FORMS OF LABOR CONTROL, CONSENT AND RESISTANCE IN ISLAMIC ENTERPRISES: A STUDY OF A FACTORY IN KAYSERİ

EKİNSU DEVRİM DANIŞ

BOĞAZİÇİ UNIVERSITY

2019

FORMS OF LABOR CONTROL, CONSENT AND RESISTANCE IN ISLAMIC ENTERPRISES: A STUDY OF A FACTORY IN KAYSERİ

Thesis submitted to the

Institute for Graduate Studies in Social Sciences

in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Master of Arts

in

Sociology

by

Ekinsu Devrim Danış

Boğaziçi University

2019

Forms of Labor Control, Consent and Resistance in Islamic Enterprises:

A Study of a Factory in Kayseri

The thesis of Ekinsu Devrim Danış

has been approved by:

Prof. Biray Kolluoğlu
(Thesis Advisor)

Assist. Prof. Tuna Kuyucu

Assist. Prof. Kurtuluş Cengiz
(External Member)

June 2019

DECLARATION OF ORIGINALITY

I, Ekinsu Devrim Danış, certify that

- I am the sole author of this thesis and that I have fully acknowledged and documented in my thesis all sources of ideas and words, including digital resources, which have been produced or published by another person or institution;
- this thesis contains no material that has been submitted or accepted for a degree or diploma in any other educational institution;
- this is a true copy of the thesis approved by my advisor and thesis committee at Boğaziçi University, including final revisions required by them.

Signature E. Devrim

Date 27.06.2019

ABSTRACT

Forms of Labor Control, Consent and Resistance in Islamic Enterprises:

A Study of a Factory in Kayseri

This thesis focuses on the dialectical relation between forms of labor control and resistance in labor processes in a factory in Kayseri. The fusion between neo-liberalism and Islam in Turkey in the 1990s had paved the way for the changes in labor processes, such as introducing several informal labor control strategies, which became more visible in the encounter between labor and capital. Contrary to the 'labor process' studies approaching religious-conservatism as either 'consent' or 'obedience', this thesis suggests that the role of labor control in the labor processes works in a more complex pattern. This thesis aims to figure out how the encounter between experiences of workers and managers indicate the boundaries of consensual control and the possibility of resistance. Focusing on the peculiarity of the dialectical relation between control and resistance, the thesis starts with an investigation of the changing forms of labor control and explores the ways how workers actively participate in the labor process. The main argument of the thesis is that, even if control strategies exist in the labor process in various ways, the ways in which the workers make sense of their daily 'resistance' practices and experiences accumulate in a collective movement and become the main dynamics of the labor process.

ÖZET

İslami Şirketlerde Emeğin Denetim Biçimleri, Rıza ve Direniş: Kayseri'de Bir Fabrika Örneği

Bu tez, Kayseri'deki bir fabrikanın emek süreçlerinde kontrol ve direniş arasındaki diyalektik ilişkiye odaklanmaktadır. 1990'larda Türkiye'de Neo-liberalizm ile İslam arasındaki füzyon, emek süreçlerindeki değişim ile birlikte emek-sermaye karşılaşmasında enformel emek denetim stratejilerini belirginleştiren değişikliklerin önünü açtı. Emek süreci çalışmalarında dindar muhafazakarlığa rızaya ya da tabiiyete dayalı ilişkiler üzerinden yaklaşılmasına karşın bu tez, dindar-muhafazakarlığı işçiler arasında rıza üreten bir unsur olarak almayarak, emek sermaye çelişkisinde denetimin etkisinin daha karmaşık olduğunu göstermiştir. Bu doğrultuda, işçiler ve yöneticilerin deneyimlerinin çeşitli karşılaşmaları incelenerek, rızaya dayalı emek kontrolünün sınırları ve direnişin olasılığı arasındaki ilişki ortaya çıkarılmıştır. Bu çalışma, işçiler ve yönetim arasında gerginliğe ve tansiyona dayanan ilişkilerin berraklaşması ile birlikte emeği denetleyen stratejilerin de değiştiğini savunarak emek sürecinde işçilerin aktif bir katılımcı olduğunu gösterir. Bu noktada, tezin temel argümanı ise denetim stratejileri çeşitli biçimlerde emek sürecinde varlığını sürdürse bile işçilerin günlük 'direnme' pratikleri ve deneyimlerini anlamlandırma biçimlerinin kolektif bir hareketi biriktirmeye devam ederek emek sürecinin asıl dinamiği olduğudur.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This thesis is the product of collective work, labor and patience. First, I am thankful to my advisor Biray Kolluoğlu for her endless academical and emotional support. Without her friendly support, this process would have been a lot harder and even demotivating for me. In my moments of hopelessness, all I want is to feel as excited and motivated as the moments I leave her room. She has always been a source of inspiration with her critical mind. I must also thank Tuna Kuyucu for being on my thesis committee and valuable contributions. Besides, I want to thank Kurtuluş Cengiz for his presence on my jury and for sharing his critical comments. Also, I would like to thank to Ayşe Buğra and Alpkan Birelma for the discussions during the class.

Besides, I owe so much to my friends and comrades. Many thanks to Kayhan for long and special discussions, Veli for his invaluable support, Olgun and Cansu for their help, Bengi for her friendship, Nora for her attentive proofread and Bahadır for his contributions. I am always grateful to Sezgin for being there for me and for his endless emotional support and compassion.

Moreover, I thank my mother and father who have encouraged me during my whole studentship and my whole life. Even if we are bickering and arguing time to time, they have always been the main drivers of my development.

Finally, I am grateful to those workers, Mahir, Ömer, Yusuf, Mehmet, Ferhat and others. They intimately shared with me their feelings and thoughts about their working life. They are the subjects of yesterday, today and tomorrow. As their stories, experiences and struggle have been making the history, I think there is nothing more important than reflecting and writing it as accurate as possible.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION……1

1.1 The aim of the thesis……1

1.2 The motivation for the thesis……5

1.3 Research questions and the methods……8

1.4 Overview of the chapters……...…9

CHAPTER 2: CAPITALIST LABOR PROCESS……12

2.1 Introduction……12

2.2 Labor process theory……...14

2.3 Control and resistance……21

2.4 Concluding remarks……24

CHAPTER 3: LABOR PROCESS FROM THE PERSPECTIVES OF MANAGEMENT……26

3.1 Introduction……26

3.2 “We” of first generation.....……29

3.3 Islam’s marriage with neo-liberalism……35

3.4 New production strategies: Kaizen and employee suggestion system……43

3.5 Unity of family…….....49

3.6 Concluding remarks……52

CHAPTER 4: LABOR PROCESS FROM THE PERSPECTIVES OF WORKERS……54

4.1 Introduction……...….....54

4.2 Consensual control…….....57

4.3 Direct disciplinary labor control…….....78

4.4 Concluding remarks……84

CHAPTER 5: ENCOUNTER…….86

5.1 Introduction…….86

5.2 Defining tensions……88

5.3 Forms of individual struggle……...95

5.4 "We" of workers: Collective action…….....110

5.5 The wildcat strike…….....117

5.6 Concluding remarks…….….125

CHAPTER 6: CONCLUSION…….126

APPENDIX……...133

REFERENCES……151

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

1.1 The aim of the thesis

This thesis focuses on the forms of control, consent and resistance in the labor processes distinctive to Islamic Enterprises[1] in Turkey. The consolidation of neo-liberalism in Turkey during the 1990s and the rise of so-called Anatolian Tigers,[2] in the cities such as Denizli, Gaziantep, and Kayseri, paved the way for changes in processes of labor control that introduced new and different forms of labor control mechanisms. Flexibility, informality, and insecurity of labor exasperated the utilization of informal labor control strategies and they became more visible in the relations between labor and capital. On the other hand, the way that cultural, religious, and traditional practices and beliefs interrelate with economic relations modifies the form and content of relationships between the employer and the workers; and thus, it leads to more consensual and harmonic relationship. In line with this, this thesis aims to explore how workers' experiences regarding the labor process and religious-conservatism interact to create new forms of labor control. However, my focus of analysis is on when and how those relationalities that rely on consent through the mobilization of cultural, religious, and traditional values and practices fail to maintain the forms of labor control.

[1] See for instance, Özgür Öztürk, "Türkiye'de İslamcı Büyük Burjuvazi" *Neoliberalizm, İslamcı Sermayenin Yükselişi ve AKP*, (Haz.) N. Balkan, E. Balkan ve A. Öncü, Yordam Kitap, 1. Basım, İstanbul, 2014. He states that there are no precise criteria for determining whether a certain corporation is Islamic and how to classify them according to political or ideological characteristics of the capital is still a pending theoretical problem. However, I would prefer to use "Islamic Enterprise" since there are common dimensions of the emergence of Islamic bourgeoisie and their capital accumulation processes, which become concrete, visible and trackable in Islamic Enterprises.

[2] See for instance, Ö. Demir, M. Acar and M. Toprak, "Anatolian Tigers or Islamic Capital: *Prospects* and Challenges" in *Middle Eastern Studies* (2004).

Additionally, this thesis intends to understand the experiences of workers who actively participate in the intensification of their own exploitation that is, characterized by longer working hours, low wages, and less job security by focusing on how and in which conditions their active participation breaks down. At this point, the social and cultural distinctive features in the context of the relation between employer-workers are significant in terms of the forms of labor control, giving meaning to experiences and the forms of resistance.

Non-critical studies on how Islamic corporations become so powerful during the last three decades mostly outline the sources of their capital accumulation processes apart from labor dimension (Demir et al., 2004). Therefore, when explaining the changes in the capital accumulation processes, these analyses turn into what Wood (1991) calls the "bourgeois paradigm" which considers changes in labor processes as the "interplays among the bourgeoisie regardless of their relations with other classes, labor in particular" (Gündoğdu, 2015, p.4). To overcome this situation, I follow the Marxian concept of class as a historical force "in the ongoing relations between exploiters and exploited and in the contradictions within each social form, which can give rise to crises, dislocations, violent conflicts (not only between but within social classes)..." (Wood, 1991, p. 8).

The narratives of neoliberal restructuring that describe the rise of the Anatolian Tigers as the achievement of the neoliberal transformation usually ignore the consequences of labor restructuring at the local level. However, Bedirhanoğlu and Yalman[3] (2009) argue the success tales of neoliberalism hide the decrease in wages, formality, and job security in central Anatolia. Similarly, according to Hoşgör

[3]Bedirhanoğlu and Yalman describe "Neoliberal illusion" for the studies explaining the rise of Anatolian Tigers because of export-oriented industry.

(2011), workers' rights and responsibilities are determined by informal relations shared feature of many Small and Medium Size Enterprises[4] and of the growing informal sector in the region, low payment, no job security or social security, long and irregular works (p. 350). Hence, "tiger" refers to attacks on labor rights ensured by the labor control mechanisms and new ways of disciplining labor.

Although the fusion of Islam and capitalism is not a new phenomenon in Turkey, with the neoliberal restructuring of Turkish capitalism in 1990's religion and religious values began to be more centrally placed in labor-capital relation (Balkan & Öncü, 2015). Neoliberal globalization and the fragmentation of the labor process made pre-modern economic and social relations and ties that were locally hidden more significant (Doğan, 2007, p. 91). Thus, Islamic rhetoric constitutes an effective barrier against institutional arrangements that regulate relations between employers and workers and contributes to the improvements in income distribution in a system where impersonal rules govern social rights and responsibilities (Buğra, 1998, p. 13).

These socio-economic relations unique to labor processes of Anatolian Tigers rendered consensual control dominant in Islamic Enterprises. Based on this, I argue that the achievement of such a huge capital accumulation that allowed the Anatolian Tigers to become so powerful during the last three decades should be analyzed in terms of the changes of subjugation towards labor process. Therefore, in this study, I investigate the cultural and social context from which emerged the subjection and forms of resistance of workers that justify the neo-liberal Islamic power faction that creates labor power especially for Anatolian Capital.

Cizre and Yeldan (2000) argue that the development of Anatolian Tigers led to the fragmentation of labor, and thus strengthened the position of capital against

[4]See for instance, Öniş (2004); Pamuk (1998) and Filiztekin and Tunalı (1999).

labor. One of the strategies most commonly employed was the destruction of the conditions for the working class to develop a culture of solidarity and organization, especially through unionization. In parallel with the fact that the extent of the rule of the capital has strengthened itself, workers' experiences have become kept in the background, and their agency neglected (Birelma, 2007). Thus, the studies on subjection towards labor processes, the forms of labor control and collective action are significant in explaining and defining processes and future possibilities of social transformation. The specific dynamics and complexities of capital-labor relations based on cooperation versus conflict are reduced to either labor control or resistance. In a world made up of mutually dependent processes, however, the interconnections between things include their ties to their own preconditions and future possibilities as well as to whatever is affecting them (and whatever they are affecting) right now (Ollman, 2006).

On the other hand, control of the labor process realized by cultural strategies entrenched in informal social mechanisms and paternalistic relations in Islamic enterprises are merely facades. As labor processes change, hybrid forms of subjection gradually become more visible and other dynamics of labor processes such as resistance and cooperation continue to exist in different forms. Since the approaches of social researchers towards change are rooted in causality, it is worth of questioning whether they can understand which contradictions exist, and when and how they become visible. In this context, I seek to examine changes in the concept of contradiction to narrow the gap between the social reality and the researcher. Accordingly, I claim that the relationship between the control of labor and resistance is not an external one; on the contrary, it is closely related to the internal contradictions of the labor process.

1.2 The motivation for the thesis

Neo-liberal regulations against labor such as de-unionization, illegalization of strikes and lockouts on the relations of work led some social scientists to think that the class is no more a significant agent in history. On the other hand, most researchers who continue studying the issue of labor try to understand why this "silent" class is "silent". At this point, the assumption that the universal laws of the labor-capital conflict do not work causes the local and cultural elements to be considered and emphasized as phenomena that are independent of the relations of production. This study, in contrast, adopts a dialectic-materialist method against the limitations of structuralist and culturalist approaches interpreting the labor relations. While structuralist approaches try to understand the working class only when it is clearly in visible forms (strikes, large-scale resistances, struggle for unionization, etc.), the cultural studies of the working class attempt to understand the lack of the former excluding the basic contradictions of labor and capital. Therefore, labor studies have been conducted on either long-term large-scale resistances or forms of subjugation of labor to capitalist labor control.

In consistent with these statements, current academic debates on local labor control regimes in Central Anatolia fail to explore the boundaries of consensual control. At the same time, most studies on the relation between religion and class point out the role of Islam generating either consent or obedience. Although the peculiarity and the emergence of local and global dynamics in similar cases have been studied with different emphases since the 1990s (Nichols & Suğur, 2004; Yücesan, 2003; Cengiz, 2013; Durak, 2011), none of the study has examined the boundaries of consensual control with reference to collective action and everyday

reaction of workers within the scope of dialectical relation between control and resistance.

The purpose of this study is to examine the relations of subjugation and resistance in the workplace relations under the light of the two-day strike led by workers working in a factory tied to an Islamist Enterprise. In the second of February of 2015, nearly three thousand workers of Boydak Holding went on strike because of low wages, demand of shortening to intervals between episodes of collective bargaining, and disputing compulsory overtime working hours. This action realized against the employer and the union by a factory that had never experienced a strike before has also destroyed the presumption that there is a causal relationship between religion and consent.

Therefore, I analyze the example of wildcat strike to examine how certain dynamics of the labor-control mechanisms interrelate with the conditions of collective action. This thesis aims to understand in this rather understudied aspect by following the theoretical framework developed by labor process theory supported with an empirical analysis, and Ollmann (2006) supported with a dialectical method. Two main concerns have motivated this study. First, it seeks to establish a critical approach of the relation between consent and resistance, focusing on the contradictions of capital-labor relation in dynamic workplace. Besides, it argues the ambiguous nature of consensual control and resistance regarding local class relations. Second, this study argues the possibility of change in labor processes in which workers are active participants of the labor process. Therefore, this master thesis intends to reveal the contradictious nature of workplace by focusing how and when labor control and resistance overlaps regarding the case of Kayseri.

My main aim is to understand the boundaries of consensual control which enable new forms of capitalist control and evaluate the relations established by the subjective positions created by these new conditions. Labor processes of the working class are subordinated under daily capitalist class relations. This does not obscure how the surplus value is produced and secured but conceals which side has the real power of struggle and resistance. According to McCabe (2014), workers engage in activities, games, and develop some strategies, responses that are a messy combination of resistance and consent. Workers' response and resistance do play an integral part both in restructuring the labor process and in the everyday organization of work. Resistance is not separate from consent because, while resistance does not pose an obvious threat to management, consent may include 'the potential for resistance within it' (Hawkins, 2008, p. 433). In this line, this thesis does not aim to draw clear distinctions between control, resistance, cooperation and consent but rather to understand how they merge and overlap. It is the contradictory nature of labor process dynamics which renders both consent and resistance ambiguous. In McCabe's (2014, p. 59) work, Fineman and Gabriel (1996) argue that 'compliance and resistance are not either/or responses' and can 'coexist in the same form of behavior' (op cit: 87). Likewise, Collinson (2005) argued that we must 'treat control/resistance as dialectic rather than a dualism'. This master thesis works from this theoretical perspective to analyze the control-resistance dialectic within workplace level relations in the city of Kayseri.

Using terms from Ollman (2006), where he explains the dialectical method that is based on internal relationships, I will try to open up the cover of labor control mechanisms by examining the labor process, which contains the most important and most critical aspects of capitalist integrity by rendering the process of abstraction

specific to this method. Considered in this framework, focusing on the ‘things’ that we cannot perceive the phenomena that we use in the reality-gripping activity as static and interdependent, and to ignore their dynamic structure and systemic properties may cause us to miss the events that are intrinsic. One-sided explanations, and dualities such as obedience and resistance, or conflict and cooperation, fail to indicate the mutual processes among them that may disrupt the social reality.

1.3 Research questions and the methods

Boydak Holdings, one of the nationally significant Islamic Enterprises was established in 1957 as a family company in Kayseri, a conservative, predominantly Sunni Anatolian city. Boydak enterprises have been successful in various sectors of production, especially furniture, textile, and metal. In the transformation from small scale to large scale international cooperation, it is important to recognize changes in labor process reflected in Boydak Holding’s growth and the deterioration of conditions for workers.

The research for this master thesis is based on in-depth interviews and focus groups with production managers and workers in Kayseri conducted between December 2016 and April 2017. I have lived in Kayseri for three months to be able to closely observe the workers’ opinions on the workplace relations, the relations between the workers themselves and their everyday life. Thus, I could establish a friendly connection with them based on sincerity and trust. To gain access, I contacted the representatives of one of the major trade unions, DİSK Confederation. However, I did not want to remain within the confines of the networks that the union offered and to be able to see the larger picture I went to neighborhoods where Boydak workers lived. I rang workers' door bells randomly which brought positive

outcomes. Overall, I interviewed thirty-eight workers, two foremen, two engineers and eight production managers in Kayseri. The factories of Boydak Holding which I examined the labor processes are following: Boyteks, Boytaş, Hes Kablo, Form Sünger, Boyçelik and Mondi. All data were collected through face to face interviews in cafes located in downtown marketplace of Kayseri or in worker's homes. Following the premises discussed above, the formulated research questions are as follows:

1. How and when do relationalities that rely on consent generated through the mobilization of cultural, religious, and traditional values, practices and form break down? How does resistance develop within these dynamics, forms and tensions?
2. How do material conditions and experiences of workers and religion interact in the labor process by generating either consent or resistance?
3. How do current dynamics, forms and tensions of local class relations in the labor process enable new rising forms of labor control that parallel to developments in technology in large scale Islamic Enterprises?
4. How are class relations reflected at the workplace level? How do class relations develop in direct and actual encounters between factory management and workers? What is the role of everyday worker response in building collective action?

1.4 Overview of the chapters

Following the introduction, Chapter 2 develops the theoretical framework of the research. It introduces the methodological basis for thinking through a set of conflictual relations of capital-labor relation within capitalist labor processes, and

then examines critical theories on labor process theory, mainly dealing with the necessity of labor control. The chapter concludes with a conceptualization of demystification of surplus value from a materialist perspective, referring to the fundamental contradictions of capitalist economy as the dialectics of labor control and resistance.

Chapter 3 aims to reveal the labor process from the perspectives of management. It elucidates the cultural, religious, and economic references that the management employs in building company identity, relating the foundational myth of company with the sources of different labor control mechanisms. Hence, Chapter 3 illustrates the changes in forms of labor control in relation to the changes in organization of work with the demand of productivity and quality.

Chapter 4 approaches experiences of workers regarding the dynamics, forms and tensions of class relations in labor process. The chapter reveals how workers actively participate in labor process by mobilizing their experiences within the dynamic labor process. Chapter 4 concludes with the argument that labor-control, cooperation and conflict can become visible forms, depending on some elements, but essentially, they have an intermingled relationship and this relationship covers the increasing contradictions and conflicts between capital and labor.

Chapter 5 focuses on the different forms of resistance based on the encounter of workers with the factory management. The chapter reveals hidden forms of resistance in the labor process and its dialectical relation with the possibility of collective action. It specifically argues that such dialectics of different experiences as in the form of encounter shows how labor process can include both consent and resistance. Also, this chapter elucidates how different encounters between workers and factory management switch consent to resistance, or vice versa, with the active

participation of workers into labor processes. Chapter 5 concludes with the argument that individual forms of resistance of workers (e.g., foot dragging, soldiering, shoddy workmanship, undeclared slowdowns, pilfering, false compliance, desertion, absenteeism, feigned ignorance, slander, sabotage, "accidents"[5]) form the building blocks[6] for working class struggle.

Chapter 6 concludes the thesis, reconsidering various dynamics of local class relations in Kayseri. In this line, it also aims to provide empirical and theoretical insights for future studies.

The structure of the thesis is not motivated by temporal or categorical differentiations. Yet, I intended to approach two different perspectives to show how they have dynamic and dialectical relations. Within the context of "encounter" I pose their conflictual relation, which becomes more visible when examined as a form of hidden resistance and collective action. This separation is significant in understanding a dialectical relation between labor and capital which could not be approached as structural, static and pre-determined. Hence, my aim is to show the dialectical-dependency between labor and capital, demystifying the conditions and possibilities of collective action. Therefore, I use the notion of "encounter" to show how two different perspectives within the same labor process proves the intertwined relations among conflict, cooperation and resistance in local labor regimes.

[5]See for example, "Weapons of the Weak: Everyday Forms of Peasant Resistance" by James C. Scott, 1985.
[6] See for example, Gamze Yücesan Özdemir, "Hidden Forms of Resistance among the Turkish Workers: Hegemonic Incorporation or Building Blocks for the Working-Class Struggle?" in *Capital and Class* (2003).

CHAPTER 2

CAPITALIST LABOR PROCESS

2.1 Introduction

The announcement of a unique social system which indicates a specific class relationship based upon the extraction of surplus-value under capitalism was a historic separation of the producer from the means of production (Roberts, 2002, p.89-90). In *Capital*, Marx (1867) emphasizes the necessity of integrating labor into capital accumulation processes and arguing that it takes different forms in different regimes of accumulation. Capitalists should organize and manage the labor process to achieve a certain capital accumulation and re-organize or restructure it to maintain the accumulation. Hence, the creation of surplus value requires at least a minimum degree of control by capital over the labor process (Gough, 2003).

On the other hand, individual or collective resistance to the creation of surplus value is always present, and 'control' is necessary partly because of the possibility and existence of resistance. Therefore, the labor process includes conflict, cooperation, resistance and the interrelations between them. In this context, one of the most disputable issues is the relation between subjectivity of workers and 'structure' of the workplace.

In this section, I briefly set out what is meant by the term 'labor control' and how can it be located within the relation of labor and capital. The term 'structure' refers to capital-labor relations and social processes, including objective conditions of capitalist control and subjectivities conditioned by these relations. Although 'structure' is commonly understood as a static concept, it is dynamic based on the contradictory existence of production and social relations, (Özuğurlu, 2008, p. 26)

and this approach enables us to conceptualize links between workplaces and wider socio-economic relations.

Overall control over the capitalist labor process and labor power is a functioning relationship that manifests through historical-social forms. According to traditional labor process theorists', the capitalist labor control grounds the factory floor (Anner, 2015). Following Marx's critiques of the capitalist labor process, Braverman suggests that the main motive for the organization and control of the labor process is "the separation of conception (management) from the execution (labor) of tasks, including the tasks of management" (Braverman, 1974, p. 195). In the decades that followed, Burawoy criticized Braverman's "objectivistic and economistic framework" and developed an approach in which any labor process is understood to involve "three 'inseparable' dimensions: an economic dimension (production of things), a political dimension (production of social relations), and an ideological dimension (production of an experience of those relations)" (Knights & Willmott, 1990, p. 16).

This chapter aims to discuss forms of labor control, its conditions and relations with the possibility of resistance determined in a capitalist labor process involving both workplace level relations and wider processes. The main aim is to understand the material particularities of capitalist control and evaluate the social relations affected by the subjective positions in the labor process.

Though discussing employer or management strategies in terms of controlling the workplace is significant, I trace the subjectivity of workers and its limits which is in relation to the dynamic structure of the workplace. Therefore, I avoid singular dichotomies such as "control versus resistance", or "consent versus conflict" but explore "nature of worker resistance and noncompliance in defense of their interests

against employer control devices" (Budd, 2011, p. 121). In addition, in privileging the subjective experience of workers over the objective conditions of the capitalist labor process, I approach the labor process in terms of "dialectic of control and accommodation." That is, capitalist labor process is characterized by the dialectic relation between control and resistance, and consent is also internal to these relations. It is, therefore, both consent and resistance are fragile in labor processes, which is determined by the workers encounter with the management and their meaning-giving mechanisms.

2.2 Labor process theory

To explore the distinct and contradictory characteristics of capital-labor relations, and of workplace relations, I use 'labor process theory'. This enables an understanding of the core of capitalist control (obscuring and securing surplus value) and subjective outcomes (conflict, cooperation, resistance) on workplace level relations. Hence, in this section, labor process theory is considered the key starting point that seeks out fundamental relations between capital and labor.

In the context of this thesis, the 'labor process theory' is used to express how labor is organized around the means of production. Hence, when referring to changes in the labor process, it is understood that the results of the changes in the relation between labor force and means of production, as well as the interrelationships between workers and means of production, as a result of the differentiation, mainly, such as in the production technology and the technical work division.

Burawoy (1985) points out that "there is no separation either in time or in space between necessary and surplus labor time" (p. 31). Therefore, it is only through its control of labor process that capital can ensure that laborers produce more

value than they are paid in wages. Concordantly, Gough (2013) emphasizes that, at labor market, labor is initially subordinated to capital, fundamentally through the basic social need of employers to be profitable enough to supply jobs. Within the development of the social forms of worker and employer, then, the laborer is also subordinated to the labor process itself because the employer supports the jobs only through extracting enough surplus value from the laborer. To consolidate the relation between subordination of labor and surplus value, it is necessary to look at what labor process includes.

Based on universal aspects of capital-labor relation (concrete use value and surplus value production), Friedman (1986) sees the labor process as following five aspects, which are internally related elements within the labor process. These are: the technical nature of production such as raw materials; the process of production and technology; labor management and control; employment relations; the tasks necessary to carry out production process and relations between workers within the labor process.

However, ideological and political relations conditioned by the socio-economic relations of work place's own ideological and political structure significantly influence the production process (Özuğurlu, 2008, p. 49). Accordingly, the workplace is confined by politics and ideology. This raises the question of where and in which relationality the workers' dependency on capitalism arises.

2.2.1 Essence of capitalist control

According to Burawoy (2012) the defining essence of capitalist labor process is the simultaneous obscuring and securing of surplus value. The labor process must be understood in terms of the specific combination of coercion and consent that reveals

cooperation in the pursuit of profit. In *Manufacturing Consent* (1979), he formulates an answer to a very general, but also very specific question: Why does one actively participate in the intensification of one's own exploitation? In response to this, the twofold truth of labor can be evoked as follows: "if surplus labor is obscured (objective truth of capitalist work, first break), then the question becomes how it was secured (subjective truth of capitalist work, second break)" (Burawoy, 2012).

Burawoy's question is mainly relevant to the first break, which refers to the process of how surplus value is obscured. The process of production appears to workers as a labor process, that is, as the production of things-use-value rather than the production of exchange value. This is enhanced by the institutional separation of the relations of production from the relations in production. Since workers' wages cannot be differentiated from production of surplus value, the worker is rendered dependent on capitalism and the production of surplus value becomes an uninterrupted process. That is how the source of profit is mystified within the labor process, particularly in the relations of production.

Although I follow Burawoy's labor process theory, I must accept that his theory partially lacks internal relationalities of social reality, and thus organized around structural separations. Although his separation of relations in production from relations of production is significant in understanding the mystification of surplus value, it could not be approached as if this is a structural separation. In this thesis, my main aim is analyzing social reality, not by falling into the trap of reductionism, but by indicating the dialectical relation between abstract and concrete realities which constitutes totality. In other words, I try to understand the structural interdependencies between particularities, which are ultimately part of abstract reality (Olmann, 2003). Relations of production and relations in production only can

be separated by showing their dependency, which demystifies the very production of surplus value.

Furthermore, there is an indispensable link between relations in production and relations of production since “it is impossible to perceive the economic sphere as exclusive to its own ideological and political influences and as free from the ideological and political structure of workplace” (Özuğurlu, 2008, p. 49). As previously touched upon, a worker is not paid until after he has expended his labor power and realized in commodities not only its value, but surplus value. Therefore, he has produced not only surplus value, but also the fund out of which he himself is paid, the variable capital, before it flows back to him in the shape of wages. His employment lasts only so long as he continues to reproduce this fund (Marx, 1867). What flows back to the laborer in the shape of wages is a portion of a product that he continuously reproduces. As a result, commodity hides the production of surplus value in terms of the workers who are integrated to capitalist labor process. The importance of mystification is to create foundation for stable hegemony for the organization of consent in advanced capitalism (Burawoy, 2012). ‘Mystification’ describes the social process that produces the gap between experience and reality for all who enter a specific set of social relations. As I will discuss in the following section, individuals are both carriers and effects of these relations. At that point, I do not approach consent as managerial control, but in its connection to the politics of production.

2.2.2 The game: Manufacturing consent

Having discussed the importance of mystifying surplus production, examining the evolution of labor process gives clues to greater understanding of the mechanisms of

organizing consent on the shop floor and of constituting workers as individuals, rather than members of working class. In other words, looking at the organization of work through which surplus/unpaid labor is obscured and secured illustrates the "essential" control. Workplace level controls tell much more than the conditions producing consensual control, prompting us to consider if the organization of work obscures surplus production or naturalize the relations of exploitation. In fact, workplace level relations themselves mystify the broader socio-economic relations on which relations of production lie.

