerin siyasi düşüncelerinde ne gibi değişiklikler oldu?
	8-Son 15-20 yıl içerisinde Samsun ve ilçelerindeki köyden kente göç etme eğilimleri hakkında neler düşünüyorsunuz? Biraz anlatır mısınız?
Samsun Tarımı:	9-Son 15-20 yıl içerisinde Samsun ve ilçelerindeki tarımsal ilişkilerde ne gibi temel değişiklikler yaşandı?
	10-1980 öncesi ile bugünü karşılaştırdığımızda, Samsun’da ve ilçelerinde tarımda yaşanan değişimleri hangi özellikleri ile nasıl mukayese edersiniz? Biraz anlatır mısınız lütfen?

	11-Son 15-20 yıl içerisinde Samsun ve ilçelerinde hükümetlerin kırsal alana özellikle tarımsal ilişkilere yönelik yaklaşımını siz nasıl yorumluyorsunuz?
	12-Son 15-20 yıl içerisinde Samsun ve ilçelerinde hükümetlerin kırsal alana, tarımsal ilişkilere yönelik yaklaşımını sizce bölge halkı nasıl karşılıyor? Bu konu hakkında neler söylemek istersiniz?
Türkiye Tarımı:	13-Son 15-20 yıl içerisinde Türkiye tarımında yaşanan değişimi nasıl değerlendiriyorsunuz?
	14-Bugün Türkiye tarımının geldiği aşamayı nasıl değerlendiriyorsunuz?
Tarımın Geleceği:	15-Türkiye tarımının gelecek 10 yıl içerisindeki durumunu nasıl görüyorsunuz? Sizce önümüzdeki dönemlerde ne gibi değişiklikler yaşanacak?
	16-Samsun ve ilçelerinde tarımına yönelik olarak öncelikli neler yapılmasını gerekli görüyorsunuz? Biraz detaylı bir şekilde anlatır mısınız?

## APPENDIX D: TURKISH SUMMARY/TÜRKÇE ÖZET

Bu tez, çağdaş feminist kritik teori içerisinde konumlanan Feminist Duruş Kuramı yaklaşımı ile Türkiye'nin Batı Karadeniz bölgesindeki bir köyde gerçekleştirilen alan araştırmasına dayanarak, kırsal alanda kadınların neoliberal dönüşümlere kendi ve hane/aile yaşam biçimlerine yönelik özgün ve öznel olarak göstermiş oldukları direniş ve/veya uyum özelliklerini incelemektedir. Bu tez, aynı zamanda, böyle bir analizin kırsal kadınların kısmi bilgisini anlamak için kritik olan kadınların öznelliklerinin özelliklerini anlamak için yararlı olduğunu savunmaktadır. Çalışmanın odağı, 1980'lerden sonra Türkiye'nin tarımında yaşanan neoliberal dönüşümler ile sınırlandırılmıştır. Bu çalışmanın tarihsel olarak 1980 sonrası döneme indirgenmesinin nedeni, Türkiye'nin neoliberalizmin uygulanmasının başlıca örneklerinden biri olması nedeni ile Türkiye tarımında yaşanan neoliberal dönüşümü anlamak için 1980 sonrası döneme odaklanmanın gereklilik arz etmesinden ileri gelmektedir. Bu argümana paralel olarak, bu tez, 1980 sonrası dönemde Türkiye tarımında yaşanan neoliberal dönüşüm sırasında kadınların hayatlarının değişen dinamiklerini ele almaktadır.

Kır sosyolojisinin tarihsel gelişimi içerisinde bu tezin nerede konumlandığını anlamak, tezin teorik argümanlarını anlamak açısından önem arz etmektedir. Kır sosyolojisi; klasik kır sosyolojisi, yeni kır sosyolojisi veya tarım sosyolojisi, çağdaş kır sosyolojisi ve post-modern kır sosyolojisi olarak tasnif edildiğinde; bu tez, paradigmatik pozisyonuna paralel şekilde, çağdaş kır sosyolojisi içerisinde konumlanmaktadır. Bu noktada, çağdaş modernite konumunun<sup>95</sup> kırsal sosyal ilişkilerini sorunsallaştırmak için kır sosyolojisine önemli bir teorik bakış açısı sağladığı belirtilmelidir. Kır sosyolojisinin çağdaş modernite pozisyonun vurgulanması gereken bir diğer önemi ise yalnızca tarım ve köylü ilişkileri temelinde kırsal ilişkileri değil, aynı zamanda tarım ve gıda ilişkilerini de temel almasıdır. Fakat bu çalışmada, tarım ve gıda arasındaki ilişki incelenmemiş ve bu çalışmada

---

<sup>95</sup> Kır sosyolojinin çağdaş modernite konumu M. C. Ecevit tarafından Orta Doğu Teknik Üniversitesi'nde vermiş olduğu kır sosyolojisi dersleri boyunca tartışılmıştır.

kırsal alanın kapsamı, kadınların Batı Karadeniz bölgesindeki kırsal sosyal ilişkiler içerisindeki konumlarını anlamak için fındık üretimine indirgenmiştir. Çalışmanın amacının fındık üretimindeki değişiklikleri anlamak değil, 1980 sonrası döneme odaklanarak Batı Karadeniz bölgesindeki kadınların yaşamlarındaki değişimleri anlamak olduğu vurgulanmalıdır. Kadınların değişen kırsal sosyal ilişkilere yönelik geliştirmiş olduğu direniş dinamiklerine, Türkiye’deki tarımsal ilişkilerin özgünlükleri ve kadınların küçük meta üretimi içerisindeki öznellikleri çerçevesinde odaklanılmaktadır. Kadınların, özel olarak küçük meta üretimi içerisindeki, genel olarak ise kırsal sosyal ilişkiler içerisindeki konumlarını anlamak için; bu tezde, kadınların dahil olduğu kırsal sosyal ilişkiler Feminist Duruş Kuramı (FDK) perspektifinden kavramsallaştırılarak tartışılmaktadır.

