



Social Protection for Migrant Labour in Ghana Pineapples

Stephanie Barrientos

John Anarfi

Nicolina Lamhauge

Adriana Castaldo

Nana Akua Anyidoho



Ghana Pineapple Sector

- Rapid growth pineapple exports (70,000 tons of \$US22 million in 2004))
- Located in Eastern Region (north of Accra)
- Destinations EU (especially UK and German supermarkets)
- Volatility of export markets (switch from Sweet Cayenne to MD2 drop to 47,000 tons in 2005)
- Horticulture export initiative 2005 to help small producers make switch.
- MD2 demand in Europe and US rising rapidly

Migrant Labour in Pineapples

- Labour intensive, year round production
- Estimated 30-40% migrants from Central and Volta regions
- Two groups identified:
 - *Primary Migrants*: independently migrated in search of work, current location separate from 'hometown' of origin
 - *Secondary migrants*: born locally to migrants or migrated as children with family, current location separate from the 'hometown' to which they remain affiliated.



Analytical Framework

Linkages explored between:

- Global production networks:
 - Commercial linkages and networks
 - Socially embedded nature of production
- Migrant labour networks:
 - Demand and supply of internal migrant labour (emphasis on pull dynamics of global production)
 - Migrant labour rights and decent work (ILO)
- Social protection networks
 - All interventions that address risk and vulnerability:
 - Preventative (avert deprivation)
 - Promotive (improve incomes and capabilities)
 - Transformative (enhance bargaining power and social rights)
 - SP channels: employment & community based



Research Aims

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

Case Study - Research Methodology

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

Profile of migrant workers

- Profile of participants: 108 Primary migrants, 147 secondary migrants (27 indigenes - comparator group)
- Gender ratio
- Age: primary migrants on average older than secondary
- Education: primary migrants better educated (62% JSS+) than secondary (50% JSS+)
- Skill: primary migrants more often in skilled jobs (spraying and packing)
- Primary migrants origin:
 - 50% Volta Region, 21% Eastern Region
 - 66% moved to find employment
 - 72% living with dependent household members
- Source of information on work: primary migrants family & friends, secondary migrants employer

Risks and vulnerabilities of migrant workers in pineapples

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

Employment based protection

- Social Security (SSNIT)
 - 40% primary migrants
 - 32 % secondary migrants
 - 55% of workers in export farms with standards covered, only 12% in non-export farms without standards
- Employer benevolence
 - 43-45% of primary and secondary migrants would turn to their employer in times of need
- Trade Union CBA
 - Depended on type of farm – 48% covered by CBAs in export farms with standards, 5% in medium sized farms without standards
- Fairtrade and social standards – buyer/export led

Community Based Protection

- Hometown levies (paid by resident and non-resident citizens)
- Primary migrants more likely to:
 - Send remittances (mainly parents at origin)
 - Contribute to home town welfare fund

“Yes it has helped me because I am able to send some money at the end of the month to my mother in Volta. I am able to buy cloth and save some money too.”
- Secondary migrants expected to contribute, but often said unable to because of low incomes

Community based protection in time of need...

- Survey found that all migrants turned to family and friends in equal ratio (57%)
- Primary migrants in FGDs thought secondary migrants had better local networks.
- Survey found only 9% primary migrants turned to community compared to 12% secondary migrants.

Conclusion

- Pineapple exports providing source of income and protection for migrant workers – BUT export volatility risks
- Primary migrants:
 - Better employment based protection (especially more skilled in large export farms)
 - More dependent on pineapples (with risks)
 - Stronger hometown protection
- Secondary migrants:
 - Poorer employment based protection more alternative income sources (less risks)
 - Perceived more local protection sources, lower hometown affiliation/protection
- Export sector provides additional protection channels through Fairtrade and CSR