In his ethnographic study in Geer Company, Burawoy concluded that piecework is a way in which managers control the labor process, developing an individualized and competitive culture on the shop floor which weakens the solidarity and power of workers. However, as he argues, playing the game of "making out", the workers are unlikely to be a source of conflict and find ways to cooperate, and at the same time benefit from the system that tries to crush them. On the other hand, as the workers become more individualized in the later stages, making out makes workers emotionally satisfied and makes them obtain higher wages. Overall, the game itself mystifies the broader issues such as the production of surplus value, and the reproduction of the exploitive relations of production. Participating workers concentrate on their relationship to the mode of production (the machine) and are subordinated in the process. Playing the game obscures the relations of production and generates consent to the "social relations in production that define the rules of the game" (Burawoy, 1979, p. 82). Hence, demystifying the rules of game suggests the possibility of understanding the time when domination will become transparent. Thus, we are left with another question: How are workers

persuaded to cooperate in the pursuit of profit? Is 'consent' a strategic outcome of managerial control, or, are games in workplaces only particularities of the totality?

> A game is defined by a set of rules, a set of possible outcomes, and a set of outcome preferences. The game becomes an ideological mechanism through which necessity is presented as freedom. The very act of playing a game produces and reproduces consent to the rules and to the desirability of certain outcomes. (Burawoy, 1985, p. 38)

In many respects this quote reveals the basic mechanisms of 'ideology'[7] structurally related to the consent generating mechanisms in the factory floor. Burawoy argues that the game itself coordinates the interests of the management and workers. The point is managers, and even capitalists are not aware of how surplus is obscured since it is the objective truth of capital. It is the "rules of the game" that constitute workers as individuals and coordinate their interests with those of management, securing surplus rather than obscuring it.

Thus, the labor process produces the gap between experience and reality for all who enter the game. Burawoy (1979) argues that conflict and consent are not primordial conditions but products of organization of work, which are "directly observable activities that must be grasped in terms of the organization of the labor process under capitalist mode of production" (p. 12). He does not identify capitalistic control as despotic or "de-skilling" but follows a more hegemonic methodology of co-optation and subtle coercion.

However, the organization of consent concerns only the securing of surplus, and not its simultaneous obscuring. At most it is an account of the naturalization of domination, not the concealment of exploitation. In other words, the capitalist labor

[7] Burawoy, quoting Althusser, defines ideology as "a concrete phantasy which acts". According to Essex Lacanian School, the rules of game in the labor process are determined by the attachment of social actors to their fantasy: "the greater the attachment to and dependence on the fantasy, the stronger the ideological grip." Therefore, any effort to undermine the subject's fantasy will generate tension and conflict (Pignot, 2016).

process reproduces relations of production while at the same time concealing the essence of those relations:

> Under capitalism because of the absence of a separation, either temporal or spatial, between necessary and surplus labor time, the capitalist is never sure whether he has indeed recovered a surplus... Surplus is obscured in the process of production not only for the worker but also for the capitalist too. Therefore, the dilemma of capitalist control is to secure surplus value while at the same time keeping it hidden. (Burawoy, 1985, p. 32)

If the consent is related to securing surplus value, what do we mean by the obscuring surplus value? Since wages are paid as if for the entire working day, the wage labor contract mystifies the existence of unpaid labor. The main question is as following: "how does the organization of labor process itself- the relations in production- conceal the existence of surplus, the relations of production?" (Burawoy, 1985, p. 32). Indeed, workers encounter only with one another, the foremen and with managers "who appear, like themselves, to sell their labor power for an income" (p.32). However, the traces of concealment can be understood not only with reference to the economic sphere but to political and ideological processes as well:

> Capitalist mode of production is not just the production of things but the production of social relations and of ideas about those relations, a lived experience or ideology of those relations… The point is that capitalist control, even under the most coercive technology, rests on an ideological structure frames and organizes our lived relationship to the world and thereby constitutes our interests. (Burawoy, 1985, p. 36)

Playing the game in labor processes has significant consequences both for workers and the managers. In addition, "constituting work as a game is common in many workplaces because it counters ennui, and arduousness, it makes time pass quickly, enabling workers to endure otherwise meaningless work" (Burawoy, 2012, p. 193). Hence, institutional conditions of mystification are the political and ideological apparatuses of the enterprise. However, other forms of labor control (although never to the exclusion of direct control or coercion) including despotic, technical and

bureaucratic control demonstrates the complexity of shop floor politics (Edwards, 1979). In this line, game itself can be both the source of consensual control and resistance to the managerial ideology and the control regime.

2.3 Control and resistance

The relevant literature on labor-capital relations has long focused on changes in capitalist regulation practices at the workplace scale and has identified various periods of changes in the technical-organizational characteristics of the labor process.

> The labor process becomes an arena of class conflict, and the workplace becomes contested terrain. Faced with chronic resistance to their effort to compel production, employers over the years have attempted to resolve the matter by reorganizing, indeed revolutionizing, and the labor process itself. Their goal remains profits; their strategies aim at establishing structures of control at work. That is, capitalists have attempted to organize production in such a way as to minimize workers' opportunities for resistance and even alter workers' perceptions of the desirability of opposition. Work has been organized, then, to contain conflict. (Edwards, 1979, p. 16)

Edward's emphasis on the contradictory nature of the labor process points once more to the capitalist tendency of individualizing workers and suppressing the conditions that could produce resistance. As Baldoz and Kraft (2001) state Edwards distinguishes three systems of control in a chronological historical development: simple, technical and bureaucratic control. These theories are harmed by their reliance on linear models of labor control driven by technological transformation. They fail to represent a dynamic contestation of social forces to the constitution of workers' agency and subjectivity in their daily work.

Thus, even "second wave"[8] Labor Process Theory follows the idea that "new controls generate their own contradictions and conditions for resistance"[9], their

[8] See; Thompson & Newsome, 2004.
[9] See; Ackroyd & Thompson, 2016.

studies mostly focused on managerial strategies (technical and bureaucratic controls from Edwards (1979); direct control and responsible autonomy from Friedman (1977) than of types of resistance" (Ackroyd & Thompson, 2016, p. 189). Similarly, the Foucauldian labor process theory's perspective on labor process analysis underlines the surveillance of workers' behavior, leaving no space for the resistance of workers (Ackyord & Thompson, 2016). On the other hand, conflict and consent are both important, and in which workers have agency as active participants in the labor process. Hence, the relation between control and resistance cannot be reduced to a single dichotomy, but instead "the inherent tensions between consent and conflict further make the employment relationship a dynamic social relation in which employers and workers are constantly readjusting their control strategies, resistance tactics, and areas of accommodation" (Budd, 2011, p. 122).

Following Marxist/Materialist labor process theory, I compensate for the structural-functionalist generalizations of Burawoy's analysis on "game metaphor". Having established that there are no clear boundaries between consent and resistance, the 'game' can be considered an endeavor to find some "space for escape" (Knights & McCabe, 1998). Hence, I follow the "second wave" labor process theory, considering the dialectic of mutual influence of forces based on control and resistance relation. The case studies following this argument demonstrate that "workers adapt their actions such as absence, labor turnover, the use of sanctions and sabotage to a particular mode of control over work or payment" (Ackyord & Thompson, 2016, p. 50). Although there are various forms of labor control mechanism including consent and coercion, spaces for opposition do exist even if said opposition cannot be openly declared.

Silver (2003) discusses that although some forms of open protests such as strike, boycotts and marching are easily associated with the labor unrest, it is possible to observe hidden acts of resistance, though it is still controversial to identify them as labor unrest. While some scholars think these kinds of acts are forms of hegemonic incorporation, some insists that these hidden forms of resistance form the building blocks of working-class struggle. In determining whether to approach hidden forms of resistance as adaptation or labor unrest I follow Silver's (2003) position that "it all depends on the context" (p.185). As discussed before, "context" refers to the game itself, and thus the patterns of workers' participation give meaning their actions. To identify the significance of context, Silver (2003) gives the following example:

> …religion may be the "opium of the masses" (e.g., exploitation at work can be tolerated because the meek will be rewarded in an afterlife), or it may provide community networks and a counter ideology of justice and struggle for the oppressed. (e.g., the active church role in the workers' struggles in Poland and Brazil) (p.185)

Following similar position, Chakrabarty (1994) emphasizes that the role of culture, particularly religion should not be discussed as if it is destructive element for the formation of working class. Tendency to see "religion" as something there (to be used by the ruling classes to divide workers against themselves) lies upon a static understanding of labor-capital relation.

On the other hand, Mccabe (2014) states that hidden resistance of workers is not independent from consensual control since it does not pose an open and purposefully threat to management. However, as Hawkins (2008) emphasizes, even if "different creative 'moves'" do not obviously threaten the order, they illustrate "the potential for resistance within it" (Mccabe, 2014, p. 8). Having suggested that the "game" has potential for resistance within it, everyday acts of workers can constitute that which can be easily identified as "worker resistance".

2.4 Concluding remarks

Several studies in existing literature have investigated how workers interpret, inspire, and respond to the practices they experienced in their workplaces. However, it is not possible to deal with the economic sphere by separating it from both the ideological and political influences it has created, and from the ideological and political structure of the workplace (Aydoğanoğlu, 1991). The relations in production must itself be an inseparable combination of economic, political and ideological aspects (Burawoy, 1985). Therefore, the answer of how labor comes to recognize that its interests are opposed to those of capital needs to be understood from these intermingled and complex relations in the labor process.

Though labor control regimes are constructed in a socio-economic context that extends beyond the workplace, labor control regimes include forces of domination, control, repression and resistance operating in the labor process. For example, a local sector capital may change the organization of production and develop technological tasks to make the labor process more competitive and profitable, which may affect internal processes and class relations, particularly forms of labor control mechanisms, at workplace level. This is related to how five dimensions of labor processes interact since they already include the clues to the formation of relations between local and universal.

Workplace relations also involve various informal workplace cultures workers establish with each other. Both source of consent, and resistance is notably through labor's participation in capitalist exploitation through workplace games and routines (Wardell & Steiger, 1999, p. 313). Parallel to that, creative and purposive actions give workers a sense of power and effectiveness, increasing their ability to

control their own destinies. The workplace is therefore a key arena for human agency and for the realization of human dignity (Hodson, 2004).

Finally, according to Cohen's (as cited in Silver, 2003, p. 185) emphasis on different forms of hidden resistance, including "the creation of a contra-culture by workers, drug use, and belief in otherworldly solutions" these forms can be categorized both in the context of consent and resistance. Look behind apparent consent in the factory paves the way to see possibility of different forms of resistance. In other words, in some contexts, these hidden/individual forms of resistance have a potential for future collective actions; in other contexts, they are merely the forms of adaptation to the alienation of labor.

CHAPTER 3

LABOR PROCESS FROM THE PERSPECTIVES OF MANAGEMENT

3.1 Introduction

In this chapter I will analyze the labor processes from the perspectives of employers and management. Referring to the labor processes in the case of factories of Boydak Company, I indicate the changing and ongoing relations between the employer and workers. By examining the path of changes in the labor process, I examine the following: the foundational myth of the company; cultural, religious, and economic references that the management employs in building company identity; how the employers' demand of productivity is operationalized; and to what extent religious-conservatism are determining factors in the labor process.

As mentioned in the second chapter, labor process is a concept that expresses how labor is organized around the means of production. Thus, when referring to a change in the labor process, it is understood to be a result of the differentiation in the manufacturing technology and the technical division of labor, including both the relations established by the labor force with the means of production, and the related changes that the producers establish with each other and with the employers (Harvey, 1982; Marx, 1868; Gartman, 1978).

This work is framed through periodization based on certain historical points which are important in the process of industrialization of Turkey as references to contextualize the growth of Boydak Holding within these periods. Therefore, the intervals from 1957 to 1980, from 1980 to 1990 and from 2000 on have been identified as relevant historical intervals. The purpose of this periodization is neither to make an account of the growth from the perspective of the employer nor to affirm

this growth through the economic-political processes of Turkey and of Kayseri in particular. However, the organization of the business and the changes it has undergone may be related to certain processual changes rather than the scale of the factory. The changes in the labor process are the outcome of a dialectical relation between wider socio-economic abstract relations between labor and capital and the more concrete workplace level relations. Hence, to understand the role of culture, particularly religion in the labor process, dynamics of these dialectical relations and their inner dimensions, such as conflict, junctions and coincidences should be discussed together (Gough, 1991; Gündoğdu, 2015). Certain changes in the organization of the work also affect the course of the relationship that consists of the concessions and agreements between the worker and employer; this is also based on tension.

This ever-changing relationship affects the labor process directly. The labor process told from the perspective of the management, shows that some behaviors of the employer are based on a sort of obligation, not a preference or choice, also revealing the local authenticity of these behaviors. In other words, the necessity that the capitalist labor process should secure the surplus value has opened the way for the labor process to be managed with the local games, myths and rules. For this reason it is important to understand both the foundational myth on which Boydak Holding wanted to build itself and the obligations for updating this myth with new needs in that it would reveal the relationship between the necessities brought by the global competition and the local elements referred to by the management of labor process. The use of periodization offers the opportunity to better follow the course of the dynamic relationship between the worker and employer. When Boydak was a smaller firm, it could have been easier for the employer to establish a one to one

relationship. However, when the numbers of working people increase, workers mostly conduct face to face relations with foreman, manager and human resources department, rather than employer. Thus, the way employers understand the work at in different time intervals reflects the different labor control mechanisms and relationalities with the workers.

Boydak Holding[10] was established in 1957 as a family company in Kayseri, which is known as a Sunni Turkish city. This factory has been successful in various sectors of production especially in furniture, textile, and metal operating in 7 different famous brands comprises the companies such as İstikbal, Bellona, Mondi, Boyteks and Form Sünger. To analyze the process whereby the Boydak Company grew while the conditions of the workers deteriorated is important to understand the transformation from small-scale production enterprise to a large international cooperation. Considering what has changed in the organization of work in the factories of Boydak Holding in technology, development of sub-industry, and management strategies will contribute to my study in terms of seeing their effects on the labor process, labor control and workers' responses.

In this chapter, I aim to understand the strategies that individual capitals develop in relation to changes in the labor process. At this point, labor control strategies between the individual capitals and workers reflect beyond the workplace level management to represent recent class relations in Turkey. The story of Boydak Holding's transformation from a small workshop to a large-scale enterprise should be considered not as an inspirational story reflecting the rise of an industrial center but as a narrative of different forms of labor control, new relations of labor exploitation,

[10] See Boydak Holding web page http://www.boydak.com.

new means of consent generation and new forms of encounter between labor and capital.

3.2 “We” of first generation

The years of the foundation of the workshop are also the years when Turkey was passing through political, social and economic transformations. Considering the parallels of the development of Kayseri industry and the industrialization of the district of Hacılar, Cengiz (2013) states that the traders of Hacılar became better acquainted with the trade through marketing the fabrics/clothes woven in Hacılar in neighboring provinces, thus indicating the role of weaving in the process of industrialization. Some agents who spread to the neighboring provinces through this process opened shops/stores in different sectors in Ankara and became very rich.

On the other hand, some of those who came to Ankara started to work directly in the industrial sector and particularly in Siteler, the furniture manufacturing center of Ankara. The information and experience regarding the manufacturing, marketing and selling that would be transferred from Siteler to Kayseri was learned on the spot. To sum up with the words of Ayata (1987), the industry of Kayseri, in the 1960s, was showing a double structure consisting of big factories and plants, such as Birlik Mensucat Factory, which employed over 2000 people, on one hand and small traditional craft workshops on the other. Small and medium-sized capitalist firms had not yet emerged.

To go back to the early 1950s, Osman Kavuncu, the then Democrat Party mayor of the city, built the Industrial Bazaar in the west of the city so that these small workshops and the small industry could come together in a given area, to which these small workshops were forced to move. Some of these craftsmen were

carpenters engaged in woodwork, producing goods such as doors and windows. These carpenters started to manufacture upholstered furniture in the early 1960s. While supportive side activities connected to the rise in the furniture manufacturing increased, there emerged in Kayseri merchants dealing in sponge, leather, artificial leather, glue, and so on (Cengiz 2013). At that time, children of Hacılar Street entered the Kayseri industry and worked as an apprentice, calligraphers and then masters under intensive labor exploitation; followed by years of trying to open small workshops. These apprentices who worked in the small companies in Kayseri had neither social security nor rights to protect them.

Hacılar apprentices sent to the industry started to make small production, earn money and accumulate capital by opening the first workshop of returning to military service (Cengiz, 2013). If we take a general look into the 1950s and 60s from this perspective, it would be easier to understand how Boydak family of Hacılar launched into the sector.

Revival of the past with the desire to redefine the present through mythicizing the past has become a way of debating the continuity of a myth (Keskintaş, 2016). Similarly, the story of the growth of Boydak family has been rewritten in identification with the story of the industrialization of the district of Hacılar, in which the family rose. In the book *The Best Man is the One who Produces* penned by Vardar (2009) in commemoration of the 50th year of İstikbal Furniture,[11] there is a "humble" story of how the Boydak family launched into the furniture sector and grew up in it:

> One of the children of Hacılar, Mustafa Boydak takes a small workshop of about 50 square meters in the Old Industrial Zone in Kayseri when years after his return from his compulsory military service. Then, Mustafa and Sami

[11] İstikbal is the famous brand of the company and the leader in the furniture industry in Turkey. For more details, please see, http://www.boydak.com/en/p/74_istikbal.aspx

> Boydak (cousins) start to produce cots, wardrobes, chests, etc. in their 50 square meters shops in Old Industry with their hand tools.

Vardar (2009) emphasizes that over time, a master trained these two brothers, Cemal Usta, in the furniture business from Eskişehir. This is how he tells the story: In those years Eskişehir and Ankara led the furniture business. When Cemal Usta came to settle in Kayseri, he teaches his craft of making furniture and furnishings to his young apprentices. On the other hand, the father of the two children wanted them to stay in the carpentry industry and be patient. The children consulted a man, known as Yeşil Hoca (Green Hodja) in Kayseri, to learn about their possible future. Green Hodja said, "Be careful, you will have a hard time first, but you will be very open with your patience, because I saw cloudy water in my dream, and then this water was clear and settled" (Vardar, 2009, p.40). After that, the Boydak brothers persuaded their father and after that day, they officially entered the furniture business with the help of Cemal Usta.

In the story reported by Vardar (2009), the launch of the Boydak family, as predicted later by Green Hodja, become an international trade in field of furniture is introduced as the realization of a life almost scripted (pre-planned and forewritten) by others. The process of growth/enrichment whereby different mythic narrations are considered true by workers is explained by a new myth told by the Boydaks themselves. In this way, the historical mystery that may be convenient for negative interpretations and meanings has been replaced by a more divine, unquestionable myth.

On the other hand, another narrative told by workers is conflicting with a more divine myth told by the Boydaks themselves. A family that I visited when I went to Kayseri reported the claim that once upon a time, the Boydak family travelled all around Kayseri with a gold detector, and they found the gold which

belonged to the people of Kayseri. In the city square and I talked to workers and heard similar stories concerning how the Boydak family grew richer thanks to their discovery of gold.

There are rather conflicting inception narratives of the Boydaks and how they grew out of a small carpenter's workshop into their leadership position in the furniture sector. Although the Boydaks strive to sustain their business growth success story, the story told by the workers breaks the unquestionability of the myth and differentiates their perceptions from the employer.

3.2.1 Sources of consensual control

In the book presenting the interviews of Vardar (2009) with Boydak family, there is an account of factory building and managing through which many difficulties are overcome through patience, hard work and faith. Some principles that have come to be the foundation myth of Boydak family came into circulation discursively dating back this period. Hacı Boydak, the Board Chairman of Boydak Holding, reports the difficulties they underwent before building factories:

> When I was a child, I sold *simit*,[12] *kete*, tea, sunflower seeds and soda pop. I made people draw lots, based on their fortune, thus earning my pocket allowance. My father had not told me to do so, but even so I took pleasure in earning my pocket allowance. In those years my father and uncles had a small workshop, where they manufactured furniture and armchairs and sold clothes. In short, we got by on a shoestring.[13]

Indeed, Hacı Boydak's statements parallel the account of the foundational myth: two poor Hacılar children working under the hard conditions learned the trade through experience and eventually grew up through moral values like hard work and patience. They come from within the working class and know the troubles and

[12] Turkish street food like pretzels and bagel.
[13] Özcan, Z. (2014), *Bir Anadolu Hikâyesi / Boydak Modeli*, Zaman Yayıncılık.

demands of the workers (Cengiz, 2013). Besides, the process whereby the Boydak family-built factories has come to be mythicized and to harmonize with the story of industrialization of Hacılar as a district. The children of a poor family of Hacılar were able to overcome the difficulties and problems through patience, labor and industriousness like the children of other families of Hacılar.

The main question, however, relates to the conditions under which the foundation myth has become an element of the control of the labor process. At this point, the fact that they come from the same experiences and backgrounds and even share the same local links as the workers has produced a paternalistic relationship. We can say that the Boydaks' emphasis on the concept of "family" enabled them to strengthen their workers' loyalty and commitment. In other words, the foundational myth of the company has been continuously updated according to new needs brought on by changes in the labor process.

3.2.2 Paternalistic control

In her book, Atasoy (2017) shows the structured paternalistic relations within agriculture's informal labor markets in small villages of Ankara and Kırşehir. According to her findings, ties among local persons from the same village or town are important for labor recruitment, while trustworthiness of the workers is the determinant dimension of sustainability of accumulation. This is also true in Kayseri. Local industry in Kayseri developed with low-skilled workers mostly having rural links, which would be an advantage for competitive production. At this point, the sustainability of the labor process is supported by the paternalistic labor-capital relation within local industry. These workers had different sociological backgrounds than current workers in factories of Boydak Holding. Their need for food and drink

were met by families living in village. Thus, although workers get low wages, employers legitimize this situation by utilizing workers' strong family ties. In other words, familial and local ties and traditional socio-economic relations were one of the paternalistic elements generating consensual control.

Even if employers claimed they were the father of workers who protected, helped and fed them, workers' wages were low and working conditions were harsh. This is the contradictory dynamic of consent generating mechanisms operationalized in the name of "fatherhood," blended with inevitable hate and compassion. In the context of becoming working class in Kayseri, any possible distinction between working class and individual capitalists was already suppressed by the "unity of family" discourse. This mythical relation based on the paternalistic relations was the key point of consent within the process of 1957 to 1980s.

Hacı Boydak, the second-generation son of Boydak family, explains what makes the Boydak Group successful is:

> In 1957, our father and our uncle established a foundation in a small factory. The secret of success of the company is honesty, family solidarity and most importantly our workers. Today, Boydak Holding is a big family with about 12 thousand workers and they are the most important architects of the success of the family because all moved with the perspective of "us" and the same faith instead of the sense of "me." (BizBize, 2006)

To support the mythical belief that there is no cultural distance between employer's past and present, these industrialists pretend to know the common troubles of the workers. Employers come together with workers at weddings, prayers, and village gatherings. Thus, the paternalistic discourse of "we" is integrated with the practices of employers who constitute informal and close relations with workers. One interviewee, who was the Chair of the Chamber of Industry during the first generation of the Boydak family, states: "I remember that Boydak members used to go to weddings of almost all of their workers. It was a sort of honor for workers.

What was more important for the workers is not the low wages but being flattered." This statement shows some of the organizational logic of paternalistic relations between employer and the workers. Here, the main sources of consensual control are perception of the common past, traditional economic and social relations and ties hidden in locality,[14] and solidarity patterns in the reproduction site. Those are intermingled elements occurring within the very dialectical relation between production process and reproduction site. Yet, the discourse of "we" is the main source of consensual control which these dynamics have generated. Although "we" is common rhetoric of many corporations in Turkey, the "we" of Boydak Family is still alive in different forms. Hence, changes in labor processes have transformed the very meaning of "we", gaining new functions beyond the "foundational myth" of company. In other words, along with the changes in the labor process, the foundational myth of the company continued to be updated with new needs. In the next section, I will analyze how these elements would switch to a new field because of changing labor processes with parallel to neo-liberal shift in Turkey.

3.3 Islam's marriage with neo-liberalism

In Turkey, there is an extensive recent literature on indicators of the rise of new industrial elites, mostly called Anatolian Tigers. According to these studies, the main indicators of the emergence of new industrial elites are "entrepreneurial spirit",[15]

[14] See, Doğan, Ali Ekber (2007), Mekan Üretimi ve Gündelik Hayatın Birikim ve Emek Süreçleriyle İlişkisine Kayseri'den Bakmak, Gündelik Hayat ve Emek Süreçleri, *Praksis Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, *16*.

[15] See Ş. Özdemir, "İslami Sermaye ve Sınıf: Türkiye/Konya Musiad Örneği", pp. 37-57. See also C. Temelli "Musiadın Söylem ve Pratiklerinde İslam ve Kapitalizm İlişkisi" in *Ardahan Üniversitesi İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Fakültesi Dergisi*, and ESI (European Stability Initiative). 2005. Islamic Calvinists: Change and Conservatism in Central Anatolia. Berlin and İstanbul: European Stability Initiative.

"interest free banks"[16], and antagonistic relation between Islamic/Istanbul based bourgeoisie.[17] Although these indicators are multidimensional, arguably the most important and least mentioned is the legitimation of labor control mechanisms within the neo-liberal discourse, wherein I locate a discussion of Islamic rhetoric.

Although internal dynamics of Anatolian Capital depends on traditional, cultural and economic peculiarity of certain provinces, I focus on changing labor processes of Turkey after 1980s. The ongoing debates on how Islamic corporations became so powerful during the last two decades mostly outline the sources of their capital accumulation, with the exception of the labor dimension, as following (Demir et al, 2004): (1) transformation into export-orientation during the Özal Period which paved the way for a rapid process of production in Anatolia (foundation of SMEs), (2) remittances and savings sent by Turkish migrants working in European Countries (Kombassan, Büyük Anadolu Holding, Yimpas and Jet-Pa founded by these savings), (3) interest-free banking system since 1983 when they were legally allowed, and (4) construction of a sub-economic network through employers' associations (e.g. MÜSİAD) and religious networks which consolidated intra-community solidarity including distribution and consumptions chains.

Discussing the peculiar relations between Islam and capital during 1990s, European Stability Initiative (2005) published a report called Islamic Calvinism, which discussed the industrialization of central Anatolia in relation to religious conservatism. This report approaches economic development within the framework

[16] See, Hoşgör, E. 2011. "Islamic Capital/Anatolian Tigers: Past and Present". *Middle Eastern Studies.47* (2). pp. 343-360

[17] See, Z. Öniş, *"*Turgut Özal and His Economic Legacy: Turkish *Neo-Liberalism in* Critical Perspective*", Middle Eastern Studies, vol. 40.* See also H. Yavuz "The Emergence of a New Turkey: Democracy and the AK Parti." University of Utah Press, 2006 and A. Buğra, and Osman. Savaşkan, 2014. "New Capitalism in Turkey: The Relationship between Politics, Religion and Business, Edward Elgar Publishing; K. Can "Yeşil Sermaye" laik sisteme ne yaptı?" (What did green capital do to the secular system?), *Birikim*, Vol. 99. (1997), pp. 59-65.

of certain religious behaviors. Parallel to this argument, the conditions of economic growth are ensured only when material values, business ethics, investment and honesty are the main factors determining industrial relations. Additionally, the main argument of the report is supported by the tale of industrialization of Kayseri with the emergence of factories such as İstikbal, Orta Anadolu, and Hes Kablo. For example, production manager of Hes Kablo emphasizes the following argument: "building a factory could also be considered as a kind of religious ritual." According to this perspective, religion as a "thing-in-itself" has direct effects on personal success, industrial progress and economic prosperity" (Cengiz, 2013, p. 28).

On the other hand, Cengiz (2013) criticizes the concept of Calvinist Islam within the context of the industrialization dynamics of Hacılar with a chain of material and social factors. Although the conceptualization of "Islamic spirit" seems to explain peculiar mode of capital accumulation, Cengiz (2013) states that "it is almost impossible to understand and consider the development and transformation that have been taken place in Anatolia in 1980s and 1990s without looking at the historical roots, local dynamics, industrialization tendencies" (p. 17), distinctive forms of labor control and attacks through labor rights.

3.3.1 New dimension of "we": Islamic rhetoric

Yavuz (2006) explains that a new wave of globalization has opened new spaces for the evolution and consolidation of Islamic economic actors. The Anatolian-based petty bourgeoisie were mostly excluded and marginalized by the import-substitution policies of the state from the foundation of the Turkish republic onwards. Hence, this entrepreneurial Islam is the outcome of these new elite, who criticize the Istanbul based secularist elite and traditional Islamic conception of *esnaf* (small merchants).

According to them, the republican bourgeoisie does not have an Islamic base, and their enrichment comes from the vulgar exploitation of human beings (Temelli, 2015, p. 4). The way they use financial means to support the new political movement through its charities, TV stations, radios increased their social mobility, which allows them to establish their own SMEs. The new generation of industrialists across Anatolia founded Independent Industrialists and Businessmen's Association (MUSİAD) in 1990. MUSIAD represents a much larger group of small and medium sized enterprises across the country. The founding motive of MUSIAD was moral capitalism; the rules are the following (Temelli, 2015, p. 3): (1) Islam softens the feeling of guilt that individual wealth can create and (2) reduces the ambiguity of the business environment by facilitating the creation of relationships networks based on mutual trust and solidarity. To sum up with the words of Buğra and Savaşkan (2014), MUSIAD had an important role in blurring the boundaries between religion and economy, which contributed to new forms of some traditional relations, particularly between the government and the business world.

According to Yıldırım (2006) the role of Islamic rhetoric in the labor process that is the management policy of the firms affiliated to the MUSIAD is increasingly that of 'mutual social responsibility'. His argument suggests that the moral values and duties this policy is based on, renders working under insecure, unregistered and heavy conditions socially acceptable (Atasoy, 2009, p. 122).

According to Erol Yarar,[18] the founding president of the MUSIAD, in capitalist societies, human beings direct their behavior with material instincts, whereas Islamic economy is based on human morality. If this person is a worker, he

[18] Erol Yarar, "İş Hayatında İslam İnsanı (Homo-İslamicus)", Der. Hüner Şencan, MÜSİAD, 1994, s. 3-15.

is in harmony and solidarity with his employer, listening to orders and instructions, doing his job fully and continuously. Also, he behaves within the tendency that the most halal income is the income of the worker who is respectful to his employer (Temelli, 2015, p. 5). If this person is an employer with an investment, he gives part of his income to the needy, or to the state as *zakat*.[19] According to this, while laborers work hard and avoid idleness; the employers must be just and fair towards workers. With this reciprocal relation, harmony and love take the place of class struggle and hatred. Additionally, it can be inferred that workers' religiosity is important criterion for their employment (Hoşgör, 2011).