Tezin teorik çerçevesi kapsamında, Türkiye benzeri az gelişmiş ülkelerdeki kadınların kırsal sosyal ilişkiler içerisindeki pozisyonunun Türkiye’deki kırsal sosyal ilişkiler içerisindeki kadınların pozisyonunu anlamada önemli olduğu varsayımından hareketle; Türkiye’deki kırsal kadınların pozisyonlarına ilişkin çalışmaların yanı sıra Türkiye benzeri az gelişmiş ülkelerdeki kırsal kadınların pozisyonlarına ilişkin çalışmaların değerlendirilmesine de yer verilmiştir. Bu değerlendirme esnasında literatürün iki tarafını paralel bir çizgide tutmak için ücretsiz aile emeği, toplumsal cinsiyete dayalı iş bölümü ve tarımda ücretli emek gibi mevcut literatürde kırsal kadınlarla ilgili tartışılan temel kavramlar ışığında bir kavramsallaştırma takip edilmiştir.

Literatürde kırsal kadınlarla ilgili araştırmalar çoğunlukla; emek, toplumsal cinsiyete dayalı iş bölümü, ücretsiz ev işçiliği, tarımsal ücretli emek, geçim üretimi, alternatif tarım, gıda politikası ve güçlendirme konularında yoğunlaşmaktadır. Özellikle geç kapitalist veya “üçüncü dünya” ülkelerindeki kırsal kadınlar; çiftçiler, emekçiler, girişimciler ve ailenin yeniden üretiminden sorumlu aktörler olarak önemli bir rol oynamaktadır; bu nedenle kadınların tarım ve kırsal ekonomiler içerisindeki en önemli aktörler olduğu söylenebilir. Literatürdeki çalışmalar içerisinde “tarımın feminizasyonu” (feminisation of agriculture) tartışmaları önemli bir yer tutmaktadır. Araştırmacılar, özellikle Asya, Afrika ve Latin Amerika olmak üzere birçok bölgede “tarımın feminizasyonu” tartışmasının yaşandığını savunmaktadır.

Türkiye, 1980'lerde uygulanmaya başlanan neoliberal yapısal uyum politikaları nedeniyle en dramatik kırsal dönüşümü yaşamıştır. Bu dönemde, sanayileşme stratejileri, ithal ikame sanayileşmesinden (ISI), ihracata dayalı sanayileşmeye (ELI) geçmiştir. 1950'li yıllara kadar Türkiye tarımındaki temel üretim birimi küçük köylülük iken zaman içerisinde üretim birimi değişen piyasa koşullarına uyum sağlarken küçük köylülükten küçük meta üreticiliğine doğru geçiş göstermiştir. Türkiye'de tarım, kadınların ücretsiz aile işçiliği temelinde hane halkı üretimine ve geçim üretimine dayanan küçük meta üretimi ile varlığını sürdürmektedir (Ecevit, 1994; Boratav, 1995; Karkiner, 2006; FAO, 2016). Türkiye kırsalında, yapısal uyum politikalarının olumsuz etkilerini ortadan kaldırmak için aynı zamanda üretim ve yeniden üretim birimi olan küçük meta üreticisi haneler hayatta kalma stratejileri geliştirmektedirler (Aydın, 2018). Fakat, küçük meta üreticisi haneler emeklerini değersizleştirse bile küçük meta üreticisi haneler ya hayatlarını geçimlik düzeyde devam ettirirler ya da tasfiye ve/veya mülksüzleşme sürecine girerler (Ecevit, 2007).

Türkiye tarımını 1980 öncesi ve sonrası şeklinde dönemlere ayırırken dikkat edilmesi gereken önemli metodolojik nokta sadece farklılıkları içeren bir kapsamda değil, aynı zamanda ortaklıkları ve benzerlikleri de dahil eden bir çerçevede yapılmasının önemli olduğudur (Ecevit et. al., 2009). Bu dönüşümün bir sonucu olarak, üretim ilişkileri zaman içerisinde geçim üretiminden küçük meta üretimine geçiş özellikleri göstermiştir. Türkiye tarımı 1980 öncesi ve sonrası şeklinde iki döneme ayırarak incelendiğinde, bu iki dönemin birbirinden farklılık teşkil eden özellikleri sermayenin tarımsal ilişkilere müdahalesi ve devletin değişen rolü şeklinde özetlenebilir. Diğer yandan bu iki dönemin benzerlikleri ise tarımsal üretimin metalaşmamış aile emeği bir diğer deyişle ücretsiz aile işçiliği temelinde gerçekleştirilmesidir.