The mutual trust between employer and worker makes organizations like unions redundant since labor and capital work for each other's interest. For example (Temelli, 2015), HAK-İŞ (an existing labor union in factories associated with the Boydak holding) has greater difficulty organizing in MUSIAD enterprises than in Turkish Industrialists' and Businessmen's Association[20] (TUSIAD). To compete in the free market, SMEs need to have a low cost of labor and preventing unionization is one way to achieve this. Hence, the moral discourse of MUSIAD legitimizes the neoliberal market society. At that point, labor control mechanisms become legitimate in the eyes of workers through Islamic rhetoric. Loyalty to Islamic ideals of justice and brotherhood assure peace and productive industrial relations (Hoşgör, 2011, p. 349). If the main indicator of class formation of Islamic capital is religious-conservative discourse, it could be said that workers' rights and labor strikes are controlled by this peculiar type of religious-conservative discourse. This picture

[19] Zakat is one of the Five Pillars of Islam. According to Islamic law, each Muslim is expected to pay certain kinds of property used for charitable and religious purposes.
[20]TUSIAD, founded in 1971, is a dominant fraction of the capital. The Tusiad business group includes the group of major investors, who are engaged in business with secular values.

shows, once more, strategic similarity between Islamic rhetoric and neo- liberal ideology. Hence, "Homo Islamicus"[21] discourse goes beyond the reductionist explanation for the relation between Islam and the processes of capital accumulation and focuses more on the relationship between capital and labor.

3.3.2 "We" of second generation

The growth story of Boydak Holding has continued in various forms as the new capital group called Anatolian Tigers have found a place for themselves within the neoliberal discourse. The process of erecting factories accounted with such principles as patience, persistence and hard work, has sustained itself as a story of growth through the account of how Boydak Holding adapted to the export-oriented production in the 1990s. In this way, Boydak Holding, being a family corporation, made the tie between the global system and traditional or "conservative" society the main element of a special labor control in this period.

On the other hand, the perception of "unity of family" based on a common past, traditional social and economic relations and solidarity patterns has slipped into a new field with Islamic rhetoric put into practice in employer-employee relationships. Social morality has become a tool to gain the consent of working masses; constructing an image of an Islamically-moral hardworking worker along with the idea of classless community.

In 1993 Boydak Holding established their master brand, İstikbal,[22] and in 2000 they founded Bellona furniture. In this period, entrepreneurs in the process of

[21]MUSIAD published a report called 'The Muslim Person in Working Life: Way of Organizational Behavior in the Firms governed in the Direction of Islamic Principles, in 1994.For a detailed explanation see, *Islamic Capital/Anatolian Tigers: Past and Present*. (Hoşgör, 2011).
[22] One of the leader brands in furniture industry in Turkey.

spreading their knowledge to local economies started to establish local offices, sales units in Istanbul and the first TV commercials for the market to air nationally. After the 2000s they began striving to unite with the world economy by emphasizing exports (Cengiz, 2013, p.223).

What is more, the continuation of migration from village to city during this period led to the growth of the construction sector. Especially during the Özal period, this building boom, which paralleled the mass housing festival, caused an increase in household needs. As a natural result the sofa bed, which was used both as a chest and as a bed, was born. For this reason, Kayseri entrepreneurs concentrated exclusively on the furniture sector. This process, which I briefly outline, does not originate from an Islamic Calvinist motivation of actors as claimed by the report of ESI,[23] but from the entrepreneurs who have benefited from the existing conditions, opportunities, state promotions and labor control mechanisms based on consensual control (Cengiz, 2013, p. 229).

As their fathers had, the second generation of Boydak members started their management career as workers. In the journal of Vestel, Memduh Boydak emphasizes:

> Like Şükrü Bey, I started as an apprentice. I was a blue color worker until 1987. We had our office downstairs and we had our home upstairs. As soon as we came from the school, we would go down. Our fathers would give us jobs like "son, go to the bank and runs the book, check whether the bills are collected, what the customer wants, order tea, get the documents."

Based on the statements of key figures of Boydak Holding, I may infer that established discourse of "we" has been reproduced by the second generation of Boydak Holding. The sharing of common social, religious and cultural spaces

[23] See, ESI (European Stability Initiative). 2005. *Islamic Calvinists: Change and Conservatism in Central Anatolia.* Berlin and İstanbul: European Stability Initiative.

constitutes an informal sociality which plays a major role in employer-worker relations. Informal mechanisms such as partial aid, loans in critical times, or extending favors, participate in the same social, cultural and religious milieu to contribute to refashioning employer-worker relations (Cengiz, 2013). As shown in Figure 1, social clubs were established and staffed in accordance with the expectations and needs of workers, such as chess club photography club, and the theatre club, to ensure the work-life balance of workers. Besides, as shown in Figure 2, Boydak Education and Culture Foundation provides a fund to cover the treatments of the ill relatives of the workers. In this manner, consent generating mechanisms produced outside the factory before 90s were integrated into the labor processes in the factory.



Figure 1. An example of Chess club meeting in the factory[25]



Figure 2. An example of the health benefit fund of Boydak Holding[26]

[25] Vardar (2009)
[26] Vardar (2009)

3.4 New production strategies: Kaizen and employee suggestion system

In this section, I will discuss innovations in the organization of work, structure of management and sub-contracting.[27] We saw that the Boydak Holding was transformed into a global holding company as the second generation of management took over the business. They invested in factories of holding companies which produced cables, textile, finance, logistics, marketing, chemistry, iron and steel fields. Boydak Group, which had a turnover of 4.1 billion TL in 2010, closed 2015 with a turnover of 6.7 billion TL.[28] The turnover of Boydak Holding in 2009 is more than twice the sum of the turnover of all other enterprises in Kayseri (Cengiz, 2013, p. 256). This data is significant in understanding the subcontractor relationships under the competitive conditions of Kayseri. Subcontract manufacturing is a type of production strategy or, production relation involved in reducing labor costs. In this context, all production is transferred to another company. There are several big firms working under Boydak Holding and hundreds of small firms with fewer employees under them. The production manager of Mondi states:

> My plants are inadequate. So, we provide products from other plants. We prefer to say the development of subsidiary industry since we are misunderstood by *fason*. Even if they are not dependent on us; my quality control reviewer goes there to control production... I supply their materials since they must produce according to my quality standards. (Hasan, see Appendix, 1)

It can be inferred from these statements that in situations where the capacity for production is inadequate or where production costs at a different location may be lower, firms enter capacity subcontracting relationships (Cengiz, 2013, p. 260). Because the furniture industry is a labor-intensive sector, technological disparities among firms do not turn into disadvantages.

[27] http://www.boydak.com/p/24_sektorler.aspx
[28] https://www.capital.com.tr/gundem/aktuel/10-dev-holdingin-2016-yatirim-planlari

As I mentioned before, many factories in the organized industrial zone, including Boydak Holding, are following a labor-intensive production process with a large population of workers. It is also clear that the furniture sector of Boydak Holding has invested in sub-industry such as steel spring, sofa fabric, sponge and fiber, which make up raw materials, and has been allocating high budget for research and development every year to develop new products and designs.

Technological developments are key factors contributing to the growth of Boydak Holding. According to Ayata (2004) technological developments are mainly aimed at reducing the costs, increasing production scale, quality, diversity and, to a certain extent, product quality (p.571). On the other hand, the conservative nature of Kayseri is one of the factors that negatively affects research and development studies. There is no cultural and social environment where people who are not conservatives can live comfortably in Kayseri. For this reason, the city does not attract skilled labor, i.e. qualified managers, designers and engineers (Cengiz, 2013, p. 276). However, according to data collected during interviews, Boydak Holding had to break conservative norms in management section. The fact that there are many white-collar women laborers in management indicates that growth and development bring several challenges to the conservative culture.

Previously, the consent which was produced in the sphere of reproduction has yielded its place to hybrid forms of labor control with the implementation of Japanese management methods in the workplace. Japanese management methods are primarily implemented in Japan to provide companies with “less error, lower cost, better quality products and better service to their customers under the conditions of increasing competition after the Second World War” (Suğur & Nichols, 2004, p. 128). Especially, kaizen, or continuous improvement, is a pervasive concept linked to

all Japanese management methods (Young, 1992, p. 684). Under Kaizen, workers are required to make production improvements and to report their occupational secrets to management. The social organization of the Kaizen system is team working, where all workers are supposed to direct their motivation to main elements of kaizen for the elimination of waste and increase in quality (Stewart & Garrahan, 1995, p. 518). Although Kaizen is more common in automotive industries, middle or large-scale Islamic corporations in Central Anatolia have started to apply these new methods in response to a competitive global economy.

As the company grows, family members are disconnected from the production site and focus more on the functioning of decision-making mechanisms, management and finance. Yet, managers claim they continue to take care of worker's social and family problems. Hence, they must continue maintaining the existence of the "invisible father". As a result, managers must both take on the role of "father" and increase productivity. That is why managerial control has a contradictory nature which requires constant balancing.

Before the 2000s, discourse of "we" was supported by informal and face to face social relations both within the production and reproduction site. Now, the Boytaş Suggestion System, Five or six sigma methodologies, and Kaizen are implemented to increase the participation of workers in the production processes and to encourage them to achieve main strategies of the institution. Boyteks quality manager emphasizes this change:

> All departments are focusing on new product groups, rather than solving sociological problems or motivating the workers there. We spend our energy for innovations now. There is a wind and we do not want to miss that wind. (Nazan, see Appendix, 2)

There are several rules in the factories, which are operationalized around achieving "productivity". The first is the Suggestion system. According to this system, workers

can enter suggestions into the system which would simplify one's work. Even if it is an obligation in Boytaş, Boyteks does not force workers to be part of suggestion system. Yet, all the factories of Boydak Holding approach this system as it is the preliminary stage of Kaizen. "With suggestion and reward systems, our blue-collar employees are motivated to increase their contributions to the tasks they are working on, as well as to make good suggestions, improve the system and contribute to the system." says Halit Bayhan.[29] Indeed, the management tries to motivate workers by the bonuses. Beyond material motivations, these practices are trying to create 'new' culture among the workers, a 'new' culture in the process of becoming parallel to developments of new production systems.

An operating manager of Boyteks explains the advantages of employee suggestion system as follows:

> Ensuring the participation of the blue color worker to the production process is always one of the hardest jobs. I mean, it is hard to get his idea and opinion related to production. He must feel that he is important, and his ideas are meaningful so that he would care to explain his ideas. Indeed, most of the time he sees Kaizen as a threat to himself. He is afraid of being dismissed. It can be interpreted as a pressure of intense work. However, when workers feel that the people around them understand themselves and their problems, and then he holds on to work more. (Erdal, see Appendix, 3)

As the weight of technology increases in the work organization, the gap between the worker and the employer is getting wider. Hence, the mythical nature of the relation between individual capitalist and worker is becoming more visible in the labor process. Hence the worker who compensates their own alienation based on the "unity of family" starts to question compromises produced between employer and worker. The mutually concessive relationship between worker and employer also begins to disentangle with machine-intensive production technology. New production

[29] Human Resources Director of Boydak Holding.

strategies like Kaizen and the Suggestion system function to reduce this separation. Although, managers are more familiar with these methods in the white goods and car industries than they are in textiles (Nichols & Suğur, 2004), according to managers of textile factory of Boydak Holding, Kaizen is effective not only in reducing labor costs and managing labor but also is a significant aid in innovation and productivity, making them competitive in international market.

Boytas Institutional Social Responsibility Report (2012) explains Kaizen as following:

> We are committed to working together to realize the company's main strategies in the direction of developing "we" consciousness". Therefore, individual and team targets are constituted to make them support and embrace the main strategies of company. With the continuous improvement, we support our employees in the direction of our values, to enable them to develop themselves and their work. (p. 9)

Yet, managers emphasize that Kaizen does not mean that some workers must be dismissed. Kaizen serves to achieve more efficiency with less energy. In that process the employer does not only control the work pace but also learns occupational secrets and aims to increase his productivity. In this way, Kaizen appears to be a despotic form of labor control, but it also includes two forms of hegemonic and despotic methods of labor control. When occupational secrets of the worker are unveiled, the severed relation between the workers and the means of production is compensated by a produced “sense of belonging.” On the other hand, as Hodson (2004) states, “in order for participants willing cooperate and give their fullest efforts they must be induced to do so through various rewards and inducements including material rewards, but also including advancement, prestige, and personal satisfaction and development.” (p.31)

What a shift supervisor of Boyteks says supports the production of sense of belonging:

> Let us say we accepted one's suggestion, but it has not implemented yet. The man gets very angry then. He says “implement my suggestion as soon as possible because it is very difficult to work in this way. I do not want money either.” (Mert, see Appendix, 4)

Another practice which controls the labor process is the five or six sigma. According to these rules, workers must clean their machines, and working area periodically. Managers take care of the rules of five sigma and express that rules must be applied at institutional and professional corporations under all conditions. The five sigma is an application designed for disciplining labor and forcing workers to establish a relationship with the machine and working environment. Production manager of Boy Çelik states:

> Everything in your working environment should be in place, clean and tidy. If the environment you are working with is scattered, it will negatively affect you once. We give continuous training to workers in this regard. They are the ones who must that too. We are auditors and we score. According to their score, we are also found in comments. (Kadir, see Appendix, 5)

On the other hand, such involvement programs constitute significant challenges and opportunities for working with dignity, leading to various forms of conflict, which will be discussed in Chapter 4 and Chapter 5.

3.5 Unity of family

Although Boydak Group has started to apply new production systems, they claim to preserve their close relations with workers. Compared to large scale groups in the West, Boydak Group maintain certain norms integral to the foundational myth of the company. What is more, managers claim that they support their workers as part of Boydak Group rather than individually, which makes them a more sentimental company without conceding from their professionalism. According to manager of human resources of Hes Kablo, Boydak Holding is the picture of integration between professionalization and sensitivity. For example, in the pre-employment period,

instead of taking into consideration of social networks, or local ties, managers give greater importance to “merit”. A production manager of Mondi states:

> I have some essentials. I am a conservative person. My priority is merit. As a company, this merit is in our fore front. But the exception also happens. When our former bosses imply (Boydak Family) “get this one”, so you will get it. (Hakan, see Appendix, 6)

Views of a production manager of Boyçelik also support the idea that the primary criterion is being competent, although references are still effectual:

> The biggest criterion in our company is workers must be a competent. But if all of them are well-acquainted and qualified, then familiarity and the references may come into a field. For example, last day, a member of some political party came for interview. He said I am active member of this party and may attend meetings outside. Also, he is very talented man. But I thought two days later he will come and ask for my permission to participate meetings and activities. Thus, I did not employ him. (Serdar, see Appendix, 7)

With professionalization and institutionalization, the company's strategy is shaped by productivity and high-quality. In these circumstances, it becomes more important to choose workers based on competence instead of the pre-modern ties referred to in the previous section. However, to avoid harming ‘unity of family’ to be a competent person is legitimized through reference to Islam.

Again, according to the management, mutual trust is one of the strong dynamics that maintains the unity of family. Production manager of Mondi states:

> People can come and tell me their troubles. Any kind of trouble. We may subsidize our workers. Here we had our Boydak Education and Culture Foundation. Let me tell you something. The wife of a worker who works here was cancer. They came and explain the situation to me. I said how much a price, they say three thousand. I said okay, I can solve this. So, I use my own initiative without reflecting this problem on the company. (Hakan, see Appendix, 8)

Testimony from a quality system manager of Boyteks supports this situation:

> There are no factories that allow the private situations of workers as our factories. There is no pressure here in like many factories in the West. It is a more emotional workplace. If our workers have a patient there, we set up a car and send it home. These are the ones which makes here unique. Everything stops at this factory on Fridays, and 45 minutes is given to the

> Friday break. And our machines are the machines that really should not stop, since they give error when they stop. (Nazan, see Appendix, 9)

Yet, parallel to the findings in Barral's (2014) study, balance between autonomy and dependency is important in sustaining paternalistic relations. For example, since Friday prayer is central and significant in Islam, workers use mosques located on the factory plot. Additionally, workers are taking breaks to pray, which dissatisfies managers. One of the production managers interviewed indicated that although they are aware workers are slacking, they cannot interfere with their religious rituals because of traditional culture in Kayseri.

According to management, mutual trust is functional when considered alongside the concept of 'justice'. All production managers I have interviewed emphasized that they give importance to a sense of justice related to the Koran, which they try to relate to the work. For example, a Production manager of Boyçelik mentioned responsibilities of employers to workers.

> One of the most important things in our religion is justice. So, as a manager we must provide justice here. No matter who they are, we need to have equal workload distribution. This is already in our religion; we must pay attention to it. Of course, we also pay attention to our clothes, there are certain rules. Our religion does not want anything negative anyway, it always wants positive things. So, we will do what is necessary. (Serdar, see Appendix, 10)

Moreover, the operating manager of Form Sünger not only mentioned the responsibilities of employer but specifically those of the workers:

> If you obey the rightful due, you always do the right job. You do not violate anyone's rights. Here is a private company. The owners of this factory are employing you so that you can do the given work. If I really respect the rightful due, I should not violate anyone's rights in any way. If you do not work efficiently at the hour given to you, you are being unfair to the employer of this place. (Murat, see Appendix, 11)

According to statements of managers, cultural, religious and traditional references are operative only if they have material outcomes in production process. Of course, managers do not make benefit-cost analyses by themselves, but this has been the

traditional behavior of Boydak Company since it was established. However, if the concessions they give, such as prayer permit, is abused, they emphasize that even though they aware of the abuse, they cannot interfere because of the cultural norms of Kayseri. Expressions of an operating manager of Boyteks support this argument:

> Unfortunately, prayer is used here as a means of slacking. For example, he uses his rest, and then he leaves his job for 10 minutes to pray. But he can do it at rest time. But we do not interfere with this issue. Because workers may think employer is interfering even in our prayers. Even if we do not interfere, there might be such a perception. You know, because there is herd behavior, the worker is immediately affected by such things. And his confidence in management may also be hurt. And besides, if such rumors are heard from other places, we can be in a difficult situation. (Erdal, see Appendix, 12)

Thompson (2006) uses the "theatre metaphor" for this illusionary relationship that employer and worker have in common for acting in similar rituals. If the employer gives up his concessions that produce consent, the workers' insistence on the continuity of concessions based on their expectations has the potential to create tension between the worker and the employer. At this point, cultural hegemony is Janus faced; which can be beneficial not only for the employer, but also for workers.

3.6 Concluding remarks

In this chapter, I have discussed the foundational myth on which the Boydak Holding was built on and has been maintained and reproduced through various forms of labor-control. The growth story of Boydak Holding, a member of MUSIAD, an assembly of businessmen featuring their Muslim identities, has developed in different ways as the new capital group called Anatolian Tigers has found a place for itself within the neoliberal discourse. That is why it is important to evaluate the changes in the way the employer understood, organized and managed the business in a framework that crosses the boundaries of the factory.

While showing how elements concentrically form and sustain the material conditions of the unity of family, some of these elements have lost their effect due to changes in the labor process. As stated by Güler (2014), a crisis of legitimacy in the 1960s found a solution in industrial paternalism, depending on the mythos of "family" in a place where industry played a primary role in the development of nation. It kept on its effect until after 1980, even though there was a continuous decrease in the capacity of the industrial sector to create employment facilities. It could be said that negativities produced by the market's increasing lawlessness in terms of the labor front has paved the way for the re-production of the network of paternalistic relationships. In other words, from the figure of "attending and controlling father" in the 1960s to the flexibilization, de-unionization and unemployment that began to be felt in the early 1990s, paternalism maintained itself by taking over new meanings in new contexts.

On the other hand, with the domination of new methods like five sigma, suggestion system and Kaizen, which increase efficiency in the labor process, hegemonic and despotic methods started to coexist. Thus, the tension of the relations between the managers who tried to maintain the effect of invisible father and the workers gradually increased, in some ways breaking the effect of paternalistic control in the labor process from the perspective of the employer.

However, to understand the existing role of these intermingled elements - informal solidarity patterns, fatherhood, and religion in labor process - dynamics of these dialectical relations and their inner dimensions, such as conflict and the possibility of resistance, must be discussed together. An analysis of labor process which excludes the element of labor will be deficient and misleading. To combat

this, I will devote the next chapter to analyzing the labor process as reflected in the workers' perspective.

CHAPTER 4

LABOR PROCESS FROM THE PERSPECTIVES OF WORKERS

4.1 Introduction

In this chapter, I will look at the production process and workplace-level relations to reveal the different forms of labor control, cooperation and conflicts in the capital-labor relation within the labor process. In this context, workplace does not refer to fixed relations but to a labor process in which the effects of different dynamics and encounters related to these dynamics are visible. The structure of the workplace can influence workers' experiences, while the workers influence their own experiences by affecting the relations between different dynamics in the labor process. Thus, it should be noted that labor control, cooperation and conflict become evident in relation to certain elements of the labor process, but that the relationship between them is essentially intertwined. Some critical studies contribute the idea of dialectic relation between control and consent, which reflects the labor process as a concept in which conflict and consent create dynamic social relations in the workplace, and in which workers also have agency as active participants in labor process (Budd, 2011; Jermier, Knights, & Nord, 1994; Ascraft & Mumby, 2004; Cressey & McInnes, 1980).

In this thesis, I examine the dynamic labor processes in two factories associated with Boydak Holding. As mentioned in previous chapter, Boydak Holding has built a foundational frame on the discourse of "unity of family" by mystifying the dynamic structure of the labor process (including conflict and resistance). Through the development in workplace size in Boydak Holding, changes in the organization of work, and rise in demand of productivity, Boydak Holding tried to

make the discourse of "we are family" the main character of the labor process. However, with the recent global changes in the labor process, particularly, the interplay of hegemonic and despotic methods (Burawoy, 1985), the workers have acquired different experiences, and are interpreting these experiences in different ways.

Thus, I focus on the experiences of workers in the labor process to understand how different forms of labor control and dynamics condition the changes in the control of labor processes. Workers do not participate in the labor process just by converting labor power into labor; they are active agents in the labor process, through the relationships they establish with the factory management, work and other workers. In other words, labor control is a process, and the worker is the active participant of this process, which may involve conflict, cooperation, and consent. This thesis therefore aims to challenge structuralist generalizations that reduce "the complexity of social life"[31] into certain dichotomies such as workers' agency and objective conditions, or reality.

The relationship of the dynamics producing the experience of workers employed by Boydak Holding and the elements and conditions that affect these experiences is so rich that it could comprise the subject of entire thesis itself. To reduce the data to the scope of this study I examine which socio-economic, cultural or ideological references that the Boydak workers themselves understand, the rhetoric they recognize as meaningful to the labor process, and the encounters they shape their understanding of work.

I will discuss how the foundational elements of the discourse of "we are a family" and the new forms of labor control, built on dynamics that become visible to

[31] For similar perspective, see (Knights, 1990)

the workers, change the main dynamics on which Boydak Holding's consensual control is based. I separate the main elements of consensual control as follows: paternalism and new production methods. Then, I will discuss the break in cooperation between factory management and worker, parallel to new forms of labor control in which coercion prevails over consent. A better understanding of the pre-conditions of the culture of solidarity that is sprouting amongst the worker, by detecting how workers express the conflict that is rendered visible to them through disciplinary labor control.

Although understanding how Islamic and religious-conservative rhetoric interacts with the labor process is a significant aspect for my work, I will consider this interaction as an important dynamic of every encounter in the labor process. I prefer to show how Islamic rhetoric takes on different meanings stemming from the relationship of workers with each other and with the work throughout the labor process, rather than considering it an element with pregiven boundaries and meanings that determine relations in a one-way manner.

Thirteen of the workers I interviewed are from Boyteks. Boyteks, founded in 2000, is the largest supplier of upholstery fabric and mattress ticking in the world (Ayden & Demirbağ, 2017). Boyteks workers manufacture and markets mattress upholstered seat fabric. There is a total of 150 people in three shifts, fifty workers in each. Nearly 35 thousand meters of fabric is produced every day. Another eleven of workers are from the Boytaş. Boytaş[32] workers manufacture panel furniture and kitchens for İstikbal, Bellona and Mondi brands.

[32]http://www.boydak.com/en/p/40_boytas-furniture-industry-and-trade-co.aspx

4.2 Consensual control

Consensual control has two main dynamics from the perspectives of workers, based on reproducing a ‘sense of belonging’: (1) paternalist control, including face to face relations between employer and the worker, religious-conservatism, social aids; and (2) new production methods such as 5S or 6S, TPM, or a suggestion-complaint system. This section aims to better understand how factory level and general competitive market dynamics intertwine in producing consensual control. I do not mean to suggest that consent is the main form of the control of the capitalist labor processes. On the contrary, even though consensual control exists in the labor process at the factory, its fragile structure, the mobility of the elements/dynamics that make it up and the resulting temporariness/volatility of consent are among the main characters of the labor process. While the Holding is opening new businesses, increasing the scale of its factories, and transforming into a large-scale international conglomerate, consensual control continues to exist, albeit in new forms. Yet, the visibility of consensual control does not reveal that it is the only form of labor control in the capitalist labor process.

My main concern is to understand (1) the new forms by which consensual control maintains its existence, and (2) the complex relationality of the dynamics that produce consensual control in this context. However, to understand consensual control as an operating mechanism based upon different worker experiences, it is necessary to understand the fragile ground on which consensual control builds itself. Each dynamic in the labor process producing consent can gain different meanings from every encounter in the labor process. In this context, the very concept of contradiction, as a basic element of the dialectic of control and resistance, is also essential to explaining how control will assume different forms and how the

operating mechanism of consensual control can change alongside the elements producing consent. For this reason, I consider it important to understand the concept of "contradiction" while analyzing the context of consensual control as a form of labor control. Ollman (2003) discusses this concept, which Marx described as the "dominant nature of the capitalist mode of production", as follows:

> Contradiction is the incompatible development of different elements within the same relation, which is to say between elements that are also dependent on one another. What is remarked as differences are based, as we saw, on certain conditions, and these conditions are constantly changing. Hence, differences are changing; and given how each difference serves as part of the appearance and/or functioning of others, grasped as relations, how one changes affects all…Contradiction offers the optimal means for bringing such change and interaction as regards both present and future into a single focus. (p.17)

Therefore, even if consent itself remains, various forms of confrontation/encounter between the worker and the employer can make certain forms of consent visible, while some forms can be put into the background. Although a discussion of the reasons behind this is not the subject matter of a workplace-level study, my main concern is to understand how consequences of the dynamic nature of consent are made meaningful by the workers in the labor process and how the workers determine the elements constituting consent as active participators in this process. However, as Burawoy (1979) argued, even if workers are "making out", or "making do", they are still 'playing the game' and this 'game becomes an end in itself, overshadowing, masking and even inverting the conditions out of which it emerges' (McCabe, 2014).

Those who have been working at the factory for many years and workers who have been working for less than five years, or the different relations between masters and other workers, have accumulated different experiences. At this point, it should be stated that similar experiences can also produce different interpretations in the same labor process. This phenomenon exists beyond the simple consequences of age or

generational difference. The change in the scale of the factory, its physical structure and in the organization of work has affected the ground upon which consent is built, which characterizes the "ambiguous and contradictory nature of consent" (McCabe, 2014, p. 59).

As the factory scale grows and the organization of work changes, organizing for efficiency and quality has become a primary concern for Boydak Holding. For this reason, it is not possible to maintain consensual control in the same manner as in the first period of the factory. In other words, as the labor process changes in response to global competition, the worker-employer encounter develops into different forms, and a complex (hegemonic and despotic) regime is built, in which new elements of consensual control exist. In this new labor process some contradictions are apparent, but only in a way that conceals and absorbs the existence of these new forms of consensual control.

4.2.1 Paternalist control

The withdrawal of the fatherly boss from the informal practices that affect the daily life of the worker, as observed in a majority of small enterprises (Geniş, 2006; Suğur, 1995; Young, 2009; Durak, 2011; Cengiz, 2011), shifted the relationship, previously dependent upon cooperation, allegiance and contradiction, between worker and employer to a more complex terrain. By the early 2000s, the boss father, who used to have more intimate knowledge of workers' daily lives and maintain close relations with them, has turned into a foreigner in their eyes, one who comes to them only once or twice a year. Workers are more likely to have encounters with foremen, chiefs or production managers. Practices of factory management and the boss father's more distant relationship with workers weaken the "sense of belonging"

rather than making workers feel the shadow of the father. On the other hand, the charity foundation of the holding, social-cultural events, sweepstakes and bonuses continue to keep a "sense of belonging" alive.

Indeed, this phenomenon is observable in my interviews with workers at Boyteks, who emphasize that while they do not experience a close, face to face and mutual relationship with the boss, other encounters with their employer are more complex. Most of the workers at Boytaş have been employed there for at least 10 years; all my interviewees have worked there for at least 10 years. I also interviewed foremen, and the different perceptions of Boytaş and Boyteks workers towards the employer are presumably the result of different experiences. I have tried to monitor how the employer-worker relationship at the beginning of 2000s has since changed based on these different experiences, focusing on their perception of the employer.

Before Boydak Holding was transferred to the TMSF,[33] the manager of Boyteks was Hacı Boydak; Şükrü Boydak was responsible for all factories, including Boytaş 1-2-3-4-5-6. The workers distinguish Şükrü Boydak from other employers by saying: "As the fingers on a hand differ, the siblings differ, too". A worker and imam who has worked at Boytaş for fifteen years expresses his opinions on Şükrü Boydak as follows:

> I knew Şükrü Boydak. When he comes to the mosque, you get that he is a very modest person. We did not see any harm from him. In fact, he would help when somebody had a trouble. He was praying at the mosque once, a friend of mine was pushed for money. I saw it myself. He asked: "What should I do? Shall I go to the managers or what". They referred with their eyes to Şükrü Boydak. That friend went to him. At that day, he came to my side to work. I asked: "What happened?" He said: "He solved it", he said: "Come to the personnel office tomorrow; let us deal with your trouble, yeah". I witnessed it in flesh. But the others are just hearsay. (Cavit, see Appendix, 13)

[33] http://www.fortuneturkey.com/boydak-holding-tmsfye-devredildi-38259

On the other hand, most workers say that only a few privileged workers may talk to Şükrü Boydak, who they call "father":

> I did not see anybody paternal. He may have solved the problems of a couple of friends. But it would be a shame if you as the greatest businessman could not handle the problems of your workers. He deals with these problems in some little factories. I did not see any of it. Those close to him may go and ask for some pocket money and whatnot. I do not have the possibility to go and see Şükrü Boydak. If you are neighbors with him or an acquaintance of one of his neighbors, then you can go speak to him by that. (Halim, see Appendix, 14)

Another worker, Yamin, who was fired because he argued with the foreman, states that even if he had tried, he would have had no opportunity to talk with the boss or the manager in this distressful process.

> I have not witnessed anything like that in three years. There was this friend who lost his house to fire, only to him he helped with, like, 15 thousand liras. But, for example, a friend of ours could not have kids, and constantly asked for help to be treated. They did not help him even a penny. As a matter of fact, he was sacked. I cannot say that he would not pay us, he would pocket our share, and he would not pay accordingly to the hour. God knows. But he was not caring, either. The worker had no value there. I wanted to see him, but I could not, I do not know how whoever sees him. I could not talk to him even when I was getting sacked. Where is the justice here? (Yamin, see Appendix, 15)

The workers I interviewed say that they know that Sükrü Boydak had almost never seen them, but that he helped workers who had trouble. Other workers state that they could not reach him when they had a problem in the factory, and that he did not help anyone when workers reached him. In this case, workers do not believe that they will be able to contact Şükrü Boydak but think that some privileged workers are able to have a close relationship. A worker who has been working at the factory for eleven years explains how the "father" discriminates among his children and, as a result, damaged both his authority and the trust of the children. By pointing out the employer's tolerance to workers who has a level of kinship or a neighborly relationship with him from Hacılar, Bahadır states, "I asked them to pay my

compensation so that I would pay the debt of the house. I went to İlyas Boydak. He said, “By the name of Allah, Bahadır, there is nothing we can do” (Bahadır, see Appendix, 16)

It can be said that since the workers' perception of the employer does not include material support for the workers, they think that their employer does not have the quality of fatherhood. On the other hand, the impression of “father” mythologized by speculations, narratives and stories is sustained as an “expectation” by the older workers. The employer’s failure to live up to this expectation causes the worker to question the legitimacy of both the ground on which the boss has constructed himself, and the creation of consent. This “fragility of consent” is defined by Durak (2011, p. 68) as the fragile nature of compliance rooted in cultural patterns, and of the reciprocity necessary to sustain an authority without a crystallized or completed structure of supervision, in need of constant update and characterized in the context of hegemony. Similar findings of Soylu (2010) suggest that nepotism and favoritism at work are fostered by a style of leadership that emphasizes loyalty over job performance. Although nepotism is positively associated with bullying dimensions, its sustainability in the labor process in the factories of Boydak Holding is important in terms of making the shadow of a “father”.

When asked what kind of an employer they would like, Olgun’s words are illustrative in this respect:

> I want an employer who does workers justice. When he enters a factory, he must tell me “friends, may it be easy!” Now you may think why Olgun does not like Hacı Boydak. He (Hacı Boydak) came to work four or five months ago. He walks so fast that it looks like a huge horse is coming. And he made sure that he did not say hello to any worker and flounced. From the outside, he has a big name. I have been in Kayseri for 13-14 years. I have seen the Hacı Boydak twice, or three times. If you are my employer, you should always come to factory and talk with us. (Olgun, see Appendix, 17)

Based on the words of the workers, we can say that the workers' expectations from their employer revolve around the ideas of justice and fairness towards themselves. At the same time, they expect to be taken seriously by their employer and to be able to establish social relationships with them on an equal basis. At this point, what workers imply by "a just employer" is an employer whose acts encapsulate both economic and social equality. On the other hand, most of the workers are aware that constructing a face to face relationship with an employer in such a large-scale factory is difficult:

> Whatever you say, you do not have such a chance. I would say this is better, and another would say, no, this is not good, that is better, etc. This is not an enterprise of 50 workers. This is a large corporation; you cannot expect the employer to come and be interested in everyone else's troubles. (Oğuz, see Appendix, 18)

They have more expectations from the factory management, with whom they more frequently interact. The physical impossibility of face-to-face relations, which are the main dynamic of paternalist control, between employer and worker results in workers shifting the paternal relationship with the employer to the factory management. I will discuss the tensions and contradictions this creates in Chapter 5.

When workers who placed importance on the kind of a person their employer is were asked if Muslim-hood and religiousness of the boss were a priority, they said that these are not determining factors for them. On the other hand, when asked if there is a work ethic based on Islam, the workers explained the concept of "justice", based on an Islamic rhetoric. This was also referred to while talking about what kind of an employer they would like.

> Yes, my God says the share of the worker must be given to him before he rests up from the work. It is written in the Koran. But what happens is that I finished my work, I have suffered. So, what can I do with the money if I do not receive it in my off day? According to our religion everything is sin, everything is illicit, but we go through everything. Where is the sin? Where is the wrong? Boydaks can build as many mosques as they want. They can build

> as many schools as they want, it does not mean anything so long as they do not give anything to the workers (Olgun, see Appendix, 19)

> Everybody has a place. I am not a boss. But it is a fact that everything belongs to Allah, who is the bearer of justice. If a boss steals from a worker, alas to him! But the duty of the worker is also important here. He should not betray his boss, either. (Cavit, see Appendix, 20)

Workers prefer to explain the necessity of a just employer with Islamic rhetoric, while claiming that it is not important if the employer is Muslim or not. These expressions seem paradoxical at the first glance but become clear after further questionings. Workers do not trust that a Muslim boss would apply the principles important for the workers in the labor process because they experienced that the meaning they attribute to Muslimness in workplace relations does not have significance in praxis. Nonetheless, they feel a need to refer to Islamic rhetoric to ground their demands of justice and equality on a legitimate basis.

When asked about the "ill-gotten gains", which are forbidden by the Islamic rhetoric, workers cite certain hadiths while saying that they exceedingly deserve the money they gain.

> We work eight hours a day, and more than deserve the money we are paid for that time. In the period we were fasting, it was very hot outside for example, 30 40 degrees, we were working inside in 50 degrees. We deserve it exceedingly; we do not have a problem there. Let me put it like this, we would not go home before our foreheads were prickled with sweat. (Sedat, see Appendix, 21)

When asked if they expect their employer to comply with religious rules in relation to the life at work, those workers whose idea of "ill-gotten gain" is based on whether their own wages are deserved or not say that they are only interested in if their labor is met by the wages they are paid. They emphasize that it is not important if the boss participates in religious rituals or in charity, but that the employer should fairly reciprocate their labor. This may suggest that they are mainly sensitive to a workplace organized around Islamic rules when it influences them.

> A shop retrospectively has a 20 percent profit. We know this. But the rent of the shop, the wage of the worker, we do not know about these. It had been calculated at the time; we do not know it now. We cannot go that deep, we have theology professors, and they calculate that. To comply with these is not important for me, we are workers, we would not think about the margin of profit. We are only interested in getting the value of our labor. We are not in the trade business, why should we follow the profit margin? (Sedat, see Appendix, 22)

> Islamic ethics is a thing of the past now. Who would pay your wage before your sweat dries? Should they pay daily wages? According to Islam, they should pay when we are still in sweat. Is that something possible? You should leave Islam behind; they are going to pay your monthly wage on time, in lieu with the conditions of today. It would not work for me if they paid daily. I would get that money and spend it immediately. Then, what am I going to do at the end of the month? It is not good. I accept our religion, okay but... then you must immediately pay. Accumulation is impossible. I do not believe I can accumulate it if I am paid daily. I think, the most logical one is monthly wage. You can borrow money however you like. (Cafer, see Appendix, 23)

Although they describe themselves as religious-conservative, say that religion has an important place in their daily lives, and act according to Islamic rhetoric, they admit that the laws on working life in Quran or hadiths are difficult to adapt to the present. They say that every Muslim cannot fulfill all the rules, and that even though the employer defines himself as Muslim, he can still be unfair.

On the other hand, Islamic practices such as having a prayer room in each factory, granting breaks for prayer time, giving additional bonuses in the feast of sacrifice and sending workers to the Umrah make the workers feel closer to the factory. Workers say that these practices are the responsibility of the Holding towards its workers because of the religious rules, and that they duly realize it. These concessions, which are an important dynamic of the foundational myth of Boydak Holding, are each perceived as a ‘necessity’ and ‘responsibility’ that the company must undertake. For this reason, taking small steps back from this concession can cause workers to question the religiosity of their employer. One conversation with a worker who has been working at Boyteks for fifteen years perfectly illustrates this

picture. When asked if the Muslim employer has responsibilities towards workers, Taner states:

> People have responsibilities towards each other. I am always obliged to consider your wellbeing. That is what our religion orders us to do; a Muslim should help a Muslim. In hardship, poverty, sickness... Whether in death or in life... This is the law of being human. But it does not work like that in the factory. (Taner, see Appendix, 24)

When asked if the factory provides ease in terms of praying, he emphasizes that in the past, they would shut down the whole factory on Fridays. He continues: "Now there are groups. There are twelve machines in every room. They say, one of the groups will go on working there. One fourth of the factory keeps on working." (Taner, see Appendix, 25) Taner thinks that such a change is happened because overall mentality of the factory changed.

The words of two other workers who have been working at Boytaş for more than fifteen years support the argument above:

> I think it is wrong mixing up the religion and the work. Most of the foremen would not let me go pray. They would say, do not pray. Would not they interfere! When the Boydaks were here, when I first started working here, they would not interfere at first. Then a certain period passed; the foremen said we should pray during the breaks. Some foremen say, go pray and then come. They find a worker to replace you, for instance. We do not know who does that. Is it the managers or chiefs or foremen? I do not know. (Cafer, see Appendix, 26)

> In the night of al-Qadr, for example, we were on the night shift, they said they were going to have someone read Quran, then we are going to start working without a meal break. It was fifty minutes, we had 20 minutes. They cut off half an hour of that, too. They cut off the Quran they made us listen from meal break, I mean. (Deniz, see Appendix, 27)

Workers state that Islamic rhetoric brings certain responsibilities in the working life, and that the employers are not real Muslims because they do not realize such responsibilities. On the contrary, there are also those who state that the proximity and distance of the employer to concepts such as right, equality and justice are not related to religiosity. While the workers explain their expectations from their employers and

managers, they use the working conditions of relatives in Europe as points of comparison. Workers refer to the fact that non-Muslim employers in Europe can relate closely to the worker, questioning their own patrons' dedication to Islam as well as implying that religion is not decisive in working relations.

> I want the worker-employer relation to be like in Europe. They have good practices. I mean, we cannot even sit side by side with the chief. But I would like to see the employer with us. Muslims should not have like arrogance. There is no arrogance in the people we call gavur[34] but there is arrogance in the Muslims, and they should not be arrogant according to rules of Islam (Sedat, see Appendix, 28)

> It does not matter for me. I had friends who is been to Umrah. I do not care if they are Muslim or not. People care about the money they get. Those who went abroad to work, they are working for Christians or Jews. There is not even a single Muslim there. It does not matter to me if they are Turkish or not. (Cafer, see Appendix, 29)

Similarly, one narrative I present in the testimony of workers from both Boyteks and Boytaş illuminates how the idea of "resignation" suggested by Islam and produced within the workplace relations attached to Boydak Holding is broken. One dialogue between Güler Sabancı and Hacı Boydak, known as a secular capital group, has been referenced in different ways from almost every worker's mouth.

> I heard about an incident. Between these guys and Sabancı. Of course, this is just hearsay. They told Sabancı, Ms. Sabancı that there is a factory in Kayseri that grows dramatically. He asked, on what? They said, on wood, furniture. He said, there is not so much money in wood, furniture business. Get me the payroll of a worker, let us check it out. She looks at the payroll, she says brother, these guys are not making a fortune out of wood, they are making a fortune out of the workers' labor. Tell the truth, the most important reason how Boydaks grew so big is that they are making workers work cheaply. They are not paying them what they deserve. (Deniz, See Appendix, 30)

Another worker, known as Hoca in the factory, tells the same story while implying that it is an eternal trait of the employers not to pay the worker what they deserve, regardless of their religiousness:

[34] A demeaning term for non-Muslim

> When the workers open their mouths these days, they are telling this story: Sabancı would say, when my worker is working, he is also going to have a car, also a house. We are hearing this. I did not hear it in flesh, but it would not come out as such if she did not say it. The salary of a parliament member is 18 thousand liras. Then, why is the wage of a worker 1400 lira? The underdog, the poor, what are they doing, they are not even able to feed themselves. What we expect from the boss is that they should eat/spend less. They have brand new BMWs and Mercedes's, they come to work by these all the time. Their fuel money is 1400-1500, it is more than the minimum wage. Is this conscience? Is this mercy? But who is making you progress? It is the worker who makes you progress. There is not this in Turkey unfortunately, there is not a unity among the workers. (Cavit, see Appendix, 31)

It can be said that, while the workers are using the Islamic rhetoric rather abundantly as they express their demands, they claim that the religiosity is not a priority as they explain their expectations from the employers. This means that, they are excluding their employer from their own sphere of legitimacy. Both the implication that the employer is not a "real" Muslim and their reluctance to define their principles as relying upon the Muslimness of the employer suggests that they feel that the religion the workers experience is different than the religion in which the employer engages. For example, Ali states, "Would a Muslim harm you? He would not. Can you be friends with an infidel? But these guys are not Muslims." (Ali, see Appendix, 32) On the other hand, Muslim workers expect more than being paid what they deserve; they generally expect the boss to provide time for praying or an allowance for the sacrificial ritual. The meaning of 'justice', and 'equality' with reference to Qur'an, from the perspectives of workers, is not only related to the material conditions but also to the social relations in the factory. In particular, the workers expect the employer to visit the factory more often to establish a closer and more equal relationship with his workers. In short, such an expectation produces a bidirectional and transitional understanding about the importance of a Muslim employer: (1) to question and criticize the Muslimness of the employer, or (2) to think that the religiosity of the employer is not significant in the workplace relations. In both cases

Islam ceases to be a dynamic that produces consensual control, since there is no sentimental unity between the worker and the employer. It can be said that what the workers understand from "Muslim boss" is that the boss uses his authority to exert the principles of equality and justice in the workplace. One reason the concept of justice is frequently referenced by workers is that it is a concept that can meet multiple demands and has power to legitimize demands.

However, the sense of belonging that the factory is constructed upon, and the related production of consent are limited when the factory removes certain compromises (the shortened prayer breaks), or when the principles of justice and equality are not realized in terms of social relations. Especially, the partial desertion of the traditionally close, paternalistic relation with the worker, and its replacement by a relationship more convenient for the contradiction between labor and capital, destroy the discourse of "we are a family" and create a sense of "us and them." Here, we can claim that the conflict produced by the impossibility of a worker-employer or worker-management relationship, in lieu with Islamic rules as the workers know them themselves enforces the separation of "us" and "them". On the other hand, it is not yet possible to refer to a sense of "us" generated among the workers themselves. The sense of "us" in a labor process in which the perception of the already-settled paternal employer is only recently challenged is in the process of becoming and includes several conflicts. Yet, it is possible to say that the paternalistic relations based on close and face to face contact and religious conservatism have been challenged in the eyes of the workers.

Even if it is just an "expectation," it is important to remember the fragile ground of consensual control when discussing the recognition of the paternalistic relations by the worker. The persistence of the workers' expectations even though the

paternal control lost its material conditions in the labor process of the factory shows how consensual control is sustained in different forms. The workers remark how it makes them feel better when the boss smiles at them or even tells them: “kolay gelsin”.[35] Nevertheless, face-to-face and close relations are decreasing and a holding whose expanding management is being institutionalized emphasizes two main elements while organizing the labor process: quality and efficiency.

4.2.2 New production methods

A labor process with objective and subjective features can be understood in terms of the activities within and among the following arenas: (1) management; (2) social and technical relations in the workplace; (3) human resources practices; and (4) industrial relations (Wardell et all., 1999). These arenas are integrated, and are “mutually supportive domains or equal contributors in controlling labor processes” (p.11). Technology and tasks may be designed by management as a part of control strategies. In other words, organization of work may be shaped by management “in such a way as to require interaction and coordination between workers, thus enhancing flexibility when problems arise, or they may minimize such interactions in order to isolate the worker and improve management's control of task coordination” (Gough, 2013, p. 32). Therefore, new production technology does not have to be directly related to intensification or productivity. Instead, “the process of its introduction may give management the occasion to increase control.” (p. 53)

In *Industry and Labor* (1977) Edwards suggested that two types of managerial strategies, responsible autonomy and direct control, could be used to

[35] “Kolay gelsin” (let it easy for you) is one of the most frequently used phrases in Turkish. It is usually used when one sees somebody working on something especially on difficult jobs or tasks.

guide the analysis of management behavior in the labor process. However, even if the responsible autonomy type aims to treat workers as though they were not alienated from their labor capacity, the way managers behave toward workers is linked to push specific tasks that individual workers are to do. Therefore, as Edwards (1979) suggests, “there is therefore a wide range of possible positions between extreme forms of responsible autonomy and direct control.” In other words, if there is no ideological structure that would bind the two together, responsible autonomy and direct control replacing and becoming superior to each other causes severe disruptions, or conflicts. The strategies chosen by managers and the reactions of the workers to these strategies may cause the strategy to obtain new meanings and to pave the way to different consequences. For example, even if managerial initiatives such as a suggestion and complaint system, or TPM “offer a more interdependent workplace, with flatter structures and reduced hierarchy”, the ways in which workers understand these experiences can be different (Wardell, 1999, p. 207).As seen in the labor process in factories connected to Boydak Holding, even attempts to constitute a form of efficiency based on consent with new production methods (suggestion system, 6S and TPM), those applications that are based on oppression in the eye of the worker may cause conflicts.

Large scale international corporations have changed their managerial strategies to match the increase in global competitive pressures by creating ‘lean production’ culture in workplaces (Carter, 2011). Although lean production such as teamwork and TQM are common in factories such as Ford, Toyota or Renault (Nichols & Suğur, 2004), middle or large-scale Islamic corporations in Central Anatolia have started to apply these new methods as a response to a competitive global economy. However, changes in the organization of work enables hybrid forms

of labor control in large scale factories in Kayseri, which affects the ideological structure of the workplace in relation to exercising new production techniques (Gündoğdu, 2015). Boydak Holding primarily builds and changes their strategies (melding traditional family culture with professional business culture) according to workers' efficiency and their potential reactions.

Most of Boydak Holding's workers who are in the Boyteks section have been there for at most five years. In the previous chapter, I touched upon how the discourse of "unity of family" on which the holding establishes itself is maintained in different forms. Whereas the labor process is organized around the ideas of efficiency and quality, the introduction of new systems of production creates conflicts between management and workers and attempts to reproduce "consensual control" in different forms. There is an attempt to revitalize the sense of belonging that recently lost its power over the workers through the Kaizen system, suggestion and complaint systems, 5S/6S and TPMs. The hope is to provide the main dynamic that would refresh the sense of belonging, making both the old workers, who are missing the father boss figure and expecting the same from their managers, and the new workers, who have no other choice, but to love the work and the factory.

4.2.2.1 Suggestion system

As Yücesan (2000) argues, "while the workers are taking on a variety of duties on the production line, outside the line, too, they have to, on the one hand, do the basic maintenance and reparation of the machines, and, on the other hand, participate in quality circle meetings and company meetings" (p. 242). Although Yücesan's findings from Toyotosa show that management establishes two different forms of domination over the labor process (oppression through technical and bureaucratic

supervision mechanisms, and oppression through ideological control mechanisms), applying this process as purely as it is defined does not account for the complexities that exist in the workplace. New production methods may force workers to adapt new labor processes, which produce hybrid forms of labor control.

The labor processes, especially those which are based in machine-intensive sections, have started to focus more on quality and efficiency. Therefore, strategies aiming for machines that work with less trouble and limit workers' inefficient time have been developed. The most prevalent suggestion system in the Boyteks factory, where each worker is responsible of twelve machines and four workers work per machine, is the Kaizen strategy. Kaizen has only recently been applied in the machine-intensive factories of Boydak Holding and is not a settled system yet. The holding is inviting engineers from Toyota to explain and appropriate the Kaizen system. Nonetheless, since the system is not settled, the participation of the workers is neither active nor continuous. On the contrary, Kaizen is sustained by more experienced machine operators and foremen.

Thanks to the suggestion system, the workers may make suggestions to prevent a malfunction to recur, to save energy and to enhance efficiency. Every worker can make suggestions with their registry numbers on a system called eBA.[36] The system is accessible only by foremen, chiefs, managers and employer. They all can see and examine the suggestion now it is made.

In Boytaş factories 1 through 6, the workers had to make at least one suggestion per month. It has been three years since this obligation was removed; the workers are now making voluntary suggestions. In the textile section of Boyteks it

[36] It is a technological system that supports organizations that have moved all their business processes to electronic environment to manage the business in electronic environment.

making suggestions has never been compulsory, though the workers are encouraged to make suggestions to the management through offers of premiums and awards. There are workers who see the suggestion system as an opportunity to increase their payments, and there are workers who consider it to be a burden and a mechanism of oppression. The workers are talking about the suggestion system as follows:

> When I was at Mondi, there was no Kaizen or anything. When I came here to Boytaş, they came up with this thing called Kaizen. Make one suggestion and you get points in return. One suggestion, two suggestions, you cannot get suggestions out of a worker all the time. The worker is already having difficulty to survive, he feels cold in the shuttle, must pay rent, etc., and on top of all these, you expect him to make suggestions? We would make the same suggestions over and over. Good suggestions were put into practice by Kaizen (Cemil, see Appendix, 32)

According to the statements of workers, the suggestion system, instead of reconciling the worker with the work, reproduces the" making-out", which is part of the worker's daily work ritual. While workers pretend to be working in the game of "making-out", they do so to escape the necessities of the suggestion system.

> We would make suggestions; it was an obligation. But you were not able to follow up the suggestion you made yourself. That suggestion falls before the foreman. He transfers it to another, then to another. Let us say, I am making a reasonable suggestion; the foreman steals because it is good. Then you know the suggestions you make will not yield any results and start to write foolish things. Because it is an obligation... Like "The buttons of these lights are here, we would suggest them to be there". When you make a reasonable suggestion, it goes to another one. You accumulate points in accordance with the suggestions you make. For example, with your points only you can get is thermos. The man there writes half a glass to all my points, he does not even ask me what I want. I took all their presents and put them into trash, saying "damn your presents." (Bahadır, see Appendix, 33)

If there are suggestions that help to improve production within the factory, a message of congratulations appears on the panel inside the factory along with a remark on the premium the worker who suggested will be awarded. The workers say that they do not prefer to enter the system, both because they are too busy working and because the computer that they can use to access the eBA system is situated in the factory's

canteen. Yet, they also state that the size of the premiums is considerable. Moreover, because most of the workers are not qualified, it is difficult and stressful for them to produce ideas related to the organization of the labor process. Although the factory tries to encourage the workers with premiums, the most prevalent and regular users of the suggestion system are a select group of foremen. The worker who has been working there for a long time complain about the system as exemplified below:

> There is this reward thing. They think about it with the foremen, like, it is better if we do it this way and so on. Whether it is suitable or not, they gain something from this. They developed a system for the weaving machines by the foremen. They made the 900 filling by fastening three times 300 ropes with the system. But this creates difficulty for the worker and profit for the employer. The worker gets 100% exhausted. On one hand, fastening 32 coils, on the other, 42x3 coils. There is nothing done for the sake of the worker. (Taner, see Appendix, 34)

Though the factory claims that the suggestion system eases the work of the worker, even professing that the workers do not make suggestions to have premiums but to be able to do the work with less effort and exhaustion, the system is not currently used by any workers except the foremen. The heavy nature of the working conditions in the factory and the high rate of worker circulation prevent the possibility of working with more qualified staff and of long-term education for the workers. The worker participates in the system only as an implementer when a suggestion is accepted.

While the Kaizen systems aims for a worker body that can claim ownership of the labor process and becoming active agents within it, it also tries to learn the occupational secrets of the worker to increase efficiency. The process itself attempts to make the worker love the work, to feel like a significant element of the factory regime and establish a sense of belonging by offering opportunities to work alongside management. However, the inability of Boydak Holding to stabilize the

system in most aspects and to engage the workers widens the gap between the workers and the management.

4.2.2.2 Six sigma and total productive maintenance

A component of the Kaizen called “Six sigma” has rules that aim to facilitate the constant cleansing and organization of machines and the working environment by the workers themselves. This implementation, which attempts to reconcile the workers to their duties and to create a connection between worker and machine, puts intense pressure on workers.

> There is this new thing called 6s management. It is like martial law. That napkin is going to stay here, if it does not, who is at this table, Ömer, Yasin, Mehmet... because that napkin is not neat, we have a low score of 6s. The machine has certain pieces, if these pieces are not where they are supposed to be, we get a low score of 6s. There should not be any foreign object on the machine. This is a new system in our section. If the machine, we are working on is not neat and orderly then the personnel who work on that machine get a low score. If there is going to be any premium thing, our machine will be eliminated because we have a low score. (Olgun, see Appendix, 35)

Beşpınar, Kalaycıoğlu, and Topal (2014), argues that a ‘clean’ workplace plays a major role in producing consensual control. However, in the case of Boydak Holding, workers are not happy to receive responsibilities that are not related to the production process.

> They put the schemes on the walls, made a panel. There are points like, wipe, sweep, clean. They want both order and intervention time; they want us to work without making any mistakes. They want everything in a hundred percent capacity. Whatever you give them, they want more of it. They are never satisfied. (Taner, see Appendix, 36)

Another new method is Total Productive Management, or TPM. There are thirty-four written rules of this system, concerning losses of labor power, energy and equipment. The system encourages workers to work together on a machine, checking if the

machine is working in accordance with these thirty-four rules as soon as their shifts start. A foreman responsible for the TPM explains the system as quoted below:

> For example, this friend is a weaver. We gave four machines to the weaver. He should check if there is an impediment and whatnot in the beginning of his shift; if there is any, he should write it in the report; if there is not, he is going to put an okay sign, and start working on the machine. The aim is both to increase productivity and make the worker work in peace with his job. (Mahmut, see Appendix, 37)

When the system is first implemented, and there is an impediment, the engineers or the substitute weavers take care of the machine. However, if there are not enough foreman, substitute weaver or engineer to cover all the machines in one shift, the system progresses very slowly. Therefore, it can be said that this system does not have any reciprocity in the eye of the worker, and when the worker sees that the impediment, he reported at the beginning of his shift is not immediately fixed, this system turns into an additional burden.

Although the Kaizen methods aim to make the worker a significant element of the job and to close the gap between the management and the worker, the statements of the workers suggest that these systems only increase the distance between the worker, their work and the management. Since the Kaizen applications are perceived as existing outside the labor process, they are an additional burden, and even forced labor in the eyes of the worker. As a result, rather than reintroducing the cooperation between the employer and the worker that is about to lose prevalence, it widens the gaps between worker and work, worker and employer, and worker and foreman.

On the other hand, there are workers who are not complaining about the system, stating that it is not yet a part of their work since it is not settled within the factory. In short, despite aiming to reconcile the worker with the work and to revitalize the cooperation between the worker and the factory, these new production

techniques only widen the gap between the worker and the management. However, when the fluid, fragile and dynamic nature of consensual control is taken into consideration, we can say that there may appear new meanings for new production methods in the eye of the worker, especially if the system is stabilized inside the factory.

4.3 Direct disciplinary labor control

Consensual control is sustained in Boydak Holding through interwoven labor processes with the disciplinary control in the encounters between the worker and management and the worker and foreman. Direct supervision of the labor process is realized through Closed-Circuit Television (CCTV) placed inside the factory, surprise inspection visits, observations by the eBA system, surveys, and especially through the foreman's unmediated control of the workers throughout the shift.

For Boyteks, the nature of its labor process defined by uncomplicated aspects of production, the use of unqualified labor and one-sided dominance of machinery production determines workplace-level relations on behalf of disciplinary practices. It includes stages such as the quality control of the fabric or entering the repair code of an impeded machine and consists mostly of non-qualified workers. The uninterrupted reproduction of the labor process and working of the machines are the main elements of efficiency from an operationalized point of view. Therefore, the foreman is watching the workers to prevent them from taking unscheduled breaks or engaging in activities not connected to the work.

> We have someone responsible for each machine. A machine has eight workers, three shifts, three responsible people. Four people is taking care of one machine, two people taking care of two other machines. We change places in lunch or tea time if we have a problem, like, a mistake in the fabric. First, we identify why that mistake is, and then we tell that to the responsible person. That responsible one is also a worker, among us. He is at least been

> working there for four or five years. When there is a mistake, we write it on the paper, and then we refer it to the responsible worker; if it is something big, managers or engineers are checking it out. It goes to the dye house, gets re-dyed, etc. (Olgun, see Appendix, 38)

When a worker is caught sleeping, does not report a mistake to the responsible people, or worked the machine out of order, or is doing something with his phone, an official report is written. Therefore, most of the workers say that they are operating under an intense psychological pressure not to be scolded by the foremen or not to have an official report on file.

> If the product is bigger than it is supposed to be, 400 meters or something, and if you played a part in that mistake, they are either cutting it off your wage or find another way to reflect it on you. The workers are more careful because they fear mistakes. (Veli, see Appendix, 39)

There are situations where a scarf comes out disjointed or a warp thread becomes disconnected when the machine is stopped for a certain period. The weavers are obliged to intervene and repair the problem within these times. If the workers are not able to do it in the stoppage time, they call for the foreman and the foreman tries to solve it.