Metalaşmamış aile emeği esas olarak hem üretim hem de yeniden üretim alanlarında temel özne olarak konumlanan kadının metalaşmamış emeğini ifade etmektedir. Kadınların hem üretim hem de yeniden üretimde metalaşmamış aile emeği, küçük meta üretiminin hayatta kalmasındaki önemli ve vazgeçilmez rolü ile kavramsallaştırılmaktadır. Türkiye kırsalında kadınların ücretsiz aile işçisi olan



konumu, tarımda 1980'lerden bu yana uygulanan yapısal uyum politikaları ile güçlendirilmektedir.

TÜİK'in NUTS birinci düzey sınıflamasına göre, Türkiye on iki istatistiksel bölgeye ayrılmakta ve Samsun bu sınıflandırmaya göre Batı Karadeniz bölgesinde yer almaktadır. Batı Karadeniz bölgesindeki ortalama tarım arazisi %45 ile ülke ortalaması olan %35'in üzerindedir (OKA, 2012). Bunun bir sonucu olarak, tarım bölgedeki önemini korumakta ve sürdürmektedir. Bölgede istihdam edilen kadınların %54'ü tarım sektöründe, %37'si hizmet sektöründe ve %8'i endüstri sektöründe istihdam edilmektedir (TÜİK, 2018). Ayrıca TÜİK verilerine göre (2018), Karadeniz bölgesinde tarımda istihdam edilen kadınların neredeyse %90'ı ücretsiz ev işçisidir.

1980 sonrasında uygulanmaya başlanan liberalleşme politikalarının sadece üretime yönelik bir uygulama değil, aynı zamanda toplumun genelini kapsayan ve özel olarak da kırsal ilişkiler üzerinde çok ciddi sonuçlar yaratan uygulamalar olduğu belirtilmelidir (Ecevit et. al., 2009, p. 53). Bu nedenle, bu çalışma kapsamında yalnızca kadınların kırsal emeği değil, 1980 sonrasında uygulanmaya başlanan yapısal uyum politikaları neticesinde değişen kırsal sosyal ilişkiler içerisinde kadınların değişen pozisyonları da araştırma sorgusuna dahil edilmektedir. Araştırmanın sorgusunun teorik zeminini Feminist Duruş Kuramı oluşturmaktadır. Bir başka deyişle, bu tezde, kırsal sosyal ilişkiler içerisinde kadınların pozisyonu FDK'nın teorik zemininde sorunsallaştırılarak tartışılmaktadır.

Feminist Duruş Kuramı, 1970'lerin sonunda ve 1980'lerin başında, "bilgi üretimi" ile "güç ilişkileri" arasındaki ilişkiyi sorgulayan ve feminist eleştirel teori içerisinde konumlanan bir teori olarak ortaya çıkmıştır (Harding, 2004; Harding, 2009). FDK, bilgi ve güç ilişkilerinin, başka bir deyişle ise epistemoloji ve siyasetin ayrılmazlığını savunmaktadır. Duruş kavramı, kadınların doğayı ve sosyal yaşamı yorumlamaları ve açıklamaları için ahlaki ve bilimsel olarak tercih edilen bir zemin olarak tanımlanmaktadır (Harding, 1986, p. 26). İnsanlar arasındaki ilişkilerin doğası ve bu ilişkilerin "nasıl oluştuğu, yapılandırıldığı, araştırıldığı ve anlaşıldığı", FDK için politik, etik ve epistemolojik bir sorgu kaynağıdır (Ramazanoğlu & Holland, 2002)

FDK'nın paradigmatic pozisyonu; metodolojik, epistemolojik ve ontolojik sorgulamaları nedeniyle ne modernite içerisinde ne de postmodernite içerisinde konum almaktadır. Her ne kadar FDK modernite anlayışını tamamen reddetmese de çağdaş ve batılı bilimsel düşünceleri; tarihsel, tutarsız, ikicil, erkek egemen ve cinsiyetçi özelliklerinden dolayı şiddetle eleştirmektedir (Harding, 2004; Narayan, 2004; Crasnow, 2009). Diğer yandan, postmodernitenin düşünme ilkelerinin FDK'nın bazı temel varsayımlarıyla, en önemlisi de politika ile uyumlu olmaması nedeni ile FDK postmoderniteden yararlanmasına rağmen postmodernite içerisinde de konumlanmamaktadır. FDK'nın moderniteyi modernite içerisinde kalarak şiddetli bir şekilde eleştirirken postmoderniteden de yararlanıyor oluşu, FDK'nın çağdaş modernite içerisindeki konumunu vurgulamaktadır.