When the workers want a tea, smoke or lavatory break, they must enter a code to the machine with their registry numbers. In this way, their times of departure and arrival are shown on the system. Hence, all levels of management can see the length and the location of the worker's break. The workers are considerably annoyed that all their actions are under such surveillance, because they are always followed, and because official reports are compiled all the time:

> For instance, the machine breaks a peace, its mechanics get broken, etc., then you enter these setup codes. But you must enter them when you go for a smoking break, too. Once while you are going and one when you come. They see that you have been to smoking break for ten minutes. If you do not enter the code, the foreman scolds you. You end up having a disciplinary record along with a fine. (Ali, see Appendix, 40)

> When IKEA came to inspect, it was, swear to God, like martial law. Ground will be clean. There will be no trash on the machines, etc. Trivial things. Too much pressure. (Veli, see Appendix, 41)

> For example, we are taking care of twelve different things. For example, how long does it take for you to deal with the break in a scarf thread. Even the pace with you walk is shown on the system. You must run. (Oğuz, see Appendix, 42)

When the workers have trouble with this process, they address the situation to the foreman. Therefore, they rather blame the foreman because of the pressure and control over them. They think that the foreman, as one of their own, should be more tolerant and should be on the side of the workers. Management, on the other hand, says that the foreman stands in a different place than the workers and should act accordingly. The fact that the foreman is distinguished from the others as a qualified worker shows that he has a primary role in terms of organizational efficiency. The manager responsible for quality and system development in Boyteks illustrates the role of the foreman in the organization and supervision of the labor process as follows:

> If we want to follow them ourselves, we can attach them RFID cards; there are these devices that look like a button, we can attach them, and they would not even know they have these. But we want the effort we put in to be worthy of the process itself. We want the foreman who has five or six workers below him to be able to follow them. (Nazan, see Appendix, 43)

The management wants the foreman to be a main element providing a direct form of disciplinary control to the labor process. Although foremen no longer have autonomous positions in the workplaces, it is understood that journeymen are still given distinct roles in the management of labor at so-called modern factories (Gündoğdu, 2012, p. 156). On the other hand, a manager who considers the foreman to be part of the management resorts to segregation between the foremen. This situation is explained by a foreman responsible for the TPM who has been working at the Boyteks factory for fifteen years:

> When we started here for the first time fifteen years ago, they told us to salute anyone superior to us. There is hierarchy here, like in the military. For example, when the factory was just established, we would go to meetings in order to be educated. They would scold us saying, do not get in to too many conversations with the workers below you. When we had a meeting the other day, they said the same thing. They say, we are being too familiar with the weavers. (Mahmut, see Appendix, 44)

Since the management does not want to supervise the labor process via direct and face-to-face relationships with workers, they attribute this role to the foreman. However, for the foreman to be a qualified supervisor, he must limit his dialogue with the workers. In this sense, the foremen prefer to stand closer to the management and distance themselves from the workers. This situation leads to the development of two kinds of relationships between the foremen and the workers. The first is a form of management-worker relationship, in which the workers experience material rewards for being close with the foreman. An example of this is the worker whose uncle works as a foreman. He states that the factory does not create any problems concerning his leave compared to the that of other workers:

> Whenever there is something about work, I speak to the foreman. The chief is also one of us. I think they can listen to us when we have a problem. I have not had any problems yet, but God knows, they care. When I want to have a leave, they do not say, no you cannot or anything. (Yaşar, see Appendix, 45)

On the other hand, there is a large group of workers excluded from the experience of benefitting from the advantages the factory provides, those uncomfortable with foremen speaking on behalf of the management and the privileged stance of workers close to the foremen. Interviews with a foreman and a worker sufficiently reflect the situation. A worker suggests that if he wants to tire the foreman (Mahmut), he can immediately enter the setup code to the machines. The codes are used by workers in case of machines break down. When machines make a mistake, the foremen must take care of the concerned machines. He states, “Close twelve stalls, and enter the code. I don’t care whatever Mahmut’s doing.” (Ali, see Appendix, 46)

On the other hand, the foremen states, “it’s not possible for seventy machines to make a mistake at the same time. If the manager is there at the factory at that time, he sees that, too. He immediately opens the system when he comes in the morning. He sees what machine didn’t work, and why, and for how long.” (Mahmut, see Appendix, 47). The worker implies that if they unite with other weavers, the level of oppression leveraged on the workers by the foremen will decrease. However, the foreman is responsible for both the organization of labor and the supervision of breaks and the workers’ performances. Therefore, rather than establishing friendly or at least protective relationships with them, the workers tend to distinguish themselves from the foreman. In situations like this, it is observed that the workers distance themselves from the workers who are close to foremen or to the management.

> Here the worker wants to bootlick the foreman or the chief. They end up at higher levels. There is nepotism, I mean. In fact, a chief has been to see a friend of ours and asked him to tell what is going on inside. He asked, who is working, who is procrastinating. We call those Mit. (Ercan, see Appendix, 48)

> There are people who carry our words to others, we immediately distance ourselves from those. If we are talking here, the three of us, he goes and tells a fourth person. We are working at the same place; it is impossible to excommunicate. We can only put distance. The good people eventually win. (Sedat, see Appendix, 49)

While the consensual control sustaining itself as an expectation is rendered useless as it is, the management that makes its presence felt over the labor process as a shadow through the foreman is trying to patch the gap between the worker and the factory by the help of a tyrannical system of direct control. Hence, direct disciplinary control via foreman and technological control go hand in hand in the labor processes in Boyteks.

The labor process in Boytaş is organized differently than the one in Boyteks. In Boytaş, where the process is more labor-intensive, surveyors inspect the working

tempo and efficiency of the workers. The workers narrate the survey system as follows:

> In the survey system, the surveyor comes and measures your time. He surveys how you do your work on the machine. Let us say that the machine has a capacity of a hundred pieces per hour. He surveys if you can do that. He measures the time you spend on each piece. Then it becomes standardized. If you cannot keep up with the standard, you work at a low capacity. The team of surveyors are white-collar workers. The workers do not like them, of course, everybody wants to work in peace. No one wants pressure. But this system prevents procrastination. It is been applied for eight years. (Shipment officer, see Appendix, 50)

> The survey system is present everywhere. They progress because they work with this system. There is no concern about work finishing, you leaving, etc., you are obliged to do it. There are different surveys for each piece, they come out when I finish putting the last pieces together. Or he stands at the end of the production line, not getting his hands dirty. They record it with cameras, how many furniture are produced, etc. How long does it take for ten couches to be produced? they calculate that. If one couch is produced in one minute, they want ten in ten minutes, 460 couches in 460 minutes, etc. We do not believe in survey anyway. They say, we discount it when you go to lavatory, but it is not like that. Whatever the situation is, they make you work. There is no such thing as lowering the tempo or anything. (Cafer, see Appendix, 51)

The workers state that they must work all the time because of the survey system that calculates everything, even the breaks they take for their natural needs. On the other hand, there are workers who are annoyed with their friends who work in complete compliance to the system. The way the workers narrate the survey system also exemplifies the different attitudes towards the necessity of work that they have developed under the despotic control of labor process:

> If the surveyors are Muslim, then they are making a mistake. I do not know how they will give its due. They are not being fair. I witnessed it myself. If we are going to sew a pillow, it is ten seconds. The loss of time, exhaustion and whatnot should also be taken into consideration. I am pulling the needle through, he cuts it. Then what happens? If I am going to produce a hundred, normally, they expect me to produce two hundred. Then you must run. Allah is going to ask about this. But it suits the worker, too. When he is surveyed, he works as best as he can to bootlick. Okay, you are healthy, you can perform like that, okay, but think about your friends, bro! (Cavit, see Appendix, 52)

> There is “getting off cheap” system. We have scores for everything; if you are not absent, you get points. Every six months, you get rewards due to your points. Every piece and every machine have their surveys. They survey it when the piece goes in and when it comes out. The workers are recorded. If you work slowly, your survey result is slow, if you work fast, it is fast. There are some workers who work like a machine when they see a surveyor; and some of them work slowly. (Halim, see Appendix, 53)

The Boytaş workers, who work on a labor process dependent on a partial assembly line, work on a different set of machine line, resulting in labor processes that are different yet connected. The board that starts its advancement on the line is produced in a machine-intensive labor process. The connection of the amount of production per shift to the pace of the workers makes the supervision of the labor process by the classical Fordist methods more possible. The Fordist factory has traditionally used technical apparatuses, such as machines and assembly lines, and bureaucratic apparatuses, such as task control and hierarchical command, to subordinate the time and motions of workers to management control (Edwards, 1979).

4.4 Concluding remarks

The objective of this section was to shed light on Boydak workers’ experiences working under different forms of labor control. Both the consensual relations in the factory do not have constant or fixed dimensions. However, both the consensual control and absence of consensual control arises from the dynamic structure of workplace. What make this process dynamic is that workers are not passive agents of the labor process but are active. Hence, they can produce different kinds of counter-hegemonic discourses through their experiences. Secondly, with the changes in labor processes due to intensive work and direct control by disciplinary mechanisms, the encounter between management and workers produces different experiences, wherein the foundational myth of factory becomes unsustainable in the labor process.

In other words, past discourses which the factory built itself upon have difficulty establishing a hegemonic relationship because their ideological discourses no longer have a material basis. As a result, the consensual control which the factory tries to sustain is partial and incomplete.

On the other hand, consensual control is partially supported by Turkey's labor market dynamics, such as structural unemployment and the absence of welfare facilities outside the firm. Managers in large international corporations were pushed to change their strategies in response to changing market conditions and changing forms and strength of worker resistance in ways which could be predicted, with appropriate qualifications. Thus, new production methods mainly supported with the new technologies can be used both for control of labor process and the demand for quality and productivity. Yet, hidden forms of resistance occur through the experiences of workers, involving manipulation of bureaucratic, disciplinary, or technological control. Changes in forms of labor control mechanisms and changes in the experiences of workers can create counter-hegemonic discourse, resistance subcultures and primitive forms of collective action. As a result, these hidden forms of resistance create the building blocks of working-class struggle which we will examine in the next chapter.

CHAPTER 5

ENCOUNTER

5.1 Introduction

As mentioned in Chapter 3 and Chapter 4, labor control strategies generally involve a series of different methods: (1) sustaining paternalistic forms of consensual control, (2) new production methods, and (3) direct disciplinary control strategies. However, because workers are active agents in the labor process, in every encounter (conflict, concessions and control) they have with the management, foreman or other workers, they reconstitute the very meaning of the experiences/confrontations, affect the dialectical relation between control and resistance and show how different forms of labor control are intertwined.

In the previous chapters, I discussed how and on which dynamics the 'sense of belonging' on which the factory builds itself is formed, and how a certain strategy to control and discipline the labor process gains prevalence in the factory in relation to this. I also discussed how the workers respond to these dynamics and in what forms they attribute meaning to work. In so doing, I tried to explain how the dynamic structure of the labor process and the active participation of the worker in this structure change the elements that constitute the labor discipline. Consensual control built upon paternalism, new production methods and despotic labor market along with the organizational changes of the work produce new forms of labor control in the labor process. In the last analysis, I illustrated the creation of a new labor process in which technical and disciplinary forms of control are more visible, yet a labor process built upon "lean culture". Although some elements of consensual control

continue, and are expected to exist in the labor process, demand of productivity and quality of products make this hybrid form of labor control dominant.

In this chapter, I am going to examine the rhetorical tools used by the workers of Boydak Holding factories to give meaning to conflicts inside the factory and whether these meanings—in the context of both solidarity and segregation among workers—develop into a behavioral pattern. First, I am going to discuss how the workers react to and make meaning of the conflict that visibly emerges in terms of (1) mandatory overtime, (2) constant control and (3) nepotism. In other words, I will try to understand the dissolution of the "we" rhetoric, developed in connection with common goals shared by both workers and management and a sense of belonging, exploring how the workers explain and respond to this dissolution.

The relationship between the management and the worker based on compromises and agreements is replaced by a relationship based on indignity, nepotism and abuse. Whereas the conflictual relationship between the management and the workers can create segregation, it also engenders a culture of solidarity. In this way, the visible and even explicit forms of the conflict also affect the reactions of the workers and the emerging relationship of solidarity and segregation which they are in the makings of. In this context, I will examine (1) under what conditions, (2) through what kind of expressions and discursive tools and (3) in which practical forms, the experiences of the workers produce a class attitude or class feelings among the workers. Concordantly, I will emphasize the different forms of resistance- either individually or collectively- based on encounters of workers with management stemming from the class tensions in labor processes. In the last part of the chapter, I will look at the everyday life reactions of workers and analyze the collective struggle of workers through the example of a wildcat strike.

5.2 Defining tensions

With changes in the relations between employer and workers, workers' behavioral patterns, understanding, and the way they give meaning to their work also change. In this chapter, I will present how the workers express challenges to the sense of belonging (i.e. that it was created in tandem with paternalism as a form of control). Harsh working conditions such as mandatory overtime, constant control, intense disciplinary investigation, troubles requesting leave, contradicting relations with the management (such as abuse, indignity, nepotism), and the ways these reflect on relationships among workers exemplify the loss of the sense of belonging. While the material conditions of the dissolution of the unity between the worker and the management differ within the labor process in terms of interpretation, the encounters between the workers themselves also acquire various meanings. In this chapter I will examine how the workers express this conflict within the labor process, how they respond to it, and how they give meaning to it. Thus, I will be able to evaluate their responses and behavioral tendencies in the labor process in the context of a culture of solidarity and segregation.

In interviews I conducted with the workers, I asked them the following questions: "Have you ever had it up to here?", "Do you ever think that you have been treated unfairly?", "How would you act if you think you are treated unfairly?" Hence, I was able to understand the primary problems of the workers and how they react against these problems. The main elements rendering the work "unbearable" and "unsustainable" for the workers are mandatory overtime, constant control and nepotism. These three factors are visible forms of conflictual relations between labor and capital in terms of the perspectives of workers. Hence, the responses which have occurred as a part of daily struggle are partially preconditioned by the visible forms

of conflict and exploitation. Workers prefer to emphasize these conflicts with reference to their dignity. In this fashion, the references the workers make while talking about conflicts pave the way to understand when and in which encounters the experiences of the workers turn into a response. Workers illustrate the effects of long working hours and mandatory overtime as follows:

> I am working at Boyteks carpet now. Officially, there is no mandatory overtime, but there is, in the workplace. If I do not show up at work for three or four Sundays, they will put me out the door. The workers have rights only on paper. (Olgun, see Appendix, 54)

> After the fall-off between the government and Fethullah Gülen, our Boytaş community is under scrutinous supervision. Until then, there was no supervision. Until that moment, we were being colonized. We had lost our humanity. Sorry to put it like this, but we looked like animals. On the New Year's countdown, we would lie down at the great door, the heating system would not work. It would be cold inside as much as the frost outside. (Bahadır, see Appendix, 55)

> It had been very sweltering last year. They would have us work for twelve hours. They would even make us work on Sundays. You are working for twelve hours, going home, you have seven or eight hours until the next shift, you are falling asleep. One loses his mind, come-and-go, come-and-go. You do not see another world except the workplace. For a year now, it has been regular shifts. No Sunday overtime and whatnot. (Saffet, see Appendix, 56)

The workers' statements define forms of the experience of suppression in the relationship they have with the factory: (a) mandatory overtime, (b) constant control, (c) intense disciplinary investigations, (d) problems they experience in leave grants and (e) long working hours. Therefore, they express some of the conflictual elements more clearly than those elements present in other encounters. In other words, more they define the "problems", more they respond to them.

Another important question is why the workers define certain elements of their accumulated experience more than others. Workers derive various experiences from their encounters with the management in the labor process and attribute them different meanings. Similar encounters may lead to different experiences and

meanings. Therefore, it can be considered that encounters that occur in the context of mandatory overtime, constant control and nepotism create new relationships on a plane that exceeds the original encounter. We can see how the encounters on those three planes take on different meanings if we look at the statements of the worker:

> Sometimes we would hurt so much that we would call ourselves "donkey". So long as we are like donkeys, it would go on like this. We were humiliating ourselves. We were feeling excluded. It was such a system… To deprive someone from their rightful due, it is a great sin in the eye of Allah. Allah says, if you are coming to my side, do not come depriving someone of their rightful share. What are they doing? You work, they do not pay your share. Why are we not friends with you? If you ask, they are going to say we are in a family. Oh, there was this guy called Bülent Karakapı. May God keep him away from my path! He would go and he would come, and he would say, "I am the rooster of this place; you know that, swarthy boy?" He would come with his saliva dripping. I would not say hi to him if I see him outside, they made him a manager. He crows everywhere now in the Boytaş community. (Bahadır, see Appendix, 57)

> Of course, they are enjoying it, Ekinsu; one of them is a manager, the other a chief. They do not have problems in terms of leave or wage; they think everybody is like them. But the worker is not like that, the worker already has tons of problems. The worker has debts, has employment worries, credit debts, house rents. The worker has tons of problems even without coming to work. And if you add another kick to his toll, that is the moment he is fed up with it. He says, I will go and stand my ground, against them. If they do not comply, I would leave the job, too. In the end? A certain period will pass until he is employed again; and whether he is going to be employed is not even certain. He is going to have a lot of economic troubles in the meantime. His family will become anxious, his kid will become anxious. Being out of job takes two years away from a worker's life now. (Deniz, see Appendix, 58)

> No manager comes to you and asks, "how are you, brother?". There is no such thing; adding to that, the managers are superior to the bosses. What if he was the boss instead, can you imagine? They even humiliate the worker. (Cavit, see Appendix, 59)

It can be derived that the main reason the workers refer to the material conditions of work (mandatory overtime, constant control and long working hours) in terms of conflict is the fact that the encounter between the manager and the worker itself became a visible contradiction, i.e., that the material encounter changed into a form re-interpreted through the mechanisms of subjective meaning. Therefore,

accumulation of meanings as derived from these encounters causes the workers to reconstruct certain dynamics of the labor process. In this context, the workers re-interpret the different encounters they experience on the wide gap between the "meaning of life" and "working life." Especially when different forms of exploitation are defined and interpreted, the concepts of human indignity, abuse and nepotism act as the main reference points for the workers. In other words, these encounters are only considered to be conflictual when they acquire a verbally or psychologically abusive form.

Furthermore, with the changes witnessed in the organization of production (production based on efficiency and quality) and the prevalence of supervision and surveillance mechanisms aiming to decrease the inefficiency of labor power, the dynamics that once produced consensual control lose their power, causing the encounter between the management and the workers to be re-based on tenser relationalities. When the statements of the workers are studied, it can be inferred that the understanding of "we are a family" has been challenged through their understanding of encounters with chief, manager and, albeit rarely, foreman, leading workers to separate themselves from the managers in terms of class. The words of a worker who has been working in the shipment department at Boytaş illuminate how the encounter between management and worker is interpreted by the latter:

> I was loading a truck when I was working inside the storage and I received a punishment. We were loading a truck; it was a fridge truck, in the summer, I never forget it. The truck driver came, it was so hot, sweat was trickling down our necks. Guys, the ganger said, I will do something good for you. We asked, what it is? The truck is a fridge, so he offered to turn on its air conditioner so that we would work under cooler conditions. Okay bro, we said, if you do that, we will do our job faster. By the way, the air conditioner works a bit noisily. When we must talk, we must shout at each other, like "straighten it", "lay it down", etc. The foreman came from below, and spoke thus: "Hakan, don't be shouting around here!" Hakan likes being humiliated like this, cannot keep his head straight, he is a mild man. But I could not stomach it. Okay, we are shouting there but we are not giving a wedding

> party. We are at the trailer of a truck, what can you do there except work? He says, do not speak shouting. I am doing my job here and I can talk however I like. I jumped down, went to him and said, "What are you talking about?" he said, "Don't speak shouting, Bahadır!" "What the hell are you going on about?" I said, "what shouting? If I am doing my job here, I can speak however I like. We are not engaged in a social conversation here, we are speaking because the work requires it so, and you cannot forbid it," I said. Then we got into an argument. "Look Bahadır," he said, "I am shaking because of anger, get away from me!" I asked: "What are you going to do? Are you going to beat me?" and said: "You go! This is my area of work." Mesut is registering some products over someplace. I said, "Mesut, come here!" I asked him if he had any troubles about me in terms of work, whether he has witnessed me being lazy or whatnot. He said no. Then I turned to Kadir and told him, "You cannot interfere in what is beyond this, this is your line! I am doing whatever is needed, I am not going against anything." He got really disconcerted there. We are head to head now. All the shipment department is watching us. I gathered all the courage I had. We get exiled, punished. We are tortured inside the trucks. We are in such isolation. It is exile. Even your take of your own work changes psychologically. There is making that place lovable, and there is making that place isolated. That place is like an exile, like a torture chamber; and when that is the impression, I see it as an insult to me whenever I get on a truck. There are people who think like that, because you present that place like that." (Bahadır, see Appendix, 60)

Workers consider conflictual encounters in the labor process insults to their personalities. Thus, every encounter in the labor process blocks their struggle to achieve dignity and to gain some measure of meaning and self-realization at work. (Hodson, 2004; Weil, 1977) When I spoke to the workers who left the factory or got laid off after the strike, almost all of them state that they realized what they had been going through only after they left the factory.

> I started to feel like myself after I left, huh! God helped me, good that I left. You are working at the factory; you do not even shave. For whom are you going to shave? Who are you seeing? You always work. He did good to us by sacking us. (Cemil, see Appendix, 61)

> I understood there was life outside the factory after I left İstikbal. But, if you ask this to a worker working at İstikbal, he cannot give you any answer. Only thing he can say is, I am going to bazaar on the weekends. I left İstikbal, I reached out with my hands, and felt that there is really air outside. Thank god, he saved me. (Deniz, see Appendix, 62)

The material reflection of consciousness and the material reciprocation of this conflict find itself in the contradiction between the property of the means of production and socialization of production. It surfaces in cases in which the worker's human dignity is robbed and in which the objectified labor is stolen through rent. The neglect of human dignity in general terms, that which some of the workers may not be aware of, forms a lower level of character humiliation. At this point, we should not be deceived by the appearances of exploitation and resistance. A worker's interpretation of an encounter crystallized in the forms of verbal and psychological abuse as "indignity" is related to that worker's level of consciousness. We do not mean to claim that dignity is a pregiven condition in the human nature and that dignity is blocked in certain encounters of the labor-capital relationship. In fact, the indignity is a consequence. The workers refer to dignity in their responses because the conflicts become visible only when they relate to dignity. Therefore, we can say that two different forms of indignity, (1) the concrete robbery of human dignity and (2) the personal humiliation of the workers, are intertwined yet become visible in that condition. As a result, the personal reactions of the workers and the strategies they employ while responding are not only because of the harshened character of their encounter with the management but also the awareness that the experience that seems like personal humiliation is now shared with other workers. While the process by which the workers realize that their experiences are common engenders the possibilities for them to act on common interest, it also strengthens the way they respond in terms of personal stratagem. At this point, the intertwined character of class attitude and feelings, its formlessness and ambiguity, can be seen to produce dispersed forms of resistance based on competition.

The workers experience a relationship built on exploitation between the worker and the management where certain aspects of this exploitation become more and more visible, and, whether differently or independently, or whether collectively or individually, they respond to it. At this point, the real question is this: how do the workers who experience encounters in the context of harsh working conditions, constant control/discipline and nepotism subjectively reconstruct these relationships? Every encounter sustains itself by being constructed through different meanings and conflicts wherein it reproduces the relationships. This situation shows both how the consciousness of "us" the factory builds itself upon and the workers participate in is challenged and how a new relationality is constructed in its place. This relationality is built upon a mobile, slippery and fragile ground such as the main dynamics of consensual control. Therefore, the networks of solidarity among the workers, alliances or separations are not embedded in the process but shapeless enough to be substituted with each other in different contexts.

As a result, when asked whether the workers develop a culture of solidarity in the different encounters throughout the labor process, whether they are the founders of a new consciousness of "us" alongside the management or whether they are creating a personal space instead, we should know that the answer is not inside these singular questions. Yet, to be able to approach the answer, we can try to understand the tendencies the workers turn into behavioral patterns.

The increasing economic and social-based tension in the encounters of the workers with the management, the labor process sustained only through discipline and ceaseless supervision, and distrust for unions and harsh working conditions eventually cause workers to develop new strategies to cope with this situation. Although demand for wage increase become inevitable for the reproduction, because

their relationship with workers with the union is characterized by distrust, we observe that they prefer a more individual form of resistance and specifically avoid collective action. However, the class experience itself creates certain moments in which the workers act collectively. At this point, it is difficult to label this as “class consciousness” since this culture of acting together is only a feeling and an attitude. Therefore, in the situations where the workers cannot organize around their demands and problems within the unions, or when the conflicts become clear and they cannot orient the process in a calculative/conscious manner, we can only see “class” in its fragmented and “to be” forms. Nonetheless, “concepts like struggle and resistance are used in a capacity to encapsulate various forms such as wildcat strike suggesting class attributes, the formal-informal struggle, individual resistance-struggle as a whole” (Günok, 2018). As we will see, “worker noncompliance” or “misbehavior” can take many forms, including absenteeism, soldiering, misuse of company resources, or forming labor unions, depending on whether employers and employees are struggling over the appropriation of time, work, product, or identity” (Budd, 2011, p. 121).

5.3 Forms of individual struggle

The attacking of capital against labor, both globally and locally has had success not only in holding down wages and intensifying work but also in weakening the collective organization of workers – reducing union density, restricting legal action, and eroding cultures of solidarity and fostering passivity (Martin, Sunley, & Wills, 1996). These developments raise pressing questions about how labor can rebuild its organizations and develop new cultures of solidarity. The conflict between the efforts of the capital to divide the class and unite it as a labor force and the efforts of the

working class to unite against the capital and to overcome this division is one of the most basic and most important attributes of class struggle (Cleaver, 2008, p.164).

Coworker relations generate stable patterns of rights, obligations and behavior that constitute a workplace culture, also providing a basis for workers to shape a collective identity separate from that of management (Hodson, 2004, p. 47). However, since there is currently no conscious attitude among workers towards class and since the possibilities of collective action are not yet realized, the class encounters and conflicts crystallize on the level of individual worker. Thus, the workers interpret their encounters with the management on an individual level, responding based on personal strategies against the conflicts that become visible.

In the previous chapter, I discussed the concepts with which the several encounters workers experience in relation to the factory are expressed and defined. Especially, the conflicts referred to and made visible as "indignity" create an effect in the same way. However, we should understand the workers' individual struggles bearing in mind that indignity is only an appearance and that which is crystallized in the use of the word "indignity" is connected to the consciousness of the workers and how they interpret their experiences.

Dignity is a concept defined and interpreted in accordance with the current state of the human consciousness. Although it is specific to the human species, it is a basic gain left over from a struggle against alienation and should be associated with life. Therefore, the worker's struggle for dignity is much more than a desire for a management that wishes to make their work easy. Dignity is related to being able to live by producing in equal and humane conditions in which everybody gains what they deserve, without a shade of exploitation. Marx explains the historicity of the exploitation of surplus value in Capital as follows:

> One thing, however, is clear – nature does not produce on the one side owners of money or commodities, and on the other men possessing nothing but their own labor-power. This relation has no natural basis, neither is its social basis one that is common to all historical periods. It is clearly the result of a past historical development, the product of many economic revolutions, of the extinction of a whole series of older forms of social production. (p.120)

Based on these, it can be said that the alienation of the productive subject to its own labor also bears within the potential to dissolve the property relations which are not natural but constructed synthetically and protected by law (Bottomore, 1963). Therefore, the individual responses of the workers within the labor process are a part of both the economic struggle and the struggle for dignity. In other words, it is their form of resisting alienation brought on by the treatment they are subjected to, resisting harsh working conditions and against dignity.

Marx argued the following in *Handwritings*, concerning the character of the relation between the worker and productive labor:

> First, the fact that labor is external to the worker, i.e., it does not belong to his intrinsic nature; that in his work, therefore, he does not affirm himself but denies himself, does not feel content but unhappy, does not develop freely his physical and mental energy but mortifies his body and ruins his mind. The worker therefore only feels himself outside his work, and in his work feels outside himself. He feels at home when he is not working, and when he is working, he does not feel at home. His labor is therefore not voluntary but coerced; it is forced labor. It is therefore not the satisfaction of a need; it is merely a means to satisfy needs external to it. Its alien character emerges clearly in the fact that as soon as no physical or other compulsion exists, labor is shunned like the plague. (Marx, 2000, p.30)

The subjective state of the worker as a creative and active agent of the labor process means that the worker's existence does not follow the commoditizing and objectifying tendencies of the capitalist exploitation. Therefore, the capitalist class must apply new systems of production and new approaches of management and supervision designed to increase the relative surplus-value and update them constantly. Even so, the organizations of the working-class do not pay the required attention to the instances of individual, particular struggles independent of the

organization emerging within the spheres they are organized, while the capitalist class constantly re-envisions how these instances could be taken under control by the help of certain strategies (Günok, 2018, p. 45). At this point, the interpretation as an element the capital to increase and guarantee the relative surplus-value is prevented since the workers' interpretation of control/supervision is congested with the management's daily practices. As a result, like the way the nineteenth century industrial workers reflected their reaction to the capitalist exploitation on the machines, the workers today may perceive the experiences emerging from their encounter with the management as individual experiences and develop strategies accordingly. As Marx writes in the first volume of *Capital*:

> It took both time and experience before the work people learnt to distinguish between machinery and its employment by capital, and to direct their attacks, not against the material instruments of production, but against the mode in which they are used. (Marx, 1995-1996, p. 288)

In this line, the scope of the class struggle is also a result of the historical accumulation of the class experience. Therefore, even the responses and strategies that seem to be the most individual may accumulate experiences that create a rupture. In this sense, although the workers' individual struggles are a resistance of labor against alienation, in certain situations they may cause to alienation of the alienation.

Hodson (2004) attributes the individual forms of resistance I examine based on alienation to the irreconcilable gap between the meaning of work and the meaning of life. According to him, creative and purposive actions give people a sense of power and effectiveness, the feeling of being able to control their own destinies. The workplace is thus a key arena for human agency and for the realization of human dignity. These struggles include workers' complex and sometimes contradictory behaviors. Yet, here we see not only how workers give meaning to their work and their experiences, but also how they produce meaningful experiences. In other words,

the workers are constructing meaningful experiences while interpreting their own experiences. Thus, they reconstruct the labor process as active subjects. Hodson (2004) categorizes the forms of the workers' individual resistance under three titles: (1) Workers engage in active and passive resistance to abuse, overwork and exploitation, (2) Workers are actively engaged in trying to perform their jobs in a successful and efficient manner and finally, (3) Workers produce meaning through work.

Thus, workers feel some sense of control over their circumstances through activities both associated and unassociated with production. In this section, I discuss the different forms of individual resistance since daily reactive practices of workers can produce consent as well. Hence, a workers' pattern of behavior in labor process, though reactive, can be both reproductive and disruptive. According to Hodson's classification, while active resistance bears a disruptive character, passive resistance is more reproductive.

5.3.1 Absenteeism

Between Boydak Holding and the workers, the continuity of both active and passive forms of resistance can be observed. Frequent use of illness certificates, extending break times, frequent tea and cigarette breaks, extended prayer time and other actions taken to avoid work as much as possible are the most distinct forms of resistance. The fact that the workers try to stay away from work as much as possible is the most concrete signifier of their alienation from work. The workers mostly state that, because they are not granted leave when it is needed, they periodically opt to acquire illness certificate:

> We have other problems, too, but, for example, if we have a financial problem, who are we going to tell about that? Or even spiritual problems. We

> are talking to each other. We can get leave, yes, otherwise we get sick certificate. If there are people like me who knows a manager from a hospital or like Ömer whose mother is a nurse, we have that influence. (Sedat, see Appendix, 63)

> The only problem we have about leaves is this now: when the work is less, you necessarily use the annual leave. It is summer now; nobody is on leave. You cannot go have a vacation with your family. Then what are you doing? You seek ways to get a sick certificate. These guys do not only work in the factory; some of them are in agriculture, some are doing animal husbandry. When it is time for yield, they must go to their villages, or in certain times of certain seasons. But when they are not granted leave, what are they going to do? They must get sick certificates. (Halim, see Appendix, 64)

The experience of a worker who had been working as a foreman in a Boytaş factory illuminates how the workers behave in cases where they do not want to work or when they exhibit an attitude against the factory:

> I had a trouble, I had to go my village, I asked for leave. They did not grant it. I am saying, sir, I must; they are saying, no, impossible. I had a forklift under me at that time, and I was thinking I must but how… I saw a piece of iron a couple meters forward; so, I jumped on the forklift and crashed into the piece of iron. Just now of crush I jumped out, holding my heart, as if I am dying. I faked fainting, lost my voice, my breath. Everyone gathered around me. They are poking me and whatnot. They brought a stretcher, and while putting me on it, they are saying things like that, he is as heavy as a dead donkey. We made it to the infirmary, the infirmary man is my friend. I winked at him and he got it. I told him, send me to a hospital, now. Then the doctor came, gave something from my nose, I inhaled, my eyes were almost popping out. I was already conscious, so when I inhaled it, I became something else. He said, get up, you do not have any problems. What I mean is, they force you to lie. I had a lot of friends who tried to have leave, saying my grandma died my grandpa died, uncle, mom, etc. A guy killed his grandpa for three times, huh! (Deniz, see Appendix, 65)

Similarly, another worker who works at Boytaş factory exemplifies how going to work became a torture and how he tried to cope with it as below:

> On a Sunday, I said, I am not doing any overtime. When I said, the others also started to say the same thing. I thought, oh, now it is going to turn into a mess. I immediately went to the doctor, told him I had pains. They run a test. I said, I must go to work again in the morning. Give me a paper, I said, so that I will not go and rest. Formality. I do not want to go. I am exhausted and have fed up with it all. I got a paper from the doc like that and clocked in on Monday. They metaphorically whipped the ones who did not come that day. Write yourselves a defense, take it to the discipline, etc. They came to me and I gave them the paper. Nobody could say anything. We had to develop such

> strategies. Everyone was killing somebody. Grandma, grandpa, etc.… to get leave with lies. (Bahadır, see Appendix, 66)

The most common form of distancing oneself from work, or the most frequent coping mechanism used by the worker who sees his work as external to himself and to make his life meaningful is withdrawal from work. This reaction mostly manifests in the shape of an illness certificate and is also maintained other ways such as through frequent breaks and "making out". It is possible to understand absenteeism, which is another face of resistance to the alienation, in the words of Marx:

> He has a feeling of misery rather than well-being, does not develop freely his mental and physical energies but physically exhausted and mentally debased. The worker feels himself at home only during his leisure time whereas at work he feels homeless. His work is not voluntary but imposed, forced labor. It is not satisfaction of a need but only a means for satisfying other needs. (Marx, p. 536)

The mystified relationship between the worker's work and life, paralleled with his increasing alienation, causes him to be consumed both physically and mentally. Despite this, the worker must resist the consequences of work, and the resulting alienation, to be able to render life meaningful. This necessity is also the guarantee that the worker will attend work the next day.

The worker prefers avoiding work since he is the temporary owner of his time and space in the working hours. The potential of individual forms of resistance and struggle to turn into collective action by acquiring a class aspect in a political form signifies the existence of a dangerous sphere for the capitalist class (Günok, 2018). Therefore, the management attempts to prevent these various forms of struggle (absenteeism, soldiering, meaning making) with constant discipline, control and supervision. The production manager of Boyteks, who labels the resistance of the workers as "slacking," conveys his observations as such:

> Those who are not watched online are doing their work slower than required when they are not watched. They are bringing the tempo down. Especially,

> near the end of shift, if they have something else, they must do, just not to do it, they are making their current work crawl. They are doing everything not to start with that other work. Whereas; if they work with their regular pace, they are going to be able start the other piece too. But they do not. They linger on it for fifteen minutes. They are doing cleaning here or there, or they are not setting the weaver at 30 meters per minute but 20. They are doing everything not to weave a new thing. (Erdal, see Appendix, 67)

The words of shift commander of Boyteks support manager's observations as follows:

> If they are not supervised, they make the ten-minute break thirty minutes. For example, there is no foreman in one of the departments; they go on like that until they get caught. When they are caught, they are back to their usual pace. They see it is as their rights to spend even two minutes off the working time. (Mert, see Appendix, 68)

Another prevalent form of "slacking" is the procedure sabotage. As workers work in different shifts, late in the shift they bring the tempo down and intentionally take on the easy work to break off early. The production manager of Boyteks illustrates the procedure sabotage as follows:

> There is this procrastination method. The worker takes on the easy work, works in a relaxed manner, and does not put much effort. Then the next shift has the difficult, effort-demanding work. I think they are being unfair to each other in this way. (Erdal, see Appendix, 69)

When asked what they refer by difficult work, quality system manager of Boyteks states "For example, there are some clothes, whose customers are sensitive. These should not have any mistakes; more attention should be paid to these. Or there are very little pieces to weave or bind. Those in the management also have an idea about the clothes, so the difficulty or ease… (Nazan, see Appendix, 70). Indeed, the game of "slacking" make possible workers to "subvert capitalist control of the labor process, to autonomously organize and control key aspects of production" (Clawson and Fantasia, 1983, p. 676).

Procedure sabotage, one of the most common forms of absenteeism, implies more conscious intent than simply declining to give full effort. Hodson (2004) explains procedure sabotage as following: “Procedure sabotage is often used as part of a strategy to get work completed in a way that does not exhaust the worker or require excessive or unnecessary effort” (p. 63).

At this point, it might be needed to recall the a priori assumptions of the Taylorist labor supervision regarding the nature of workers. Taylor sees workers as beings who will procrastinate whenever the opportunity arises, who are indifferent against production, and who are not very intelligent (Taylor, 2012). Taylor categorizes “slacking” under two headings: (1) natural slacking, (2) systematic slacking. Whereas the former is the product of a tendency of workers to ease the work, the latter signifies the workers finding and “abusing” the holes in the disciplinary mechanism of the management concerning the intensity and the pace of the work. In this line, the tempo slowdown as described by the Boyteks’ production manager, the extension of break time, and preferring to do the easy work are part of natural slacking, and the collective slowdown of the pace of work in the labor processes where the division of labor is merged form or the pretense of work belong to the heading of systematic procrastination/slacking. The production manager continues to explain the active procrastination as follows:

> There is also this active form of slacking. For example, the guy seems to be working but he does not. For example, the responsible ones in the weaving department. You see that there is not any malfunction he can take care of. He should then go around to see if there is anything missing and if there is, he should take care of it. He should check the settings of the machine; he should see to it if someone is not working well. There certainly is something to do. But he does not do that, he stays in front of his computer. Whenever the code for a malfunction appears, then he runs to do that. But he is not working at all in the meantime. (Erdal, see Appendix, 71)

What is labelled as “slacking” by the manager here is the manifestation of the contradiction between the guarantee of the relative surplus gained from the worker and the worker’s resistance to it. The dialogue between Nazan, the manager of Quality System, and the shift manager from the same department sheds light on the relationship between alienation and “slacking”:

> This is in the work definition. We are machine-intense enterprise. Control is not an open-ended concept for us. It should be standard. But here, the machine works, and the man looks… (Nazan, see Appendix, 72)

> In the night shifts, the workers become sleepy, because the machine I am working on does not have much to do. You put the clothe in the entry and watch it as it comes out. You just walk around the machine. Observing, I mean. You must manually intervene only once in thirty-five minutes or so. You do not have to do anything except cutting one-and-a-half meter pieces. They get bored and they sleep now and then. (Oğuz, see Appendix, 73)

The worker describing what he does as “you put the cloth in the entry and watch it as it comes out” show that he is just another input in the production of process, plucked away from the knowledge of work similar to the clothe he is producing, meaning that his level of alienation is increased. Here the worker’s likelihood of participating in forms of resistance seems to be connected to their feeling of alienation, therefore the prevalent control networks in the labor process lead to the procurement of important advantages in terms of struggle and resistance as much as they increase the levels of workers’ alienation.

On the other hand, while talking about the workers’ “slacking,” the managers do not emphasize its effect on efficiency or quality but on how it is unjust in relation to the other workers. They claim that the workers increase the workload of another worker by procrastinating and that this produces an unfair working environment. However, since the workers cannot realize their reproduction of life at home, they do it at the workplace with an individual motivation. In this way, despite their resistance

to alienation, they are also alienated from the alienation itself. As they try to escape alienation to self-realize, they end up in another form of alienation. The worker's individual resistance, independent of coworkers experiencing similar processes, might also affect the conditions of solidarity that can only be reached collectively. This is most apparent in the case of workers who do not pray. Those who relate the meaning of work to work ethic are especially annoyed by the "slacking" of their workmates.

> To extend a ten-minute break to twenty minutes is also a bit too much religiously. For example, they go to pray and come back in thirty. This is, for example, forbidden by religion. (Veli, see Appendix, 74)

Similarly, the quality system manager of the Boyteks factory states that the prayers are instrumentalized for "slacking":

> They complain about each other as well; one comes and says; he always goes to pray. Morally, he becomes alienated from the prayer. There are those who say they are going to pray but they are not really praying; they just want to get away from work. The sin is on them. It is the foreman's job to balance this situation. (Nazan, see Appendix, 75)

At this point, it can be said that each behavioral pattern inside the labor process bears meaning beyond itself. To pray and to use prayers to stay away from work is the reaction of the worker against insufficient break time. When the worker reacts this way, it means that he expresses himself in a sphere that seems the most legitimate to him, in this case his religious rituals.

5.3.2 Meaning making

The behaviors that clearly became patterns for the workers were reconstructed through their re-interpretations of the experiences. Smoking is not an act of smoking; playing games on their mobile phones are not an act of playing; to use the lavatory does not signify the fulfilment of a need. The observations of a worker who had been

working at the factory as a foreman for a long time support the argument that the actions of the workers carry different meanings:

> We would go to toilets; there are three cabins, thirty people are waiting there for their turns. They already know that it is not going to be their turn for thirty minutes or so, but they grab their phones and play something, check their Facebook, look at YouTube, text on WhatsApp. Some would smoke. These would happen. It was about the employer. Because people work overtime, get stressed, they have brief breaks, ten-minute tea break. In ten minutes, drink a tea, smoke a cigarette, hop! you are back to work. Working is not easy; there is the etude, there are managers everywhere saying come on come on come on, it is psychologically exhausting. Physically exhausting. What is the worker going to do to relieve the stress; he must be entertained somehow. He may talk to the one next to him but it is impossible, there is a machine working there. He then necessarily grabs his mobile, goes to the WC, smokes some, plays a game; he clears his mind. The seventy percent of the fault here is on the manager and the working conditions and on the brevity of break time. (Deniz, see Appendix, 76)

The foremen may be more tolerant when the workers ask permission to smoke or to go to toilet, since they understand they want to stay away from work for a while. As a result, the workers establish a new language in which the break from work to smoke or to go to toilet gains a new meaning and that meaning is only understood by the other workers. Thus, the workers learn to act on collective profit in lieu with their individual strategies of resistance or needs. In other words, they produce an autonomous meaning system through coworker relations. The toilets especially became centers of "potential forum for informal communications and organizations" (Hodson, 2004, p. 48). Those following quotes are some examples of how workers adapt themselves to harsh working conditions, continuous work and produce coping strategies:

> There was a reaction at first when the camera system was introduced of course. But then they got used to it. To use mobile is also forbidden in the factory, but the workers text in between the machines or behind them somewhere. (Mahmut, see Appendix, 77)

> Some of the workers were like alarm clocks. When the moment comes, he leaves the job and runs to the toilet. Not for the need for toilet but mostly to smoke. Ten-minute break is not enough anyway. Hangs out at the toilet. You

> are going to sit and converse with your friend at the ten-minute break; before you settle, the announcement comes, you are back to work, like it is the military! (Bahadır, see Appendix, 78)
>
> I have this habit; when I get angry, I sing. I sing screaming to let go of the anger, since my voice is not heard. I suppress the rebellion storming inside me by singing. Otherwise, you have it up to here. You get angry at the machine, at the foreman. Some relieve themselves by texting, some by jokes. Everyone has a tactic to do it. (Yamin, see Appendix, 79)

Hodson emphasizes that most resistance is more subtle and subdued; thus, workplace resistance typically relies on small-scale actions involving a subtle withdrawal from cooperation or work. Workers often engage in meaningful activities outside of the central dynamics of power, domination and production. Thus, each of these activities has important implications for working with dignity. Meaningful activities range from taking work seriously, to putting a family picture on desk, or joking with coworkers. Such peripheral yet meaningful activities are important strategies for holding back the boredom of too many hours spent on the same activity (Hodson, 2004, p. 46).

Whereas several workers realize their psychological reproduction, when it comes to the disconnection between work and self-realization, they prefer to attribute an artificial meaning to the work. The most prevalent methods of this form of meaning-attribution are sentimental connection with the means of production, continuation of production, or conforming with the basic citizenship duties. Meanings that the workers produce to make work more bearable cause the workers to become alienated from their own alienation and reproduce the work relations based on consent. The formation of consent through the attributed meanings is exemplified by the workers of Boytaş factory as quoted:

> There are people without any conscience; they use a glove once and then put it in the trash. The babies in the cradle had a share in it but they are putting it into the trash. As if you are writing two lines with that pen you are holding and then disposing it. It is unacceptable. With no fear of God in your heart,

> spend five gloves in a day. They would not say; we will not give. I use these gloves for a whole week, cannot spare them. Just like the way we are using these materials; it is going to come back to our kids. There are people who cannot consider this, what are you going to do? (Cafer, see Appendix, 80)
>
> I would wash every card of my weaving machine, because it should regularly work. It should not malfunction so I can have clear mind throughout the shift. If it works, I have a clear mind. If it does not stop, you walk around. You must fix some malfunctions by yourself. Plus, if there is a mistake in the cloth you produced, it is your responsibility. There is no such thing as waiting for the foreman always. (Yamin, see Appendix, 81)
>
> I had a more-than-enough work ethic. You are working somewhere, if you harm the equipment there it is religiously problematic, too. He tells you; you will work for ten hours; you have the right of an hour of break. It is a right when you go out for a break for five minutes, if you neglect the work. If you harm his property, then it is a right. I work at the cardboard department. There would be one or two deficiencies, I would not dispose those, would put it on a side, cross it and use it again. These are all rights. (Cemil, see Appendix, 82)

On the other hand, the achievement of dignity at work depends on creative and purposive activity on the part of the workers. In this way, production of meaning of work in the labor process gains a disruptive effect. While the strategies the worker that employs to render the work meaningful reproduce work relations based on consent, they may also enhance the class feeling alongside the variety of the ways the meaning is attributed. That is, whether the strategies of individual resistance create reproductive or destructive relations depends on the encounters and contradictions in the labor process and the worker's level of consciousness.

A worker who calms his anger by lying down on the ground of a mosque (passive resistance) has the potential to create a destructive form of resistance by turning his anger towards the meaning of work in another encounter. While in a different context he deals his anger with patience, in another encounter, he prefers to confront with the management directly. The worker emphasizes his different responses as follows:

> There were times when I was willing to take a chance. We are humans in the end. Then you tell yourself, Cavit, look, here is your coif, you made some start praying with Allah's will, they are learning the hadith from you with Allah's will. That is why you are patient. Then I go and have an ablution. For, our prophet (s.a.v.) says that when you feel angry, have an ablution. The water will take away the fire. When you are very angry, sit on the ground; if it does not go away, lie on the ground. I am doing that sometimes. If I am angry when I get to the mosque, I just lie down there. (Cavit, see Appendix, 83)

> Look, the Muslim should be a little vigilant. I had worked at Boytaş 2 for eleven years, then came to Boytaş 1. When I came, a manager I did not know said: "Don't work there, work here!" There we had a little argument. He told me, if you cannot work the door is there. I asked, shall I read a hadith to you? Opened his eyes, looked at me. For, the word is good when it is in its place. Our prophet (s.a.v.) had a camel and this camel was invincible, I said. The manager thinks he is powerful because he is high up. I said, polytheists also had a camel and though its back was burdened with a lot of load, it passed the other one. They asked the prophet, O messenger of god, how come it beats your camel? Prophet answered, there is no powerful thing on earth that can remain invincible. There he got his answer! He got it. Some time passed, he left. See? Some things require patience. (Cavit, see Appendix, 84)

It can be said that the workers produce forms of reaction individually gaining a pattern through their own references to legitimacy such as religious-conservatism, work ethic and dignity. Most of these reactions employ a function to make the work and the intense labor process more bearable. On the other hand, the new experiences derived from the encounters in the labor process create conditions for workers to become subjects of a class. At this point, the emphasis should be on the dialectical relationship between class and worker rather than an understanding that conceptualizes the worker as a separate and distinct part of class. The different forms of struggle the workers produce through similar experiences are elements of class related accumulation. This accumulation does not always manifest as collective action, and it does not have to; however, it begins within conditions that pave the way to collective action and, through accumulation, transform.

5.4 “We” of workers: Collective action

In this section, I examine how the experiences shaped by workers’ everyday struggles condition collective action in the context of different encounters between worker and management or between the workers themselves. At this point, we should not forget that, whenever there is a reference to the individual forms of resistance examined in the last chapter, these forms signify both how the workers respond to the working conditions in the factory and how they actively participate in the labor process within their own subjectivity.

The foundation of group solidarity is “shared experiences at work” and a “sense of involvement and attachment” that arises from these shared experiences (Hodson, 2004, p. 48). Indeed, group solidarity at work depends on the willingness of workers to defend each other in the face of challenges, most often from management, but also sometimes from other groups of workers or from customers (p.48). Group solidarity can also help mitigate feeling of alienation derived from meaningless work.

Strikes are more common in workplaces utilizing direct personal supervision. The workers’ wildcat strikes especially are almost always sparked by a managerial action (Hodson, 2004, p. 89). Therefore, I will examine the strike, which, for workers who accumulate experiences within their daily forms of resistance and reinterpret these experiences in every encounter, is the form of resistance closest to class formation, since it refers to a collective action. To understand how the social disintegrations, cooperation or fractions affect the class solidarity and class feeling, we study the wildcat strike that took place in February 2015. I will begin by analyzing the workers’ understanding of the concepts of class feeling, class attitude and class solidarity. The workers explain how their life differs from that of the

employer both socially and economically and how, as a result, they have different interests with the employers but similar interests among themselves:

> There was a time we did not get any pay increase. The Boydak family got themselves an 8-person private jet for example. That year, we did not get any increase. But he was on TV, boasting about the profit he made. You should give us what we deserve so that I can live with dignity. Look, you are a witness, my kid calls me and wants some socks. What can I do if I do not have any money? You are embarrassed in front of your own kid when you get home. Consider your image in her eyes. 4-year-old says, he is going to buy me socks. A kid that says that will tell you what you are due if you do not buy those socks. He may say, you are a bad dad. He may say, I do not love you. The worker ends up being embarrassed. If he does not work, there will be a problem with his wife. He will be up against with his social circle. It is hard to be a worker. (Cemil, see Appendix, 85)

> Sometimes I think if this is the law of nature. It is been years and this system of exploitation never changes. I am a worker, but I am a modern slave. We have everything but we are slaves. I would also like to go on vacation in Netherlands, or some other place abroad, but you I cannot, that is it. They are taking away my annual leave. Let us assume my kid is sick, and I could not go to work. He gives leave but counts it as part of my annual leave. For example, now I am on leave for six days. I already had 18 days of annual leave, now extract seven. What is my fault here? I am a human being, too. I want to take my wife on vacation when the summer comes. I want to take my kid to Çanakkale. I am even in the minus territory now. (Olgun, see Appendix, 86)

The class experience of the workers is determined by seemingly fragmented elements that both surpass the labor process and contain the processes of reproduction. We can also say that, since the workers' class is distinguished, not only by their actions inside the factory but also by how they entertain themselves in the town, where they hang out, and even where they drink tea, their class's projection on the labor process also affects the reinterpretations of the class experiences (Gündoğdu, p. 197). In this line, the class encounters that contain the tensions and contradictions between management and worker, paralleled with the narrowing of the workers' reproductive sphere, cause the worker to isolate himself from all the spheres of life. To resist this situation, workers must develop "the basic collective idea, and the institutions,

manners, habits of thought and intentions" as opposed to common experiences and forms of subordination (Williams, 1968, p. 346).

I will use the concept of "collective action" instead of the concept of "class consciousness" to analyze how the workers produce collective social ideas and habits of thoughts in response to similar forms of subordination. Although the workers say that their employer becomes rich and the holding grows thanks to the workers themselves, they also state that they as workers are ultimately dependent on the employer. In other words, they emphasize that the only way for the workers to survive is to sell their labor power to the employer. In this case, even though it is not a secret for the workers that the surplus value is appropriated, the main reason behind the workers' distance from "collective action" is the fact work is enforced on them as a necessity. The workers illustrate the process of surplus value appropriation through their own experiences and observations:

> At the strike time, if it happened at Boyteks and İstikbal too, Boydak would suffer financial loss. Even if it took just one day… we produce 35 thousand meters of clothe per day. Boytaş lost eight trillion on just one shift. Let alone our factory, there is a place called Boyteks down below, they produce bedclothing. If you turn it off, poof! But, if you look at it square-wise instead of number-wise, we are making the most of the money. Our factory covers the turnover of the carpet. We produce 800 thousand meters of clothing per month, one meter of it is twelve dollars. One week to the workers, two weeks to the expenditure, the other two weeks are surplus. (Oğuz, see Appendix, 87)

> They can meet the wages of all workers, their insurances and road money with only two-days of cloth production. (Kayhan, see Appendix, 88)

When asked workers where all that money goes although they are producers, they give variety of explanations. "They have their own foundations, it goes there." says one of the workers. (Kayhan, see Appendix, 89) Some says, the employer is putting all in their "pockets". (Ercan, see Appendix, 90) Some workers emphasize that it is inevitable that the bosses to earn more money than themselves, although some insist

that Boydak Holding is the least paying one in the holding structure. (Kayhan, see Appendix, 91)

> We cannot call this inequality; this is how it should be, when you look at it. I am only a worker there. If I do not work there, I will not have money either. The boss is somehow your employer. (Oğuz, see Appendix, 92)

In discussing surplus value, the workers do not emphasize the "employing" status of the employer based on cynicism that acknowledges the generosity of the employer or the unfairness of life itself, but rather because they are not aware of their own potential power against the unfair and unequal system of work. When asked if they ever think what the factory would do without the workers, Kayhan says as follows:

> They would lose money every second. But we cannot unite. If everyone turned their machines off at the same moment… but there are bootlickers, you cannot do that. I do not consider that there is anybody who is not in debt to a bank. You are unemployed… nobody would like to initiate such thing, right? Everybody came out and walked against it at Boytaş. The managers have their men inside. This is a big firm; if I leave, someone will replace me. (Kayhan, see Appendix, 93)

On the other hand, the workers can easily and quickly come and work together to solve their problems when there is a trouble outside factory life. When asked how they deal with a financial hardship or if someone among them needs money, they state that they solve it among themselves without reflecting anything to the factory. The workers who try to solve their factory problems with the foreman prefer to solve their personal problems outside the factory, with their workmates working at the same machine. This shows that the familial perception of the factory is still sustained in a discursive manner but has lost its material and practical supports. The sense of belonging constructed upon the idea of paternity is significantly challenged when the factory establishes a socially unequal network of relations. The workers develop a way to deal with their daily, economy-based troubles outside the influence granted

by the paternal employer's compromises and initiatives, and thus cultivate closer, more solidarity-based relations among each other.

> We cannot withdraw any additional advances. We get organized among ourselves. For example, I need money, I am just telling my friends. Some gives 10 lira, the other 5 liras, supporting me. You cannot go to a firm and tell them, I have this debt, I have that trouble, etc. Does not happen. (Olgun, see Appendix, 94)

> We get other troubles, too, but, for instance, who are we going to tell if we have financial hardship, or a spiritual hardship. We talk to each other. (Sedat, see Appendix, 95)

Individualistic and pragmatic attitudes are also prevalent among the workers. One reason for this is that the workers lack the experience of collective action; another reason is that they do not think that the collective attitude that brings them together in the first place is sustainable. However, distrust among furniture workers with strike experience is also widespread. Yet, that distrust is not due to the development of individual, competitive relations between them but because they fear that they are going to lose their jobs if they act collectively. The workers explain why they do not act collectively although they have common problems and profits in the following quote:

> Not everyone is the same. You have good intentions, but your interlocutor does not. Everybody calculates their own profit. You must be like that, too; otherwise, they will crush you. It does not do any good to intend well in the factory. After a while, it is just vigilance. It does not matter if you are well-intending if they load you with the work of two workers. The system is such that people cannot come together. (Cafer, see Appendix, 96)

> You do organize 15 people in the workplace, talking to them, seeing everyone shares the same opinion; when it gets serious, I say, friends, come, let us talk to the manager about this issue, these conditions, etc. Everyone says okay, then the time comes, and someone has a sick child, someone does not come to work, etc. Then you understand that these people deserve it. Nothing changes you are facing them by yourself. (Olgun, see Appendix, 97)

The combination of the prevalent form of unionization in the factory and the workers' experiences and observations from their encounters with the union

representatives inside the factory cause them to reject as an instrument for collective action. This observation reflects the work of Gündoğdu (2011) who writes that, “in the eyes of workers, workers including the non-unionized, local unions do not bring to them remarkable changes in workplace level relations” (p.206). The view of the workers concerning the union is as follows:

> For example, I had torn pants the other day. It is also in the union’s contract. But I did not see any unionist coming and looking around in any shift every day. (Kayhan, see Appendix, 98)

> Whose union is it? It is the employers. They will not stand behind us. They will always be on the side of the employer. (Cafer, see Appendix, 99)

> During the labor agreement term, the workers did not know what they were doing. We would gather in front of the factories. In Boytaş 1, everybody gathered in the square. 4 there, 2 another place. Everyone is trying to be vocal in their own rights. We gather, then the managers and chiefs climb high places to give a speech and the unionists are always behind them. With the money we pay, they stand against us. (Bahadır, see Appendix, 100)

While the offensive attitude of capital against labor, intensity of work and, eventually, the dissolution of the sense of belonging the factory builds itself upon, strengthens the network of solidarity and the class feelings among workers, the management, taking advantage of the distrust amongst workers, attempts to establish a new consciousness of “us”. These contradictions become more visible because of the widening gap between the management and the workers, and as a cautionary action the management encourages segregation among workers. It also increases distrust between the workers close to the management and the others.

Another element of the solidarity and disintegration among workers is their factional separation based on social and political interest. It can be observed that the workers are separated into different groups for three different reasons: supporting the same political party, working at the same machine, and being in the same cohort. The

workers form relationships based on these categories both in the labor process and in their social lives.

> Either in the tearoom or in the cafeteria… we were a factory where 500 people were working. Everyone would sit with their group. Rightists are at one side, leftist at another. Those who have a similar mentality sit together. There were Menzilists, Süleymanists, Fethullah supporters. Not much Fetö supporters but there all these separate groups. They invited me a couple times. They would get together on the weekends, have conversations. (Deniz, see Appendix, 101)

> We talk about the everyday life. We have been bored for the last two nights, so we are talking politics. We are bringing CHP and AKP supporters against each other, then withdraw and watch. CHP supporters say something to the air. They are against everything, too. They had lots of votes from Kayseri but there were only three or four CHP supporters I know. They say, we are Kemalists, we are communists. (Oğuz, see Appendix, 102)

However, the separations that affect the social relations of the workers are not strong enough to create forceful disintegration among workers in the labor process. The workers explain the situation as follows:

> We have fun conversation when we are at the machine, that is different. There, we pass the time like that. Our workmates are not our kin but it is a part of it; we are fighting with people, there are punches and kicks flying in the air sometimes. The human psychology… when the time comes, we can sit and drink tea, we can show tolerance to each other at least. The worker can sympathize with his fellow worker. The employer does not; if the employer did, this would not be the state of the worker. (Olgun, see Appendix, 103)

Separation among the workers is one of the elements that determine the workers' behavioral patterns and their consciousness of collective action. They carry the potential of both disintegration and unification. Workers who work on the same shift, or at the same machine establish especially close relations with one other. When asked if they have any disagreements and clashes among each other, they reply thus:

> Has not happened yet in our place. Maybe it happens but I know my machine and the next one. I do not know about the rest. I do not care to. At most, I go to barbecuing with friends from my machine. (Saffet, see Appendix, 104)

> There are different sections in our place. Everyone hangs out with whoever is in their section. They always work together so there is in intimate atmosphere

> there. You spend ten hours in the factory at the end. We see each other more than we see our families. We talk about everything. Movies, series, TV, football, politics. (Halim, see Appendix, 105)

The workers who spend time with each other outside the factory have a higher probability of acting together in the processes of decision-making:

> I do not have much to talk with other workers. If I have a problem, I talk to Ömer. I ask his advice. Whatever Ömer is thinking, I am probably thinking the same thing. (Yaşar, see Appendix, 106)

In this line, the factions the workers establish because of their distinctions do not prevent them from building a common struggle, as shown in the last analysis. On the contrary, the close relationships within each faction results in quicker decision-making and a more sustainable decision. In the end, workers self-organizing to manage a strike and their manner of conduct against layoffs following the strike are connected to the culture of solidarity that evolved out of the factions and distinctions among the workers, in an environment where the workers do not trust their union and do not think that they will be able to approach their troubles through the union.

5.5 The wildcat strike

In this section, I will use the example of wildcat strike to examine how certain dynamics of the labor-control mechanisms which have been subject to changes in the labor processes since the founding of Boydak Holding are dissolved by the workers' experience. A strike is not the "instance" in which different control mechanisms are broken off, but rather the instance in which the process established on contradictions and experiences that can be labelled as collective are most visible. In this segment I will discuss the developed and developing interpretive experiences of the workers, the references with which the workers participate in the strike and what these mean

in terms of the dissolution of different labor control mechanisms in the encounter between worker and management.

On the second of February 2015, nearly three thousand Boydak workers went on strike over low wages, the length of time between episodes of collective bargaining, and compulsory overtime working hours. When it came time for collective bargaining, a struggle immediately began in Boytaş, one that continued for almost two days. Boytaş workers who were laid-off because they either led or participated in the strike narrate the attitude of the union and the workers in the labor agreement term a few months before the strike as follows:

> In February 2015, the union was trying to wrap this labor agreement. It had been a month or so. The union seemed to have fought but the workers were seeing that there was no fight there. This agreement had already been made as far as I know. It was named and whatnot but just to test the waters they started with this talk of taking the thirty percent of it at the end of 2014. The secretary of Öz Ağaç İş union from Ankara came, the manager came, they are walking around the factory; they are inciting the workers like, we are going to get pay increase more than we expect, etc. Just do your jobs, do not neglect it, work, always work, let us not fall on bad terms with our employer… I assure you; I heard these words from all the managers: you are going to get a pay increase more than you expect. It was clear that something else was going on, but we also wanted to believe it, because we had been there at the factory for 12-13 years with no significant increase, and there is this financial crisis. We thought, if they are saying so, we are going to get an increase. We believed it, motivated the workers. I was a foreman back then. In the meetings, I also told them stuff like, we are going to get a nice increase. Care about your work, do not neglect it and whatnot. (Deniz, see Appendix, 107)

Negotiations that start with "three percent," despite the union's suggestion that "the pay increase will be very good this year" unsettle the workers. As a result, the workers do not wait for the negotiations to continue but prefer to interfere at that moment. The reactions of the workers after hearing "three percent" are summed up by Deniz in the following quote:

> During the second meeting, I was going to the lavatory. There was a group there, talking. I approached them, asked, what is going on? Then I saw there are representatives. They closed the door, said, we came from the meeting. Result? The boss offered three percent, but we are resisting. He is resisting to

> three percent, unbelievable. What in three percent are you resisting? Then you are cussing at all these people. I consider this an insult to myself; you are swearing at me. No, he said, guys, this is just the beginning. Where are you going to fix it, though; where the negotiation starting with three percent will end… Thirty percent? You can do at most nine percent, I said. Do you think that is reasonable, I asked? There were already talks and an air of anger inside after people heard about three percent, because there was this accumulation since we have not had any increase since 2007. A bit fear, a bit worries as to what is going to happen. Will there be an increase or not…? What would happen to us if we stand against it, walk against it, rebel against it? Because we had not experienced it before. (Deniz, see Appendix, 108)

The fear, distrust and worry from before the labor agreement is also the prevalent tendency before the start of the strike. The relative independence of the shift chiefs and the foremen enable them to establish more efficient communication with the other factories and come up with a common approach. In other words, the fact that the foremen are more mobile inside the workplace and that they are not under technical or bureaucratic control render them the natural leaders of the strike.