FDK'nın öznellik tartışmaları, moderniteye yönelttiği epistemolojik eleştirilerden biri olarak oldukça önemlidir. Feminist Duruş Kuramına göre, nesnel bilgi iddiası modernitenin rasyonalist, evrenselci ve özcü varsayımlarına dayanmaktadır. Bu nedenle FDK, bilginin öznelliği ve özgünlüğü nedeniyle nesnel bir bilginin mümkün olmayacağını savunarak modernitenin nesnel bilgi iddiasını eleştirmektedir. Öznenliğin FDK içerisindeki pozisyonunun önemi, aynı zamanda FDK'nın modernitenin yapısal anlayışına yönelttiği eleştiriye de vurgulamaktadır. FDK'nın moderniteye yönelttiği epistemolojik eleştirilerin yanı sıra, FDK'nın moderniteye yönelttiği ontolojik eleştir; beden, öz, özne ve birey üzerine odaklanmaktadır. FDK epistemolojik ve ontolojik eleştirilere ek olarak, modernitenin metodolojisini de eleştirmektedir. FDK'nın metodolojik eleştirisi, modernitenin analiz birimi anlayışı üzerinden modernitenin dikotomik anlayışına yöneliktir. FDK, modernitenin toplumsal cinsiyete dayalı analizinin kadın erkek ikiliği üzerinden kurulması nedeniyle cinsiyet yanlısı bir analize dönüştüğünü ileri sürmektedir. Ayrıca, modernitenin dikotomiye dayanan anlayışı, kadınların kendi arasındaki farklılıkların da göz ardı edilmesine neden olmaktadır. FDK modernite anlayışını; batılı, beyaz ve orta sınıf kadınlara odaklanması nedeniyle tüm kadınları analize dahil etmemesi nedeniyle de eleştirmektedir. FDK'ya göre dikotomik anlayış indirgeyici ve erkekler kadınları, batı doğuyu, üstün olan aşağıda olanı belirlemektedir. Özetle, FDK, belirleyici, dikotomik, rasyonel, temel ve evrensel varsayımları nedeniyle; rasyonel, yapısal işlevselci ve eleştirel gerçekçi epistemolojileri eleştirmektedir.

Feminist Duruş epistemolojisinin temelleri, Hegel'in efendi ve köye diyalektiğine dayanmakla birlikte; Marx, Engels ve Lukacs'ın, Hegel analizlerine ve değerlendirmelerine dayanmaktadır. FDK'nın temel epistemolojik argümanı; Marx'da proletarya olan bilginin öznesinin kadın olarak değiştirilmesi gerektiğidir. "Marjinalleşmiş yaşamlardan düşünmeye başlamak" ve "gündelik hayatı problemlematik olarak ele almak", FDK'ya epistemolojik açıdan avantajlı başlangıç noktaları sağlamaktadır. FDK'nın marjinalleşmiş yaşamların bilginin öznesi olarak ele alınmasına yaptığı vurgu, kadınların bilgisine ulaşmak için bilginin öznesi olarak kadınları almanın gerekliliğinin altını çizmektedir. Bu nedenle, kadınların gündelik yaşamları ve deneyimleri, FDK tarafından bilgi sorgusunun temel kaynakları olarak ele alınmaktadır. Burada vurgulanması gereken nokta ise, FDK'ya göre sorguya ve düşünmeye başlamak için tek ve ideal bir kadın yaşamı olmadığı, başka bir deyişle ise tek bir feminist duruşun olmadığıdır (Harding, 2004; Haraway, 2004). FDK, özne ve nesne olarak konumlanan kadınların; homojen, birleşik ve dikotomik değil, aksine heterojen ve çoğul özne ve nesneler olarak konumlandıklarını vurgular. Kadınlar arasındaki farklılıklar, kadınların duygularına ve özgünlüklerine dahil olmak üzere kadınların öznel deneyimlerine bağlıdır. Marjinal yaşamların belli türdeki bilgiler için daha iyi bir temel oluşturduğu düşüncesinden hareketle FDK'nın kadınların duruşuna epistemolojik ayrıcalık veren pozisyonu, kadınların hem bilginin nesnesi hem de bilginin öznesi olması durumunun altını çizmektedir. FDK'na göre kadınlar arasındaki farklılıklar, kadınların bilgisini politik, epistemolojik ve metodolojik olarak avantajlı ve ayrıcalıklı kılar.

Feminist Duruş kuramcıları, dünyanın daha iyi anlaşılması için bilgi ve politikanın birlikte üretilmesi ile "daha iyi politikaların" "daha iyi bilim" üretebileceğini savunmaktadırlar (Harding, 2004; Haraway, 2004). Feminist duruş kurumunda bilginin öznesi konumunda bulunan kadınlar bireysel özne olmaktan ziyade kolektif özne olma halini vurgulamaktadır. Harding (2004), FDK'nın kolektif bilince ulaşma amacına bağlı olan özgürleştirici potansiyeli nedeniyle çoklu öznenin önemini vurgulamaktadır. Gruplar iktidar ilişkisindeki paylaşılan yerlerine dayanarak tarihte ortaklaşırlar; ancak bu, grup içindeki bütün bireylerin aynı deneyimlere sahip oldukları ve tarihi benzer şekilde yorumladıkları anlamına gelmemektedir (Collins,

2004). FDK, sosyal ve politik dezavantajların nasıl epistemolojik, metodolojik ve politik bir avantaj haline getirilebileceğini göstermektedir.

Feminist Duruş Kuramı, kırsal kadınların içinde bulundukları kırsal sosyal ilişkileri analiz etmek için değerli bir epistemolojik ve metodolojik araç sunmaktadır. Kırsal Türkiye’de kadınların rolü her ne kadar merkezi bir öneme sahip olsa da konumları marjinalleştirilmektedir. Kadınların kırsal alanlardaki marjinalleştirilmiş konumları, onları metodolojik ve epistemolojik açıdan güçlü özneler yapmaktadır. Kadınların bilginin öznesi konumları, kırsal alandaki sosyal ilişkileri daha az kısmi ve çarpık olarak anlamak için bir zemin sağlamaktadır. Her ne kadar kırsal kadınların deneyimleri ve yorumları birbirlerinde farklı olsa da iktidar karşısındaki ortak konumlarından dolayı ortak bir geçmiş deneyimi paylaşmaktadırlar. Kolektif bir özne olarak kırsal kadınların, kendi kolektif bilinçleri ve siyasi güçleri vardır.

Metodoloji ve yöntem birbirinden farklı olgulardır. Yöntem, sosyal ilişkileri anlamak için araştırma materyallerini toplamak için teknikler ve prosedürler topluluğu iken; metodoloji, araştırma sürecinin teorisi ile analizini, bilgi ve gerçek gerçeklik arasındaki ilişki ile birlikte göstermektedir. Bu çalışmanın yöntemi nitel araştırma yöntemine dayanmaktadır ve saha çalışması sırasında çoklu nitel teknikler kullanılmıştır. Bu teknikler, özellikle yarı yapılandırılmış derinlemesine mülakat, katılımcı gözlem ve doğrudan gözlemdir. Bu çalışmanın metodolojisi ise çalışmanın genel teorik duruşu itibarı ile Feminist Duruş metodolojisine dayanmaktadır.

Feminist Duruş metodolojisi, aydınlanma düşüncesine dayanan modernist bilim anlayışını şiddetle eleştirmekte ve kadınların bilgisini üretmek için çeşitli metodolojik yaklaşımlar geliştirmektedir. (1) sebep ve bilimsel yöntem, (2) bilen özne ve (3) evrensellik iddiası ve modern bilimin dışlayıcı uygulamaları FDK’nın aydınlanma düşüncesinde eleştirdiği önemli metodolojik noktalardır. FDK, araştırılan özne ile araştırmacı özne arasındaki ilişkinin modernist metodolojilerde olduğu gibi dikotomik temelde olmasını şiddetle eleştirmekte ve bu ilişkinin dikotomik olmak yerine karşılıklı iletişim ve etkileşim temelinde olması gerektiğini savunmaktadır. FDK’nın en önemli metodolojik önermelerinden bir diğeri ise araştırma sürecinin araştırmacının deneyimlerinden, duygularından ve hislerinden bağımsız olamayacağı ve bu nedenle araştırmacının sosyal konumunun,

araştırmacının araştırma sürecindeki konumunu etkileyeceğidir. Yansıma (reflexivity) kavramı, Feminist Duruş kuramcıları tarafından araştırmacının araştırma sürecindeki öznel varlığını sorunsallaştırmak için kullanılmaktadır.

Tezin odağında fındık üretiminde emek harcayan küçük meta üreticisi kadınlar olması nedeniyle saha çalışmasının zamanının belirlenmesinde en büyük etmen fındık üretim döngüsü olmuştur. Fındık üretiminin belirli zamanlarda yoğun emek gerektiren karakterinin mülakatları olumsuz etkileyebileceği endişesiyle, bu tezin saha çalışması fındık üretiminde en yoğun emek ihtiyacının olduğu yaz döneminden önce tamamlanması hedeflenmiş ve Nisan 2019’da gerçekleştirilmiştir. Veri toplama süreci yaklaşık olarak bir ay sürmüştür. Saha çalışması, eş zamanlı olarak iki farklı grup ile gerçekleştirilmiştir. İlk grup küçük meta üreticisi kadınlardan oluşurken, ikinci grup bölgede çalışan tarım uzmanlarından oluşmaktadır. Saha çalışmasının ilk grup ile gerçekleştirilen bölümü, Samsun’un Çarşamba ilçesine bağlı Akçatarla köyünde gerçekleştirilmiştir. Saha çalışmasının ikinci bölümünü ifade eden uzman görüşmeleri ise Samsun İl Tarım ve Orman Müdürlüğü ile Çarşamba İlçe Tarım ve Orman Müdürlüğü’nde bu kurumlarda çalışan ziraat mühendisleri ve teknikeri ile gerçekleştirilmiştir. Saha çalışması süresince, toplamda kırk bir katılımcı ile yarı yapılandırılmış derinlemesine mülakatlar gerçekleştirilmiştir; katılımcıların otuz üçü Akçatarla köyünde ikamet eden küçük meta üreticisi kadınlar iken sekizi Samsun İl Tarım ve Orman Müdürlüğü’nde çalışan tarım uzmanlarıdır. Görüşmecilerin belirlenmesinde yararlanılan başlıca yöntem ise kartopu yöntemidir.

Saha çalışmasının analizi dört ana bölümden oluşmaktadır. İlk bölüm politika ile ilgilidir ve bu bölümde, tarım politikalarındaki değişimlerin Samsun tarımına, özellikle de Çarşamba tarımına nasıl yansıdığı ve bu değişikliklerin kırsal kesimdeki kadınlar üzerindeki etkileri incelenmektedir. İkinci bölüm ekonomi ile ilgilidir ve bu bölümde, değişen ekonomik ilişkiler içerisinde küçük meta üreticisi ailelerin yaşamlarını sürdürmek için geliştirdikleri direniş stratejileri ve bu direniş stratejilerinde kadınların konumu analiz edilmektedir. Üçüncü bölüm, kırsal sosyal ilişkiler ile ilgili olup, kırsal kadınların gündelik yaşamlarındaki deneyimleri ve günlük yaşam politikaları dikkate alınarak tarım politikalarındaki değişikliklerinin kırsal sosyal ilişkilere yansıması ele alınmaktadır. Son bölümde ise Akçatarla

köyündeki fındık üreticilerinin geleceğine ilişkin öngörülerin teorik çerçeveden analizine yer verilmektedir.