> There is a talk in the factory, 10 minutes later every one of them will hear it. After the morning shift that day, we dispersed to our homes. Talked on phone at the evening. Friends called us, told us, Boytaş 4-5 is in upheaval. They turned off their machines, protesting the three percent. We got hope there, said let us go in the morning. Morning came, but it was suppressed by the department managers. We arrived at the factory in the morning, everyone is looking at each other. They are all waiting for a spark. Someone should give that spark. I walked around, gathered people from other departments, said, come on, let us desert the machines. I was a foreman, I can go walk around, and nobody can ask me where I had been. I looked around the other departments as well; when I was doing that, the unionist saw me and stared at me. I approach my friends and we talk in whispers. 10 or 15 minutes passed, every one gathered turning their machines off; there were of course a few dishonorable people who did not. There were those who were hiding in the toilet, etc.…they got awards later. Some used paid leave. We learned about these later, of course. (Deniz, see Appendix, 109)

The fact that are three different shifts of Boytaş workers is an obstacle for the conditions to realize the strike which is already unplanned and disorganized. In a labor process where the tensions frequently fluctuate, deserting machines to start a strike, and continuing production are equally possible. At this point, the statements

and attitudes of the natural leaders, and the factions and segregation among workers become the main elements that ensure the workers' refusal to work.

> First, we gathered around the machines in the middle of the factory. The production manager came and tried to make an explanation in his own rights, like, dear friends, do not be incited by the provocateurs, this is not real, we are going to give you the increase you demand, but a little bit of time is needed, please be patient, your union is resisting, etc. Of course, the union is invisible at that point. Then a call came to me, they said, Boytaş 2 3 4 5 all quit work. They are all at the door, you go out too. The manager was giving that speech, I cut in and shouted: Boytaş 2 3 4 5 all quit working, come on, let us get to the gate! They all looked at each other's eyes there: shall we stay, or shall we go? They were hesitant. I said, come on, man up a little, be a man, march! When I said that, of course, we all went out to the gate, 400-450 workers. (Deniz, see Appendix, 110)

Besides being fundamental to the maintenance of solidarity and resistance to authority, coworker relations can also be important in affirming group identities, including gender identities (Hodson, 2004, p. 48). Similarly, Collinson (1988) notes how sexual banter among male workers helps to reaffirm masculinity as a parameter of work identity separate from formal job descriptions. Boytaş workers, according to the statements of the workers, were able to make a collective decision. At moments when a critical decision should be made the effectiveness of contradictions that manifest in terms of dignity, honor and manhood for the workers can be attributed to the separation of the workers' world from that of the employers, based on the common language they create through their accumulated experiences.

> They were already gathering us at the gate, saying, we are going to get the increase, please do not go, do not stop working, this is an illegal demonstrations and whatnot. You are going to be laid-off, you will not be getting compensation pay. They were trying to inject fear in us. I took the stage and made a speech there, too. I said, look, I have three kids, two of them are attending school. My kid went to school this morning, I could put only three liras in his pocket, and I so deeply resented this that I cried in the shuttle. I said, come on, empty your pockets for god's sake, and let me empty my pocket too, and let everybody see the difference between these two pockets. I said, you can take your kids to the bazaar, you can dress them as you like, you can feed them at a restaurant; I cannot do this, not even two or three times in a year let alone a moment. I said, enough is enough! I said, we are fed up! (Deniz, see Appendix, 111)

When the workers turned their machines off and gathered in front of the factory, it was not clear where they were going to march, what they were going to do or what opinion or material agency they were going to endorse. Therefore, although the natural leaders from all factories came together and tried to draw a route, further collective planning came to a standstill since the workers had not experienced a strike before and the march was announced to be "illegal" by the union.

> We did not have a leader. Stone whoever comes and goes. Someone from CHP came, with his white moustache and neat looks. He came, climbed down from his car. Friends, he said, as I see, you do not have a representative; you do not have a spokesperson who can communicate with the inside. If you let me, he said, I can talk to the inside. I can convey your wishes and demands, he said. Some said, we do not want CHP. You came here for your own benefit, etc. It was an inconsistent circle and that is because we did not have a union. If we had a union and the union told us, guys, this is the situation, do this, do not do that, these are the lines and this is our attitude, you do this, the rest is our duty, etc.… But no. Like, you keep a calf in the barn all winter and then you open the door come the springtime and the calf exults; the same happened with the workers. Without a protector they attacked whoever came their way. Because the people had it up to here. The dereliction. (Bahadır, see Appendix, 112)

> We got together with guys with leadership qualities who came from the other factory. Asked, what are we going to do now? Let us go the central steel factory. We wanted to march to bazaar. The union people from DİSK told us that the group would disperse if we marched there. They said, if it disperses, it will not mean anything. Anyway, we gathered there. Give and take, 3500 people. There were fellow workers who came to support us from factories we did not know. Guys from the night shift came, there were workers who came in their private automobiles. Almost 4000 people, we walked towards the central steel. We marched but it was rage. It was anger. It was an explosion. That is why we did not have anyone to lead the way, to gather people, to give advices. We were trying to make our voices heard in our own rights, but how can you do it with only 4000 people? We of course still could not see the union with us. They are nowhere to be seen. We arrived at our destination, to the side of the union managers there. They are arm in arm with our bosses, asking us our demands. They are like, why are you doing this, we are going to give you what you want. We are shouting, thirty percent. Someone said, in accordance with the decision made by the upper management Memduh Bey will talk to you. Then people first called for Şükrü Baba. They expected him to show his fatherhood. Şükrü Boydak, though, took their side and then people booed Şükrü Boydak too. After that, they booed whoever appeared. Because it was the moment the anger exploded. One comes out, says, there is nothing to do, Sevim. Another comes and says, if I give thirty percent, I will go bankrupt. The union already does not stand with the worker. So, this

> people reached the point of explosion, booed everyone. Some of the guys on the front, I guess a union manager he was, he scolded a worker. I was also at the frontline, and when I saw this—I had a fruit juice in my hand, we were hungry too, waiting there for so long, and we are cold because it's winter—I had just taken a sip from my juice when he shouted at the worker, then I got angry; I said, are you grownup enough to scold a worker you motherfucker, and hit his forehead with fruit juice. Then I saw, coins, metal plates and lighters were being thrown from the behinds. They of course run inside. In the meanwhile, we are being recorded by four or five cameras from above. (Deniz, see Appendix, 113)

After the fire of the strike fades, the workers become reluctant to stand side-by-side and to act in solidarity with their laid-off friends. There also emerges a sense of regret accompanying the proliferation of fear and worry. The workers explain the lack of solidarity in the period of layoff with references to individual attitudes shown during the strike:

> When the night came, the workers started to disperse due to hunger and exhaustion. We agreed to continue the next day, we said, we should directly come here with the shuttles. We dispersed around 1 at night. In the next morning, they did not let most of the shuttles leave. They did not bring us to the departments. The shuttles that came were pulled to the front of the factory and the security did not allow even for two people to gather in front of the factories. Whenever two people met, they were like, no gatherings, come on, go inside. Then there was a silence inside. We heard that some our friends were regretting; they were saying that they raised to the bait. But I am sure that 80-90 percent did not think like that because most of those who joined were old workers; they were the oppressed workers. They knew that they were not getting paid their dues. For, İstikbal had grown a lot in the last ten years, but did the worker grow as well? Absolutely not. (Deniz, see Appendix, 114)

> I was at the night shift at that time. We took our department out. There were guys hiding in the toilets. Some came out just not to be disclosed. What did they do, though? They stayed at the back and urged me: Cemal, say this, too, Cemal, say that, too. They are both urging and staying back. But I am in front of the cameras, talking and whatnot, and lo and behold, you are face to face with the union people. If you have a leadership position, that urge moves you the front. (Cemil, see Appendix, 115)

On the other hand, workers who participated in the strike from the back lines claim that they may have been provoked by those who came from outside the factory:

> The march had started at night, at the time we started our morning shift. I saw that the guys left their posts. We are in quality control, so we go testing

> whatever the production department made. We saw that they were all outside. There were those who coordinated it. Let us gather, Boytaş 1-2-3, let us march towards the holding and whatnot. Somebody directed it there, whoever that somebody is. They were then laid off. Because of the camera footage. We got twenty percent wage increase, though… Those who did not march are the bootlickers of the boss. (Halim, see Appendix, 116)

The strike was not organized by the union; on the contrary, it was also an expression of the anger amassed against the union. The workers who thought, depending on their past experiences, that the union would sign an agreement that suggested a low wage increase could act quickly and collectively, even though they do not have a strike experience. At this point, despite their distance to collective action as an organized class, they were able to reflect the experiences they somehow accumulated into the strike. The eruption of the strike, the organization of it and the march itself as an encounter were all reflections of experiences accumulated in the labor process. The Boydak workers who has not received a wage increase for years, is mobilized by:

1- The accumulation of different forms struggles with everyday responses against the hegemonic and despotic control intertwined in the labor process,
2- The dynamics conditioning the dissolution of the cooperation between management and worker in relation to the "sense of belonging" on which the factory builds itself,
3- The effectivity of the factions based on different commonalities among workers on the collective mobilization of the workers at the time of the strike.

A worker who had worked at the factory for fifteen years narrates the effect of having an employer he had considered as "father" a year after the strike: "we are now orphans; we don't have a father". Changes in labor process, thus changes in the organization of work and the existing labor-capital relation in the workplace comes to light in the workers' behavior during the collective action. For example, during the

strike the CEO of Boydak Holding, Memduh Boydak[37], must explain how Boydak is in bad economic condition and tries to direct workers back their duties. Workers do not listen his speech and demand Şükrü Boydak come and speak to them. Şükrü Boydak is a relatively elderly man and the workers code him as "father". He comes and tells the workers to be patient, adding: "you demand thirty percent rise. We can give this rise to you but after two years, all these factories will fail. Think all of these possibilities and go back your work". However, workers do not return to work. The whole picture, which becomes visible in wildcat strike, shows that there are set of loyalties which can be reproduced anytime to control workers. We understand from the experience of the workers that the father figure is transformed to an employer figure through the changes in both local and global context.

Additionally, workers who define themselves as religious participate in the strike with reference to a sense of Koranic justice. One of them states that "the one who witnesses the unrighteousness and does not speak of it is a mute demon". It can be said that, whereas religious conservatism produces consent in different forms of encounter in the labor process, it also draws a frame that legitimizes the religious workers' participation to the march. The workers participated in the march with reference to the Islamic rhetoric about seeking justice and claiming rights; this shows that Islam does not exist as a separate dynamic within the labor process. In other words, religious conservatism affects the behavioral patterns of the workers in relation to the other dynamics of the labor process. The same worker continues as follows:

> Sometimes I get so angry, with the coif on my head, I beg to Allah for help. Because they call me hodja there. If I lie to them, if I break my promises, then I would be setting a bad example. Then your word, your speech would be useless. The guys, may Allah be pleased, do not even cuss when I am there.

[37]https://www.evrensel.net/haber/103887/boydak-iscisi-isyan-etti

> That means I left beautiful traces. Do you know what the imam of Boytaş 2 told the workers that day at the march? He said, okay guys, we did our gathering, let us go back to our homes; so, they booed him. The news channel immediately wrote, the imam of the Boytaş 2 defended the Boydaks. Why did these things happen? Because Boydaks did not pay the workers' due, because there was a problem, that's why people took to the streets. It means you keep cutting the right of the worker. (Cavit, see Appendix, 117)

As seen in the example above, the hodja exhibits a similar attitude with most of the the workers' tendencies to ensure that the respect the workers' pay him would not be challenged. On the other hand, to befall the state the hodja of the other factory is unfavorable for him. That is, when the major tendency within the factory is to follow material interests, the hodja also supports this tendency from inside his own influential sphere. This, in turn, increases influence.

5.6 Concluding remarks

The labor process in the factories of Boydak Holding shows that although in many workplaces consent and subjugation still exist superficially, most workplaces are characterized by chaos and conflict. The workers render visibly emerging conflict meaningful, so that compromises and cooperation based on "sense of belonging" between the workers and the management dramatically decreases.

Thus, the conflictual relationship between the management and the workers creates segregation that opens a space for the culture of solidarity to sprout. As conflictual encounters between factory management and the workers become more obvious, the workers struggle against the hybrid forms of labor control and for their dignity at work. The economic struggle also contains provisions for the workers' reproduction of themselves and their lives, to claim their social rights and humane working conditions (Hodson, 2004). The class struggle is therefore also a struggle to overcome alienation and indignity.

CHAPTER 6

CONCLUSION

This thesis analyzed the dynamics of changes in labor control mechanisms paralleled by changes in labor processes in one of the Islamic Enterprises in Kayseri. It focused primarily on boundaries of consensual control, enabling an understanding of developing conditions for collective action. In other words, this thesis reveals the forms of labor control and conditions of resistance from the perspectives of capital and labor within a local context.

The main result drawn from this thesis is as follows: the case of Boydak workers shows the complexity of the relationship between control and resistance, conflict and cooperation particularly in the cultural, traditional and material interests of workers. Two sides of labor process (conflict and cooperation) are always present and dependent on each other (Gough, 2003). The tension between consensual and disciplinary class relations plays out in many ways.

As exemplified by dynamics studied in factories that are connected to Boydak Holding, changes in the labor process regarding global competitive relations has enabled new forms of labor control which maintain both consensual and disciplinary control. When the testimonies of the workers and employers interviewed within the scope of the research are evaluated as a whole, the main element of how the workers are supervised is not “unique,” but is constantly taking new forms in the dynamic and continuously developing structure of the labor process. In other words, cultural hegemony based on religious-conservatism, paternalism and informal relations seems to determine the response and resistance of the worker in different conditions. Therefore, while the active encounters of the various elements of the labor control

provide a form of justification, they also produce new relationships within this form, including possibilities of resistance. Hence, the labor control in this case is not based only on rhetoric of Islam, role of paternity or on the logic of disciplinary control. On the other hand, when the study is examined as a whole, it shows the contradictory and dynamic nature of the labor process and shows how control and resistance are built together and inextricable from one another.

Hence, I proposed that the relationship between labor control and resistance is not based on temporal distinctions. On the contrary, it is interrelated and constantly re-establishing. An element which, in some contexts, is a source of consensual control, in others becomes the dynamic of a "legitimate" resistance, aided by changes in how workers interpret their experiences. At this point, the rules of the dialectical relationship between labor control and resistance emerge demonstrating a dynamic labor process.

According to the research presented in this thesis, the dialectic of labor control and resistance has three founding characteristics under the factories owned by Boydak Holding.

First, consent can take different forms within the interchange of self-conditioned associations. This does not mean that consent is out of the question, but it does show that the way in which workers interpret their experience as an active participant of the labor process can vary, thus the elements of the consent can be differentiated. It can be said that, while the worker's dependency is not provided through the manipulation of the worker, the worker can determine the forms of conflict and cooperation as active participants in the labor process. In her study *Hidden forms of resistance among Turkish workers,* Yücesan (2003) emphasizes a similar point, stating that "they insinuate a critique of managerial strategies and the

control regime itself through their cleaver, creative, manipulative tactics and strategies of passive resistance".

Second, the "we" rhetoric of the consensus between workers and employers has been broken with the change of the material conditions on which this discourse is based. The cooperation built on the consensual control between the worker and the employer has been shaken by new methods of productivity and created new forms of encounter between the employer and the worker. Two examples of the new production strategies employed by the disciplinary labor regime are Total Quality Management and Six Sigma. Direct disciplinary power (including coercion) coexists with apparent consensual control in the factory to build up hybrid forms of labor control within the dynamic and conflictual labor processes, resulting in multiple forms of hidden resistance.

Third, the fact that the way in which the factory management regulates the reproduction of consent is being carried out within the labor process does not change how the workers are subjugated. I mean, even if the factory establishes a relationship with the workers based on cooperation and gives the opportunity to express the individual problems of the workers does not produce a consent that will prevent them from expressing the class demands of the workers. Thus, the maintenance of the "theater" and concessions through the cultural hegemony of Islamic rhetoric does not cover the material contradictions. Particularly, sharp working conditions, increasing demand for efficiency, and inspections have caused accumulated anger within the resistance. In such cases, contradictory obedience demonstrated by workers indicates that the cultural hegemony is also binding on the employers in their reciprocity (Durak, 2011).

When the findings of the research are evaluated within the context of similar studies, the following can be said:

The study most closely related to this thesis was conducted by Durak (2011) with a total of 30 participants from Konya Organize Sanayi, 15 of them workers, 10 employers and 5 unemployed with experience working in the industrial sphere. Durak (2011) found a cultural hegemony, which follows the popular logic of being subjected to the working class and shaped based on religious conservatism. But the findings of Durak's (2011) study and his methodology is precisely the approach which my work tries to overcome. It is not a coincidence that a study, which discusses forms of subjugation and obedience while excluding the possibilities of resistance, interprets the working-class culture as largely trapped within the templates of the ruling class. At this point, Durak (2011) has hinted at the conditions of the breakdown of cultural hegemony through the experience of the working class, but only while understanding the experience through open/pure material contradictions. In other words, by suggesting that religion is a cover put on the class relations, he also perceives the experience as something that will uncover conflicting relation between labor and capital. In my research, however, experience is not a drive for uncovering the fog, but is a condition for the redefinition of conditions that produce consent and for these elements to gain new meanings in the labor process. As seen in the relations bringing the labor process to a strike in the factories owned by Boydak Holding, this strike is not a moment that uncovers the fog; rather it is a picture of how the workers turn the contradiction into collective action with all the possibilities of the process. Within this picture, “religion,” which is considered by Durak as the sole element of cultural hegemony does not obscure material contradictions, but becomes a driver in the process of striking, even though it is an

area on which the workers' rhetoric is based. My approach differs from Durak's at this point, in the importance I place on explaining the "invisible." My main approach is to expose the "invisible" one, which is in the process of becoming, and to elucidate relationships that are unobvious. Thus, resistance that occurred "today", "whenever it occurs always emerges out of what existed and accumulated yesterday, including the possibilities contained therein, and always led (and will lead), in the very same ways that it has, to what can and will take place tomorrow" (Ollman, 2006, p. 3). At this point, dialectics guides the transfer of the items of reality we are trying to examine to those who do not generally think dialectically about the resulting conclusions about this reality (Ollman, 2006). For this reason, the main distinction of my research from related studies is the question of how to reflect social reality. In other words, the main problem here is that reality is more than just an image of itself, and in this respect, it is very misleading to focus only on the images, on the instantaneous and direct data (Ollmann, 2006).

On the other hand, some conclusions from this research are quite parallel to the findings of Durak in the study. Cases were found in which employers showed frustrated or unsuccessful theatres. In situations where contradictions are crystalized enough to be observed, the responses of the workers have also manifested in visible forms. The forms of daily resistance of workers are both visible and hidden, that are observable in the cases of absenteeism and meaning making, when a strike becomes crystallized. However, Durak (2011) states that, considered within the framework of "conflicted obedience," these individual reactions cannot lead to a fundamental break and will even create some form of obedience. At this point, our disagreement with Durak (2011) is more about how the overt or covert responses of workers may affect the class struggle, whether their response to unsuccessful theatres will be a sort of

obedience or resistance. The real problem is that workers are perceived as passive agents who are manipulated even when they respond. In other words, the boundaries of cultural hegemony are sought in the concessions of the employer, the failure of the founding myth and the transparency of material contradictions. However, the fact that the employer fails to maintain labor control through cultural hegemony in changing work relations shows that the workers are not manipulated, passive agents; they are active participants who affect the course of the labor process.

The most difficult part of the study was determining how to express different connections, without distorting them and while granting them the appropriate weight and importance. The use of dialectics tries to overcome this problem by taking the process of getting to the final state of things and the interactivity floor they have in them as a part of what they are and by expanding our notion towards anything at this point. One priority was to avoid the question of why something has changed, as if it has not changed before and only started to change when I began to study the dynamics at hand. This perspective helped me understand the changes in consent itself via the changes in its objective and founding elements while trying to understand consent as a labor control form**.** A remarkable number of studies focus on constant forms of subjugation and obedience, producing the illusion of workers that have been manipulated without developing a class struggle. I have tried to show the many possibilities and inherent dynamism in the most constant relationships in the labor process.

I have also tried to portray the labor process in Boydak Holding's factories through the lens of labor power control, contradictions and possibilities of resistance. I have tried to show, not a wildcat strike in such a religiously conservative workplace points to a major breakdown at the control of labor process, but instead to expose the

dynamics at play to try to understand how it came to be, as if there had never been such a relationship before. I argue that this perspective gets closer to the social reality that determinist explanations have darkened, that subjugation is only possible within the possibility of resistance, and that relations that result in a strike have already matured in the labor process. My contribution to a dialectical research methodology in labor studies consists of breaking up perceptions of different but related elements of labor in the labor process that have, prior to now seemed to exist independently.

The scope of the thesis is not enough to understand the role of reproduction sphere on the possible forms of cooperation and conflicts among workers. After strike, I was expecting workers' solidarity to be strengthened, yet I observed deeper despair and competition among each other. Thus, further researches can be made on the dialectical relation between production and reproduction spheres to understand the role of everyday life culture of workers on class culture. In this line, several questions can be formulated for future investigations. How do we distinguish between everyday life culture and class culture that point out class interest? Should we approach these two as separate spheres? I think we require an analytic distinction between everyday life culture and class culture. Yet, workers continue to live in the same neighborhoods, they continue to struggle with the same economic problems; share the same culture, which may allow developing informal solidarity relations in their living spaces. Therefore, cooperation and conflict in the labor process cannot easily be understood without any reference to the dynamics such as pre-existing networks, local culture, and family life. In this line, to analyze how the working-class culture penetrates to the everyday life culture and, conversely, how and in which ways everyday life is permeating the working-class culture needs further questions.

APPENDIX

ORIGINAL INTERVIEW QUOTES

1. (Hasan): Benim tesislerim yetmiyor. Dışarıdan ürün ürettiriyorum. Fason deyince yanlış anlaşılıyor diye yan sanayi geliştirme diyoruz biz. Direk herhangi bir şekilde bağlılıkları söz konusu değil, ama benim kalite kontrol elemanım gider orada kontrollerini yapar. Orada kullanacağı malzemelerin belki birçoğunu ben veririm. Benim standartlarıma göre üretecek. Benim kalite kontrol elemanım her ürünü yüzde yüz kontrol ettikten sonra teslim alır.

2. (Nazan): Tüm bölümler, işçilerin sosyolojik sorunlarını çözmek veya oradaki işçileri motive etmek yerine yeni ürün gruplarına odaklanıyor. Artık enerjimizi yenilikler için harcıyoruz. Bir rüzgâr var ve o rüzgârı kaçırmak istemiyoruz.

3. (Erdal): Mavi yakayı işe katmak her zaman en zor işlerden biridir. Yani, onun düşüncesini, işle ilgili fikrini almak zordur. Çünkü onun kendine önem verildiğini, kendi fikirlerinin anlamlı olduğunu hissetmesi lazım. Hissetmeden açıklamaz. Hatta çok zaman iyileştirmeyi kendi için bir tehlike olarak görür. İşten çıkarılma ya da bundan sonra daha yoğun çalıştırılma baskısı olarak görebilir. Fakat, işçiler çevrelerindeki insanların kendilerini ve sorunlarını anladıklarını hissedince işe daha bir sıkı sarılır.

4. (Mert): Mesela önerisi kabul ediliyor, biz önerisini de veriyoruz. Ama uygulanmıyor. Adam çok sinirleniyor öyle olunca. Yani adam ben parasında değilim diyor. Uygulansın çünkü ben zorlanıyorum burada diyor. “Yeter ki o çözülsün para da istemiyorum” diyor.

5. (Kadir): Çalıştığın ortamda her şeyin yerli yerinde olması, düzenli ve temiz olması gerekir. Bu zaten insanı psikolojik olarak da çok etkiler. Çalıştığın ortamın dağınık olması bir kere seni olumsuz etkiler. Biz işçilere bu konuda sürekli eğitim veriyoruz. Bunu da yapan kendileri zaten. Denetleriz ve puan veririz. Puana göre de yorumlarda bulunuruz.

6. (Hakan): Benim olmazsa olmazlarım vardır. Ben muhafazakâr bir insanım. Benim önceliğim liyakattir. Şirket olarak da bu liyakat bizim için ön plandadır. Ama istisna da oluyor tabii. Bizim daha önceki patronlarımız (Boydaklar) “bunu alacaksın” dedim mi alacaksın yani. Patronlar sonuçta. Ama benim patronum da şunu bilir. Onlar için de liyakat ön planda.

7. (Serdar): Şirketimizdeki en büyük kriter çalışanların alanında yetkin olmasıdır. Ancak hepsi iyi ve nitelikli adaylar ise o zaman akrabalık ve referanslar devreye girebilir. Mesela, geçen gün siyasi parti üyesi bir işçi mülakat için geldi. Bu partinin aktif üyesi olduğunu ve dışarıdaki toplantılara katılabileceğini söyledi. Çok da yetenekli bir adam. Ancak iki gün sonra gelip de toplantılara ve etkinliklere katılmak için izin ister diye düşünerek onu işe almadım.

8. (Hakan): İnsanlar gelip bana dertlerini anlatabilirler. Her türlü sıkıntısını maddi olarak gidermeye çalışırız. Kendimiz şirket olarak ayrıca burada bir Boydak Eğitim ve Kültür vakfımız vardı. Vakıf olarak yapardık bu işi. Bir olay anlatayım. Burada çalışan bir işçinin hanımı kansermiş. Bana durumu izah ettiler. Dedim ne kadarlık bir fiyat, dediler üç bin. "Tamam, ben çözerim problem yok" dedim. Kendim hallettim yani. Şirkete yansıtmadan yani inisiyatif kullanıyorum.

9. (Nazan): Bu fabrikalar kadar da insanların özel durumuna müsaade eden yerler yok gerçekten. Batıda birçok fabrikada olan baskı burada yok. Daha duygusal işyeri buralar. Şurada bir hastası olduğunda araç ayarlayıp evine gönderme filan... Bunlar devam ediyor. Burayı özel kılan şeyler zaten onlar. Yani burada birinin çocuğu hastaysa hemen ona araç ayarlanıp evine gönderiliyor. Cuma günleri bu fabrikada her şey duruyor ve 45 dakika cuma molası veriliyor. Ve bizim makineler aslında durmaması gereken, durduğunda hata veren makineler.

10. (Serdar): Yani şimdi bizim dinimizde en önemli şeylerden biri adalet. Yani biz burada yönetici olarak adaleti sağlamalıyız. Kim olursa olsun herkese eşit iş yükü dağılımını sağlamamız lazım. Tabii giyimimize kuşamımıza da dikkat ederiz, buranın belli kuralları vardır yani. Zaten bizim dinimiz olumsuz bir şey istemiyor ki! Hep olumlu şeyler istiyor. O yüzden gereğini yerine getiririz.

11. (Murat): Kul hakkına riayet ediyorsanız her zaman en doğru işi yaparsınız, en verimli işi de yaparsınız. Kimsenin hakkını çalmazsınız. Burası özel bir şirket. Buranın sahipleri sana güvenmişler, seni çalıştırıyor ki verilen işleri yapsın diye. Ben gerçekten kul hakkına riayet ediyorsam, hiçbir şekilde hırsızlık yapmam. Eğer sana verilen saatte verimli çalışmazsan zaten buranın patronu kimse onun hakkına geçmiş oluyorsun yani.

12. (Erdal): Ne yazık ki, namaz burada kaytarma aracı olarak kullanılıyor. Mesela molayı kullanıyor ve sonra namaz kılmak için 10 dakika fazla mola kullanıyor. Ama istirahatte de yapabilir ibadetini. Fakat biz bu meseleye müdahale etmiyoruz. Çünkü işçiler "patron namazımıza bile müdahale ediyor" diye düşünebilirler. Müdahale etmesek bile, böyle bir algı olabilir. Bilirsin, sürü davranışları olduğundan, işçi bu tür olaylardan derhal etkilenir. Ve yönetime olan güveni de zarar görebilir. Ayrıca, bu tür söylentiler başka yerlerden duyulursa bizi zora sokan bir duruma da girebiliriz.

13. (Cavit): Ben Şükrü Boydağı tanırdım. Ama o camiye geldiği zaman anlıyorsun çok mütevazı biri. Hiçbir zararını görmedik. Hatta ve hatta birilerinin bazı mağduriyeti olduğu zaman Şükrü Boydak yardım ederdi. Şükrü Boydak camide namaz kılıyordu. Arkadaşımın biri çok sıkışmış. Bizzat gördüm. "Napayım acaba müdürlere filan mı gideyim?" dedi. Ona da kaş göz yapıp Şükrü Boydağı gösterdiler. O arkadaşımız da gitti yanına. Ha o günde benim yanıma geldi çalışmaya. Dedim "ne oldu? "Halletti" dedi yav. Yarın gel de personele senin işini halledelim dedi yav. Ona ben canlı tanığım yani. Ama diğerleri sadece kulaktan duyma.

14. (Halim): Ben kimsenin babalığını görmedim. Bazı arkadaşların sıkıntılarını gidermiştir. Senin en büyük iş adamı olarak işçinin sıkıntısını gidermemen zaten

ayıp olur. Bazı küçük fabrikalarda işçisinin sıkıntısını gideriyor. Görmedim ben böyle bir şey. Çok yakın olan insanlar gidip cep harçlığı vesaire isteyebilir. Benim kalkıp Şükrü Boydak ile görüşme imkânım yok. Komşusudur veya komşusunun bir tanıdığıdır o vesile ile gidip konuşabilir.