Tarım politikalarında 1980 sonrasında gerçekleşen değişikliklerin genel olarak Karadeniz bölge tarımına, özel olarak da Samsun tarımına etkileri yıkıcı olmuştur. Tarih boyunca Çarşamba bölgesinde bölgeye özgü olarak üretilen başlıca tarımsal ürünler; fındık, tütün ve çeltik olmuştur. Fakat tarım politikalarındaki değişiklikler neticesinde Çarşamba bölgesindeki küçük meta üreticilerinin ürün tercihlerinde ciddi değişiklikler meydana gelmiştir. Bu değişikliklerin en önemlilerinden bir tanesi tarımsal özelleştirmeler sonucunda terk edilmek zorunda kalınan tütün üretimidir. Tütün üretimini bırakmak zorunda kalan küçük meta üreticisi aileler/haneler alternatif ürün olarak fındığı tercih etmişlerdir. Fakat fındık üretimine geçilmesi bir tercih olmaktan ziyade çoğu zaman bir zorunluluk olarak gerçekleşmektedir. Bunun nedeni ise tütün arazilerinin görece verimsiz olması nedeniyle alternatif ürün üretimine olanak sağlamamasıdır. Tütün üretiminin yanı sıra artan maliyet baskısı nedeniyle bir diğer temel tarımsal ürün olan çeltik üretimi de bölgede daralma göstermiştir. Fındık, Çarşamba bölgesindeki üreticiler için alternatif bir ürün olarak öne çıkmaktadır. Fakat, tarım politikalarındaki değişikliklerin fındık üretimini ve dolayısı ile fındık üreticilerini de oldukça ciddi bir şekilde etkilemiş olduğu açıktır. Fındık üretimine geçiş, makasın piyasa lehine açılması sonucunda çoğunlukla zorunluluktan ileri gelmektedir.

Devletin Fiskobirlik aracılığıyla fındık alımını sonlandırması, fındık üreticileri için zor günlerin başlamasına neden olmuştur. Bu politika değişikliğin özeti, fındık üretiminin değişen tarım politikaları sonucunda piyasanın vicdanına bırakılmış olmasıdır. Tarım politikalarında gerçekleşen yapısal uyum politikaları yalnızca tarımsal üretimi değil kırsal sosyal ilişkileri ve dolayısı ile kadınları da derinden etkilemiştir. Kırsal kesimdeki kadınlar devlet politikalarında meydana gelen değişimlerden üç şekilde etkilenmektedir; (1) tarım teknolojisindeki ve ticari pazarlamadaki gelişmeler sonucunda, (2) göç sonucunda ve (3) eğitim reformları sonucunda (Gündüz Hoşgör & Smits, 2007).

Akçatarla köyü özelinde, yapısal uyum politikalarının sonuçları nedeniyle küçük meta üreticisi aileler varlıklarını oldukça zor bir şekilde sürdürmektedirler.

Akçatarla köyü, Çarşamba ovası üzerine kurulu bir köy olması sebebiyle, köyde lisanslı fındık üretimi yapılamamaktadır. Dolayısı ile Akçatarla köyündeki fındık üreticisi aileler fındık özelinde alan bazlı olarak yapılan devlet desteklerinden faydalanamamaktadır. Köydeki küçük meta üreticilerinin, desteklerden faydalanamıyor olmalarına rağmen fındık üretimini diğer tarımsal ürünlere göre tercih ediyor olmaları sorunsallaştırılması gereken önemli bir noktadır. Akçatarla köyünün ova arazisinde konumlanması nedeniyle yüksek verim getiren topraklara sahiptir. Sebze üretimi Akçatarla köyündeki yaygın varlığını uzunca bir süre korumasına ve sürdürmesine rağmen, değişen tarım politikaları sonucunda küçük meta üreticisi aileler tarafından terk edilmek zorunda kalmıştır. Sebze üretiminin terk edilmesi sonucu fındık üretimi Akçatarla köyünde temel ürün halini almıştır. Köydeki hemen hemen her hane fındık üreticisidir. Fakat köydeki çok az sayıdaki hane, seracılık ile sebze üretimini günümüzde de sürdürmektedir.

Küçük meta üreticisi haneler varlıklarını devam ettirebilmek için çeşitli direnme stratejileri geliştirmekte ve uygulamaktadır. Akçatarla köyü özelinde bu stratejiler; (1) tarımsal ürün değişim, (2) emeğin farklılaşması ve (3) geçimlik üretim olmak üzere üç farklı şekilde gerçekleşmektedir. Fakat küçük meta üreticilerinin direniş stratejileri, toplumsal cinsiyete dayalı iş bölümü temelinde çeşitlenmektedir. Küçük meta üreticileri varlıklarını sürdürmek için direniş stratejilerini çeşitlendirirken, kadının metalaşmamış aile emeğine olan gereksinim önemini daha da artırmaktadır. Kırsal kadınlar yalnızca tarımsal üretimde değil aynı zamanda aile/hanenin yeniden üretiminden de sorumludur. Bunun sonucunda hem üretimin hem de yeniden üretimin feminizasyonu şeklinde tartışılabilir. Feminizasyon yalnızca sayısal bir artışı ifade etmekten ziyade, kadınların üretim ve yeniden üretim sürecinde birincil aktör olarak konumlanmalarını vurgulamaktadır. Kırsal kadınların direniş stratejileri emek sürelerini uzatmak veya yoğunlaştırmak şeklinde ortaya çıkmaktadır. Akçatarla köyü özelinde ise, kadınların tarımsal üretimde emek sürelerini artırmaları mümkün değildir çünkü fındık üretiminde hasat zamanı kısıtlı bir süreye ifade etmektedir ve kadınların maksimum kullanabilecekleri emek gücü de sınırlıdır. Kadınlar, temel tarımsal üretim olan fındıkta emeklerini yoğunlaştırmak veya emek sürelerini uzatmak yerine geçimlik üretim gibi, hayvancılık gibi alanlarda bu direniş stratejilerini uygulamaktadır. Kadınların daha çok çalıştıklarının bilincinde olmaları

da kadınların kolektif bilincine katkı yapmaktadır. FDK perspektifinden baktığımızda, kadınların kişisel deneyimleri, pozisyonları, konumları, şartları; dolayısı ile kadınların öznellikleri ve özgünlükleri, kadınların eylemlerini ve anlatılarını şekillendirmektedir. FDK'nın modernitenin genellenebilir bilgi üretimine getirdiği eleştiriden hareketle, kadınların direniş özelliklerini ve değişen kırsal sosyal ilişkiler içerisindeki konumunu anlamak için kadınların öznelliklerine bakılması gerekmektedir. Ve hatta kadınların öznelliklerinden de ziyade kadınların öznelliklerinin özelliklerine bakılması gerekmektedir. Kadınların direniş özellikleri ve konumları yalnızca öznelliklerinin özelliklerinin analizi ile kavranabilir.

Literatürdeki teorik tartışmalar ışığında Akçatarla köyündeki fındık üreticilerinin geleceği hakkında birkaç şey söylenmesi gerekmektedir. Uygulanan politikalar neticesinde Akçatarla köyündeki küçük meta üreticilerinin temel tarımsal üretimleri fındık üretimine dönüşmüştür fakat küçük meta üreticileri yalnız fındık üretimi ile varlıklarını sürdürememektedir. Direniş stratejilerinin bir sonucu olarak bazı durumların gerçekleşmeye başladığı söylenebilir. Bunlardan ilki ilçe merkezine veya şehirlere doğru gerçekleşen göç hareketleridir. Akçatarla köyünde yaşayan genç erkek ve kadınlar arasında eğitim, evlilik veya çalışma yoluyla gerçekleşmeye başlayan bu durumun zaman içerisinde artarak devam edeceği ve hatta artacağı öngörülmektedir. Akçatarla köyünde gözlemlenen güncel durum, ailenin en büyük erkek çocuğunun kendi ailesi ile birlikte anne ve babası ile köyde birlikte yaşaması ve köydeki üretim ve yeniden üretim faaliyetlerinin sürdürülmesi şeklindedir. Bu durum bir süre daha geçerliliğini koruyacak olsa daha zaman içerisinde kaybolacağı öngörülmektedir. Genç kuşaklar köyde yaşamayı gerek yoğun iş yükü karşılığında emeklerinin karşılığını alamamaları sonucu gerekse kırsal yaşam tarzından uzaklaşmak istemeleri sonucunda zaman içerisinde Akçatarla köyünü terk edeceklerdir. Şu an seracılık ile sebze üretimini devam ettirmekte olan aileler de gençlerin göç etmeleri ve kendilerinin de yaş alması sonucunda seracılığı bırakmak zorunda kalacaklardır. En nihayetinde Akçatarla köyündeki küçük meta üreticisi tüm ailelerin tarımsal ürün olarak fındığa geçmesi çok uzak bir ihtimal değildir ve gerçekleşmesi de yakın gelecekte olacaktır. Küçük meta üretimi Akçatarla köyünde varlığını sürdüremeyip tasfiye olsa dahi fındık üretimi mevsimlik temelde varlığını sürdürecektir. Fındık üretiminin ve fındık üreticilerinin geleceği tarımsal



politikaların geleceği ile yakından ilişkilidir. Küçük meta üreticilerinin tasfiye olmamasını sağlayacak olan tek şey tarımsal politikalarda küçük üretici lehine alınacak kararlar ve uygulamalardır.

Bu tezin literatüre teorik, metodolojik ve pratik bazı katkıları olmuştur. Klasik kır sosyolojisi çalışmalarının aksine, bu tez kırsal kadınlara özne ve nesne pozisyonunu birlikte sağlaması nedeniyle kadınların kırsal sosyal ilişkiler içerisindeki marjinal konumlarının bir analizini sunmuştur. Kırsal kadınların marjinal pozisyonları, FDK'e göre kadınların epistemik avantajlarını oluşturmaktadır. Bu nedenle, çalışmanın önemli teorik katkılarından biri, kırsal kesimdeki kadınların epistemik avantajını ortaya koyma çabasıdır. Ayrıca tez boyunca bilgi ve politika arasında ki ilişkinin kurulması bu çalışmanın önemli teorik katkılarından biridir. Tezin çağdaş modernite olan paradigmatik konumu, çalışmanın teorik zeminini zenginleştiren bir sorgu olan modernite ve post-moderniteyi sorgusuna olanak sağlaması nedeniyle çalışmanın önemli bir diğer teorik katkısını oluşturmaktadır. Araştırma sürecinin araştırmacının öznelliğinden bağımsız olamayacağı iddiasından hareketle, bu tez boyunca kendi kendine yansıma (self-reflexivity) özelliğini uygulamak, bu araştırmanın metodolojik katkılarından biridir. Bu çalışmanın bir diğer metodolojik katkısı ise, araştırmacı ve araştırılan özne arasından dikotomik ilişkiyi reddetmesi ve araştırmacıyı bilen özne olarak konumlandırmıyor olmasıdır. Metodolojik bir katkı olarak, bu tez, kadınların hayat hikayelerini, kadınların kırsal sosyal ilişkiler içerisindeki konumlarını ve deneyimlerini kırsal kadınların kendi sözleri ile anlamayı amaçlamaktadır. Çalışmanın pratik katkısı, kadınlarla görüşmelerimiz sırasında, kadınların birbirinden farklı ve özgün yaşam öykülerinin ve deneyimlerinin kolektif bilinçlerini zenginleştirmeye katkıda bulunmuş olmasıdır. Bir diğer pratik katkısı ise, kadınlarla yapılan görüşmelerin kendimi feminist araştırmacı olarak konumlandırmamda yardımcı olmuş olmasıdır. Bu eşsiz deneyim, kendimi gelecek araştırmalarda da feminist bir araştırmacı olarak konumlandırmama yardımcı olacaktır.

Bu araştırma boyunca teorik, metodolojik ve pratik çeşitli sınırlılıklarla da karşılaştım. Feminist Duruş Kuramının çağdaş modernite içerisinde konumlanan paradigmatik pozisyonu, teorik pozisyon belirlemeyi zorlaştırmıştır. FDK'nın çağdaş modernite pozisyonu bir yandan çalışmanın teorik katkılarına temel teşkil ederken

diğer bir yandan teorik sınırlılıkları da beraberinde getirmiştir. Feminist Duruş epistemolojisi ile Feminist Duruş metodolojisinin iç içe geçmiş pozisyonları, çalışmanın bir diğer teorik sınırlılığı olarak vurgulanabilir. Metodolojik sınırlılık olarak, alan çalışması süresince, kadınlarla aramızda oluşan hiyerarşik ilişkiyi yıkmak kolay ve sorunsuz bir süreç olarak gerçekleşmemiştir. Pratik sınırlılık alan çalışmamın yerel seçimlerin hemen sonrasına denk gelmiş olmasından kaynaklanmaktadır.

Bir öneri olarak, gelecekte yapılacak olan araştırmalar, kadınların deneyimlerini ailelerindeki konumlarına göre çeşitlendirmeyi araştırabilir. Kadınların aile içerisinde ailenin genç kızı, gelini veya kayınvalidesi olarak çeşitlenen konumları kadınların deneyimlerini farklılaştırabilir ve böylece kadınların aileleri içindeki pozisyonlarına bağlı olarak konumsal bilgileri analiz edilebilir. Bu çalışmanın bir benzeri, farklı fiziksel yapıda konumlanan köylerde yapılabilir. Dağ köyleri gibi direnme stratejilerinin çeşitlendirilme imkânının sınırlı olduğu yerlerde yapılması farklı analizleri de beraberinde getirecektir. Ayrıca, bu çalışma küçük meta üreticilerinin yaşamlarındaki, direnç stratejilerindeki ve ailedeki kadınların deneyimlerindeki farklılıkları anlamak için fındık üretiminin yaygın olduğu diğer bölgelerde de yapılabilir.

## APPENDIX E: THESIS PERMISSION FORM/ TEZ İZİN FORMU

### ENSTİTÜ / INSTITUTE

Fen Bilimleri Enstitüsü / Graduate School of Natural and Applied Sciences

☐

Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü / Graduate School of Social Sciences

☒

Uygulamalı Matematik Enstitüsü / Graduate School of Applied Mathematics

☐

Enformatik Enstitüsü / Graduate School of Informatics

☐

Deniz Bilimleri Enstitüsü / Graduate School of Marine Sciences

☐

### YAZARIN / AUTHOR

Soyadı / Surname : BATUROĞLU BALCI

Adı / Name : ÜLKÜ

Bölümü / Department : GENDER AND WOMEN'S STUDIES

TEZİN ADI / TITLE OF THE THESIS (İngilizce / English) : PETTY COMMODITY PRODUCTION IN AGRICULTURE CANNOT SURVIVE WITHOUT WOMEN'S LABOUR: FROM THE STANDPOINT OF RURAL WOMEN'S LIFE EXPERIENCES IN TURKEY

TEZİN TÜRÜ / DEGREE: Yüksek Lisans / Master

☒

Doktora / PhD

☐

1. Tezin tamamı dünya çapında erişime açılacaktır. / Release the entire work immediately for access worldwide.

☒

2. Tez iki yıl süreyle erişime kapalı olacaktır. / Secure the entire work for patent and/or proprietary purposes for a period of **two years**. \*

☐

3. Tez altı ay süreyle erişime kapalı olacaktır. / Secure the entire work for period of **six months**. \*

☐

\* Enstitü Yönetim Kurulu kararının basılı kopyası tezle birlikte kütüphaneye teslim edilecektir.

A copy of the decision of the Institute Administrative Committee will be delivered to the library together with the printed thesis.

Yazarın imzası / Signature .....

Tarih / Date .....