15. (Yamin): Ben üç senedir görmedim böyle bir şey. Sadece bir yangında evini kaybeden bir arkadaş vardı. Ona mesela 15 bin lira gibi bir yardımda bulunuldu. Ama mesela bir arkadaşımızın çocuğu olmadı, defalarca yardım istedi tedavi için. Bir kuruş yardımda bulunmadılar. Hatta daha sonra işten çıkarıldı. Paramızı vermiyordu, hakkımızı yiyordu, mesaimizi vermiyordu diyemem. Allah var. Ama ilgilenmiyordu. İşçinin bir değeri yoktu orada. Ben görüşmek istediğim halde görüşemedim patronla. Kim nasıl görüşüyormuş. İşten çıkartılacağım durumda bile görüşemedim. Adalet bunun neresinde...

16. (Bahadır): Onlardan tazminatımı ödemelerini istedim. Böylelikle, evimin kredi borcunu ödeyecektim. İlyas Boydak'a gittim. "Valla Bahadır, Allah için yapabileceğim hiçbir şey yok" dedi.

17. (Olgun): İşçiye adaletli davranan bir patron istiyorum. Bir fabrikaya girdiğinde, bana "arkadaşlar kolay gelsin!" diyebilmeli. Şimdi Olgun neden Hacı Boydak'tan hoşlanmıyor diye düşünebilirsiniz. O (Hacı Boydak) dört ya da beş ay önce işe geldi. Sanırsın arkasından atlı kovalıyor öyle hızlı yürüyor. Böylece herhangi birinin onu durdurup da bir şey sormasını engellemiş oldu. Dışarda ismi büyük. Ama ben 13-14 yıldır Kayseri'deyim. Hacı Boydak'ı iki ya da üç kez görmüşümdür. Eğer sen benim patronumsan, daima fabrikaya gelmeli ve bizimle konuşmalısın.

18. (Oğuz): Ne kadar deseniz de öyle bir şansınız yok yani. Ben derim şöyle olsun, diğeri de derki öyle iyi değil, öbür türlü olsun. 50 kişilik bir işletme değil ki devamlı gelsin işçisiyle ilgilensin. Büyük bir şirket.

19. (Olgun): Rabbim diyor ya işçinin alnının teri kurumadan işçinin hakkını vereceksin. Kuranda yazıyor. Ama ne oluyor benim alnımın teri soğumuş gitmiş eziyet çekmişim ben. Diyorum ki kötü günümde olmayan parayı ben napayım. Diyorum ya dinimizce her şey günah, haram, ama her şeyi yaşıyoruz. Bunun hani günahı nerede, haramı nerde. Boydak grubu istediği kadar cami yaptırsın. İstediği kadar okul yaptırsın işçiye bir şey vermediği zaman...

20. (Cavit): Herkesin bir konumu vardır. Ben patron değilim. Ama şu bir gerçek ki her şey adalet sahibi Allah'ındır. Eğer o patron o işçinin hakkından sırtından yiyorsa eyvah onun haline. Ama burada işçinin de görevi çok önemli. O da çalıştığı zaman patronuna ihanet etmeyecek.

21. (Sedat): Biz sekiz saat çalışıyoruz, sekiz saat içinde aldığımız parayı fazlasıyla hak ediyoruz. Yani daha fazla bile verse bize hak ediyoruz yani. Oruç tuttuğumuz dönemde mesela aşırı derecede sıcak oluyordu dışarısı 30-40 derece ise içeride 50 derecede çalışıyorduk. Fazlasıyla hak ediyoruz yani o konuda bir sıkıntımız yok. Şöyle söyleyim alnımız terlemeden eve gitmiyorduk

22. (Sedat): Geçmişe dönük bir dükkânın yüzde yirmi kar etme oranı var. Bunu biliyoruz. Ama dükkânın kirası, adamın maaşı bunlarla ne olur bilmiyoruz. O zamana göre hesaplanmış, şimdi nasıl olur bilmiyoruz. Hani o kadar derine inemiyoruz, onu illaki dini profesörlerimiz var, onlar hesaplıyor. Bunlara uymak ama benim için o kadar da önemli değil, biz işçiyiz, kâr marjını düşünmeyiz yani. Biz sadece emeğimizin karşılığını alıp veya almamakla ilgileniyoruz. Ticaret yapmıyoruz ki kâr marjının peşine düşelim.

23. (Cafer): İslam ahlakı derken onların hepsi geçmişte kalmış. Alnının teri kurumadan kim verir senin paranı. Günlük yevmiye mi versinler. İslam'a göre kurumadan vermesi lazım terin. Böyle bir şey mümkün mü? İslam'ı bırakacaksın şu anın şartlarına göre aylığını günü gününe yatıracak tamam. Mesela günlük para vermesi benim işime gelmez. Ben o parayı alır alır yerim. Ay sonunda ben ne yapacağım para yok. İyi bir şey değil. Dinimizde kabul ediyorum tamam ama. O zaman hemen gidip veriyorsun. Para birikmez. Gerçi bana günlük verseler ben biriktirebileceğime inanmıyorum. Mantıklısı bence aylık ödeme. Her türlü borç alırsın.

24. (Taner): İnsanların birbirine karşı sorumluluğu vardır. Ben senin her zaman iyiliğini düşünmekle mükellefim. Çünkü dinimiz onu emrediyor. Müslüman Müslümana yardım etmek zorundadır. Zorlukta, darlıkta, hastalıkta...Ölüsünde de dirisinde de. Bu insanlık kanununda da var. Ama fabrikada böyle işlemiyor.

25. (Taner): Eskiden cuma namazında fabrikanın tamamı kapatılırdı. Şimdi gruplar var. Her salonda 12 makine var. Diyor ki bir grup çalışacak burada. Yani dörtte bir çalışmaya devam ediyor.

26. (Cafer): İşin bence dinle alakası yok. İş ile din işlerini karıştırmak bence yanlış. Ustabaşılarının çoğu zaman beni namaza göndermezlerdi. Kılma derlerdi, karışmaz olurlar mı? Boydaklar varken ben yeni işe girdiğim zaman başlarda karışmıyorlardı. Daha sonra belirli bir zaman geçti ve ustabaşıları namazları istirahat saatlerinde kılmamızı söylediler. Bazı usta başları da var git namazını kıl gel, diyor. Senin yerine bir adam ayarlıyor örneğin. Bu işi kim yapıyor bilmiyoruz. Müdürler mi söylüyor şefler mi söylüyor ustabaşıları mı söylüyor bilmiyorum.

27. (Deniz): Kadir gecesinde mesela bir gün gece vardiyasında kuranı kerim okutturacaklar işte sonrasında işbaşı yapacaz. Yav baktık ki yemek molası yok. 50 dakikaydı 20 dakika yaptık. Yarım saat de onu oradan kestiler. Dinlettikleri kuranın yarım saatini yemek molasından kestiler yani.

28. (Sedat): Ben o işçi-patron yakınlaşmasının Avrupa'daki gibi olmasını isterim. Güzel bir uygulama. Yani bir şefi bile masamıza oturtamıyoruz, ama ben bunu patronum nezdinde görmek isterim. Bir Müslümanda olmaması gereken özellikler kibir, kendini beğenme. Biz kâfir dediğimiz insanlarda gurur kibir hiç yok, olmaması gereken Müslümanda gurur kibir var.

29. (Cafer): Benim için fark etmiyor. Umreye giden arkadaşlar da oldu. Benim için Müslüman olup olmaması fark etmez. Millet aldığı paraya bakıyor. Gurbete

çalışmaya gidenlere bakalım ya Hristiyanlığa çalışmış ya da Yahudi ile. Orada bir tane Müslüman yok. Türk olması veya yabancı olması benim için fark etmez.

30. (Deniz): Benim bir duyumuma göre şöyle bir olay geçmiş. Sabancı'yla bunların arasında. Tabii bu bir rivayet. Sabancı'ya demişler sayın Sabancı Kayseri'de aşırı derecede hızlı büyümekte olan bir fabrika var. Demiş, "ne üzerine?" Demişler, "ağaç, mobilya üzerine." Kesinlikle, demiş. Ağaçta, mobilyada o kadar para yoktur, demiş. Oradan bir tane işçinin bordrosunu getirin kontrol edelim. Sabancı bordroya bakıyor diyor ki; kardeşim bu insanlar ağaçtan kazanmıyor diyor, bu insanlar işçinin sırtından kazandı diyor. Gerçekten de Boydakların bu kadar büyümesindeki en büyük etken işçiyi ucuza çalıştırması. İşçinin hakkını vermemesi.

31. (Cavit): Evvela şu çok önemli. İşçinin patrondan beklediği tek şey isin aslı maddiyattır. Bugün işçilerin ağzı açıldığı zaman şunu diyorlar: Sabancı diyormuş ki benim işçim çalışırken işçimin evi de olacak arabası da olacak diyormuş. Bunu biz duyuyoruz yani. Hani bizzat duymadım ama genelde bunu söylemeseler çıkmaz bu konu. Bir milletvekilinin maaşı 18 milyar lira. Neden peki bir işçinin maaşı 1400lira. Bir mazlum, bir gariban ne yapıyor karnını bile doyurmuyor onun için patrondan beklediğimiz az yesinler yani. Patronun altında sıfır Mercedesler BMVler ve her gün işe arabayla gidiyor geliyor. Bir yakıt ortalama 1400-1500 lira asgari ücretin de üzerinde. Bu vicdan mı, merhamet mi yani? Ama seni kim kalkındırıyor. İşçin kalkındırıyor. Türkiye'de şu olay yok maalesef. İşçilerde bir birlik yok.

32. (Cemil): Ben Mondi'deyken Kaizen filan yoktu. Baytaş'a geçtiğim zaman son yıllarda bir kaizen diye bir şey çıkardılar. Öneri sistemi bir öneri veriyordun puan alıyordun karşılığında. 1 veriyon 2 veriyon sürekli öneri çıkmaz ki işçiden. İşçinin zaten geçim sıkıntısı sırtında serviste üşüyor, kira derdi var, bide tutup öneri mi verecek. Sürekli aynı önerileri yazıyorduk. Kaizen de güzel bir önerinin hayata geçirilmiş haliydi.

33. (Bahadır): Öneri veriyorduk zorunluydu. Verdiğin öneriyi sen kendin takip edemiyorsun ki. Verdiğin öneri ustabaşının önüne düşüyor. O oradan oraya aktarılıyor. Belki ben mantıklı bir öneri veriyorum. Ustabaşı diyor ki; lan bu güzelmiş diyor önerini çalabiliyor. O yüzden, verdiğin önerinin sonuç vermeyeceğini bildiğin için saçma sapan şeyler yazıp veriyorsun. Mecbur olduğundan... Lambaların düğmeleri şurada, şuraya alınsın gibi basit öneriler veriyorduk. Mantıklı bir öneri verdiğin zaman gidiyor başkasına. Verdiğin önerilere göre puan biriktiriyorsun. Biriktirdiğin puan termos alacak puana giriyor, çoğalarak birikiyor. Adam tutuyor puanlarımın hepsine buçuk bardak yazıyor. Bana sormuyor bile ne istersin diye. O verdiklerinin de hepsini aldım çöpe bastım. Dedim "lanet olsun sizin vereceğiniz hediyeye".

34. (Taner): Ödül olayı da var. Onu zaten ustalar birlikte düşünüyorlar şunu şöyle yapsak daha iyi olur diye. Uysa da uymasa da ondan bir şeyler kazanıyorlar. Örme makinelerinde ustalar bir sistem geliştirdi. 900 dolguyu cavla sistemiyle 3 tane 300 ip bağlayarak 900 yaptılar. Ama bu işçinin zorluğu için işverenin karı için. İşçi yüzde yüz yoruluyor. 32 tane bobin bağlamak var, 42 çarpı 3 tane bobin bağlamak var. İşçinin karına yapılmış hiçbir şey yok.

35. (Olgun): 6s yönetimi çıktı yeni. Sıkıyönetim gibi bir şey. Şu peçete burada duracak, eğer şurada durursa bu masada kim var Ömer, Yasin, Mehmet. Bu peçete düzgün durmuyor diye bize 6s puanı düşük geliyor. Makinenin belli parçaları var, o parçalar yerinde olmazsa bize 6s puanı düşük geliyor. Makinenin üstünde yabancı bir madde olmayacak yani. Yeni bir sistem izim bölümde bu. Hani bizim çalıştığımız makinede tertip düzen yoksa bizim makinenin personeli ne düşük puan veriliyor. Hani prim olayı olacaksa eğer, yarın bizim makine düşük puan aldığı için elenecek.

36. (Taner): Hatta şemaları duvarlara astılar, pano yaptılar. Sil, süpür, düzenle gibi maddeleri vardı. Adam senden hem düzen istiyor hem müdahale süresi istiyor, hatasız iş istiyor. Her şeyi yüzde yüz istiyor yav. Bunlara ne verirsen daha fazlasını istiyorlar. Hiç gözleri doymuyor.

37. (Mahmut): Şimdi mesela arkadaş dokumacı. Biz dokumacıya dört makine verdik. Onun vardiyanın başında, ilk üç veya dört saatte aksaklık neyi var. Hortum kopuğu, makinenin sağında solunda zedelenme var mı diye her gün o makineyi kontrol edecek, olumsuzluk varsa yazacak. Olumsuzluk yoksa okey işareti koyup diğer makineye geçecek. Hem üretimi yükseltmek hem de işçiyle işi barışık hale getirmek amaç.

38. (Olgun): Bizim her makine başında böyle makine sorumlusu vardır. Makinede sekiz kişi var. Üç vardiya var, üç tane sorumlu var. Bir makineye, dört kişi, diğer iki makineye iki kişi bakıyor. Yemek saatinde, çay saatinde yer değişimi yapıyoruz. Bir sıkıntımız olduğu zaman atıyorum kumaşta hata var, hatayı tespit ediyoruz önce nereden geldiğini, ona göre sorumluya söylüyoruz. Sorumlu da işçi kendi aramızdan. Nerden baksan dört beş yıllık işçi orada. Kumaşta hata olunca düzenleme kâğıdına yazıyoruz, o şekilde sorumluya iletiyoruz memur mühendisler bakıyor hata büyükse, boyahaneye tekrar gidiyor baştan boyanıyor.

39. (Veli): Çıkan üretim büyükse 400 metre senin hatan da varsa ya maaşından ya da yansıtıyorlar sana bir şekilde. Hata olmasın diye işçiler daha çok sarılıyor.

40. (Ali): Makine mesela parça kırar, mekaniği bozulur. O zaman bu ayarları girersin. Asıl sigaraya molaya gittiğinde makineye girmek zorunda kalıyorsun kod. Giderken ve dönünce. Adam bakıyor bu 10 dk. sigaraya gitmiş. Girmezsen kodu fırçalıyor ustabaşı seni. Disipline gönderiyor. Onun da para cezası var tabii.

41. (Veli): İkea denetime geldiğinde valla OHAL varmış gibi. Yerler temiz olacak, yok makine üstünde çöp olmayacak. Eften püften şeyler. Çok sıkıyorlar.

42. (Oğuz): Biz mesela 12 tane yere bakıyoruz. Mesela atgı, çözgü kopuğunu kaç saniyede aldığın. Yani yürüme hızın bile görünüyor sistemde. Koşturacan.

43. (Nazan): Yani biz takip etmek istesek RFID kartta takarız adamlara. Düğme şeklinde cihazlar var, takarız. Ruhları bile duymaz. Biz de attığımız taş ürküttüğümüz kurbağaya değsin istiyoruz. Bir noktada ustabaşı yani altında beş altı tane adam var, onları takip edebilsin istiyoruz.

44. (Mahmut): Biz ilk girdiğimizde 15 yıl önce bize dediler ki, üstünüzden kimi görseniz selam vereceksiniz. Alt üst sistemi var ya askeriyede burada da aynısı var. Mesela fabrika ilk kurulduğunda 30 kişi toplantıya girerdik eğitim amaçlı. Ustabaşılarına kızarlardı altınızdakilerle dokumacılarla muhabbetinizi çok ilerletmeyin diye. Geçen toplandığımızda yine aynı şey söylendi. Dokumacılarla sen yüz göz oluyorsun diye.

45. (Yaşar): İşle alakalı konular olunca ustabaşı ile konuşuyorum. Şefte bizden biri zaten. Bi sıkıntımız olduğunda dinleyebilir bence. Şu ana kadar sıkıntım olmadı ama Allah var ilgileniyorlar. İzinle alakalı problem olunca yok arkadaş gidemezsin gelemezsin diyemiyorlar.

46. (Ali): 12 tezgâhı yatır, ayarı gir. Mahmut kazınsın dursun bana ne.

47. (Mahmut): 70 tane makinenin aynı anda hata yapması da mümkün değil. O saatte işletme müdürü fabrikadaysa zaten o da görüyor. Sabah geldiğinde direk sistemi açıyor. Hani makine ne kadar yatmış, niye yatmış, hepsi aynı anda niye yatmış görüyor.

48. (Ercan): Bizim burada ustabaşına, şefe yalakalık yapmak istiyor işçiler. Onlar daha üst seviyelere çıkıyor yani. Kayırma var yani. Hatta işletme şefi bizim bir çalışan arkadaşa gitmiş, içeride ne oluyor ne bitiyor bana anlat diye teklifte bulunmuş. Kim çalışıyor, kim kaytarıyor anlat demiş. Biz Mit deriz onlara.

49. (Sedat): Laf taşıyan insanlar oluyor, hemen o insanla aramıza mesafe koyuyoruz. Burada üç kişi konuşuyorsak varıyor dördüncüye söylüyor. Aynı işyerindeyiz küs olma şansın yok. Aynı vardiyada çalışıyoruz. Sadece mesafeli davranıyoruz. İyiler mutlaka kazanır.

50. (Sevkiyat memuru): Etüt sisteminde de etüt çalışanı gelir senin süreni tutar. Makinenin başında senin işini izler. 1 saatte mesela 100 parça diyelim makinenin kapasitesi. Sen onu çıkarabiliyor musun onu izler. Zaman ölçümü yapar, her parçayı ne kadar sürede tutuyorsun hesaplar. Sonra bu standartlaşır. Eğer bu standarda uyamazsan düşük çalışıyorsundur. Bu ekip de beyaz yakalılardan oluşuyor. İşçi sevmiyor tabii, herkes rahat çalışmak ister. Baskıyı sevmez. Ama bu sistem işçinin kaytarması ve boşa zaman harcamasının önüne geçer. 8 senedir uygulanıyor.

51. (Cafer): Etüt sistemi mutlaka her yerde var. Bu sistemi yaptığı için ilerliyor. İşin bitip gitmemesinin kaygısı yok mecbursun. Her parça için ayrı bir etüt yapılıyor en son tüm parçaları birleştirdiğim zaman etüt ortaya çıkıyor. Veya bandın sonunda duruyor hiç bu işlemlerle uğraşmıyor etütçü. Kamera ile çekim yapıyorlar. Kaç adet kanepe çıkmış.10 tane kanepe saniyede çıkıyor onu hesaplıyorlar. Dakikada 1 ise 10 dakikada 10 kanepe istiyorlar. 460 dakika çalışıyorsan 460 adet kanepe üretimini bekliyorlar. Biz zaten etüde inanmıyoruz. Çünkü tuvalete gittiğimiz zaman sen düşüyoruz diyorlar fakat öyle değil. Her Halükârda seni çalıştırıyor. Mecbur çalışmak zorundasın. Tempoyu düşürmek diye bir şey yok.

52. (Cavit): Eğer etütçülerin dini İslam olarak yanlışlıkları var. Hakkını nasıl verecekler bilmiyorum. Hakkıyla müdahale etmiyorlar. Adamlar ben tanık oldum yastık dikeceksek 10 saniyede bide bunun zaman kaybı var, yorulması var adam ben iğneyi geçiriyorum çıkarıyorum orayı kesiyor. O zaman ne oluyor. Ben bundan normal etüte göre 100 tane çıkaracaksam adam benden bunu 200 tane istiyor. Bu sefer performansı koşmaya başlıyor. Allah onu sana soracak. Ama işçiye de yakışıyor bu. Adam bunun etüdünü verirken diğeri yalakalık yapacam diye son performans çalışıyor. Tamam sen sağlıklısın verebilirsin böyle bir performans. Ama öbür arkadaşlarını düşün kardeşim.

53. (Halim): Ucuz atlatma sistemi var. Bizde her şeyin puanı vardır devamsızlık yapmazsam puan alırsın. 6 ayda bir ne kadar puanım birlikteyiz ona göre hediye alırsın. Etüt vardır. Her parçanın ve makinenin etüdü vardır. Parça ilk girdiği ve son çıktığı yere kadar etüdünü alırlar. Sisteme girerler. Etüdü veren işçiler fakat hepsi kayıt altına alınır. Yavaş çalışsa yavaş hızlı çıkarsa hızlı etüt ediyor. Bazıları vardır etütçü gördüğü zaman elleri Makine gibi çalışır. Bazıları da yavaş çalışır.

54. (Olgun): Ben şimdi Boyteks halıda çalışıyorum. Zorunlu mesai yok resmiyette ama iş yerinde var. Ben üç pazar dört pazar gitmesem kapının önündeyim. İşçi hakları sadece kâğıt üzerinde var.

55. (Bahadır): Hükümet ilen Fethullah Gülen ters düştükten sonra bizim Boytaş camiası yoğun bir denetlemeye girdi yani. O ana kadar hiç denetleme yoktu. O ana kadar biz sömürge altındaydık. İnsanlıktan çıkmış vaziyetteydik. Affedersin bir hayvan gibi görünüyorduk. Yılbaşı sayımında koca kapıda yatardık ısıtma sistemleri çalışmazdı. Dışarıdaki ayaz kadar içerisi de soğuk olurdu.

56. (Saffet): Geçen sene baya bunaltıcıydı. 12 saat çalıştırma durumu oluyordu. Hatta pazar günü de çalıştırıyorlardı. Hani 12 saat çalışıyorsun eve gidiyorsun zaten 7-8 saatin kalmış uyuyon. İnsan mal oluyor git-gel git-gel. İşyerinden başka dünya görmüyorsun çünkü. 1 yıla yakındır sadece vardiya şeklinde oluyor bu. Pazar mesaisi filan olmuyor.

57. (Bahadır): Bazen o kadar canımız yanıyordu ki kendimize biz eşek diyorduk yani. Bizim gibi eşek olduğu sürece bunlar da böyle gider. Kendimizi aşağılıyorduk yani. Kendimizi böyle dışlanmış gibi hissediyorduk. Sistem öyle bir sistemdi ki... Kul hakkı yemenin Allah katında da çok günahı var. Allah diyor benim yanıma ne ile gelirsen gel kul hakkıyla gelme. Bunların yaptığı ne? Çalışıyon hakkını vermiyor. Niye arkadaş olamıyok biz sizlen? Söylesen aile ortamındaydık güya. Hele bir tane Bülent Karakapı vardı. Allah onu benim karşıma çıkarmasın. Gider gelir buranın horozu benim derdi. “Biliyon mu lan Karaoğlan” derdi bana. Öyle salyasını saça saça gelirdi. Dışarıda görsen selam vermen ama müdür yapmışlar. Boytaş camiasının her tarafını öttürüyor adam.

58. (Deniz): Tabii adamların keyfi yerinde Ekinsu biri müdür biri şef. Adamların izin sıkıntısı yok maaş sıkıntısı yok herkesi kendi gibi sanıyor. Ama işçi öyle değil kardeşim işçinin zaten bin türlü derdi var. İşçinin borcu var, işçinin iş sıkıntısı var, kredisi, ev kirası var. Bu adamın zaten işe gelene kadar bir yon sıkıntısı var. Hani sende tepik vurunca işte canına tak etti dediğin an o an oluyor.

Ya diyor işçi ben varırım resti çekerim çok basit. Çıkar da giderim. Sonunda? İş bulana kadar belli bir zaman geçecek bulacak mı bulamayacak mı belli değil. O zaman zarfında bir sürü maddi sıkıntıya girecek. Ailesi huzursuz olacak. Çocuğu huzursuz olacak. Şu an işsiz kalması bir işçinin 2 yılına bedel.

59. (Cavit): Ne bir müdür yanına geliyor "selamünaleyküm kardeşim nasılsınız?" Böyle bir şey yok. Ayrıyeten müdürler patronlardan daha üstün. Sebebi şu. O adam patron olsaydı kim bilir nasıl olacaktı? İşçiyi yerine göre aşağılıyor bile.

60. (Bahadır): "Depo içerisinde çalışırken ben ceza verdiler kamyon yükleme yapıyordum. Tır yüklüyorduk, buzdolabıydı yazın hiç unutmam. Mesut bizim sorumlumuzdu. Adam geldi tır şoförü, sıcak yani ter ensemizden akıyor. Size bir güzellik yapayım mı gençler dedi. Napacan dedik. Hani buzdolabı ya, onun klimasını çalıştırayım siz de serin serin çalışın dedi. Tamam, abi dedik yav, sen onu yaparsan biz de senin işini daha çabuk bitiririz. Yalnız bu arada klima biraz gürültülü çalışıyor. Biz de aramızda birbirimize sesimizi duyurmak için bağırarak konuşuyoruz. İşte "dik", "yatır", "yatık at" ... Ustabaşı aşağıdan geldi böyle dedi "Hakan bağırarak konuşmayın". Hakan da böyle ezilmeyi sever yani. Fazla dik başlı değil, yumuşak başlı. Ben bunu hazmedemedim Sonuçta biz orada bağırarak konuşuyoruz da düğün çalmıyok. Kamyonun kasasının içinde bir insan ne yapar. E çalışır yani. Bağırarak konuşmayacakmışız. Ürünün üstünden atladım aşağı vardım yanına. "Ne diyon sen?" dedim. "Bağırarak konuşmayın Yusuf" dedi. Sen ne diyon lan ne bağırması ben burada işimi yapıyorsam bağırarak da konuşurum, istediğim gibi konuşurum. Hem dedim biz burada sohbet etmiyok, iş icabı konuşuyok. Ben istediğim gibi konuşurum, buna da sen engel olamazsın dedim. Sonra tartışmaya girdik. "Bak Yusuf dedi; git elim ayağım titriyor". Ne yapıcan, beni mi dövecen dedim. Dedim sen git, burası benim çalışma alanım. Sorumlumuzda orada ürün okutuyor. Gel dedim buraya Mesut. İş ilen alakalı benle bir sorunun var mı dedim. Haylazlık, çalışmamazlık yapıyor muyum dedim. Yok dedi. Döndüm Kadir'e bundan ötesine sen bana karışaman dedim. Sen değil, senin kralında karışamaz dedim. Gereken neyse onu yapıyorum, dışına da çıkmıyorum dedim. İyice bu bozuldu. Biz bir kafa kafaya geldik. Sonra Kürşat çıktı geldi. Bütün sevkiyat bizi izliyor. Gözümü kararttım. Sürgün edilip ceza alıyok, kamyonda eziyet çekiyok ya. Öyle soyutladılar orayı. Ora sürgün yeri. İnsanın psikolojik olarak bile işine bakış açısı değişiyor. Yani bir işi sevdirmek var, bir de orayı soyutlamak var yani. Ora sürgün yeri, eziyet yeri gibi izlenim bırakınca ben kamyona girdiğim zaman kendime hakaret gibi görüyorum. Öyle düşünen insanlar var. Çünkü siz orayı o şekilde ifade ediyorsunuz insanlara.

61. (Cemil): Kendime geldim işten çıkınca yav. Allah yüzüme bakmış. İyi ki çıkmışım. Fabrikada çalışıyon ya tıraş olmuyon. E kime süslenecen ki. Kimi görüyon ki. Sürekli çalışıyon. Adamlar bize iyilik yaptı aslında çıkararak.

62. (Deniz): Fabrika dışında yaşamı ben İstikbalden çıktığımda anladım. Ve bunu istikbalde çalışan bir işçiye sorsan hiçbir yanıt veremez ama. En fazla sana diyeceği şey hafta sonları gezmeye, çarşıya gidiyorum. İstikbalden çıktım şöyle elimi açtım dedim ya dışarıda gerçekten bir hava varmış. Şükür yarabbi kurtardın beni.

63. (Sedat): Başka da sıkıntılarımız oluyor ama mesela biz maddi yönden sıkıntıya düşsek kimse söyleyecez veya manevi yönden. Birbirimize söylüyoruz. İzin ihtiyacımızı görebiliyorsak yoksa son çare rapor alıyoruz. Benim gibi tanıdığı hastanede müdür ya da Ömer gibi annesi hastanede hemşire olan varsa biraz torpilli oluyoruz.

64. (Halim): Şu an izin konusunda tek sıkıntımız şudur; işler düştüğü zaman zaman senelik izne mecburen kullanıyorsun. Şu an yaz geldi mesela hiç kimsenin izni yok. Ailen alıp tatile gidemiyorsun. Bu sefer ne yapıyorsun bir şekilde rapor almanın yoluna bakıyorsun. Sadece fabrikada çalışanlar yok hayvancılık ve köylülük yapanlar var. Ekin biçme döneminde yılın belirli mevsimlerinde gitmeleri gerekiyor. Ama izin ver olmadığı zaman ne yapıyorlar, bir şekilde rapor falan ayarlıyorlar.

65. (Deniz): Başımdan şöyle bir olay geçti anlatayım. Köye gidecem sıkıntım var izin istedim. O zaman da ustabaşı değilim işçiyim. Vermediler izin. Diyorum abi bak gitmem lazım. Yok, olmaz diyorlar. Benim altımda o ara şarjlı araba var. Dedim ben buradan gitmem lazım ama nasıl. Bir baktım ilerde demir var. Forklifte bindim vardım demire bir tosladım araba demire çarpınca ben kendimi yere attım. O ara kalbimi tutuyorum tabii ölüyorum diye. Bayılmış numarası yaptım. Sesim soluğum gitti. Herkes başıma toplandı. Dürtüyorlar, cimcikliyorlar. Hemen sedye getirdiler. Sedyeye koyarken de diyorlar eşek gibi ağırmış diye. Revire vardık. Revirci arkadaşım olur. Göz kırptım ona bir anladı yani o. Beni dedim hemen bir hastaneye gönder. O ara doktor geldi. Burnuma bir şey verdiler bir çektim içime gözlerim fal taşı gibi açıldı. Zaten ayığım bide içime de çekince gözlerim kocaman oldu. Kalk kalk dedi bir şeyin yok. İnsanları bir yerde buna mecbur bırakıyorlar yani yalan söylemeye. Benim çok arkadaşım vardı mecbur ananem öldü, dedem öldü, nenem öldü diye izin alıp gitmeye çalışanları. Üç defa dedesini öldürdü bir adam yav.

66. (Bahadır): Bir pazar günü dedim ben mesaiye kalmayacam. Ben öyle deyince hepsi başladı bende gelmem. Aha dedim bunların hiçbiri gelmezse işler karışır. Hemen hastaneye gittim, dedim sancım var doktora. Test yaptılar. Dedim sabah ben yine işe gideceğim. Bana bir kâğıt verin, işe gitmeyim, istirahat edeyim. Formalite. Gitmek istemiyorum. Bıktım, usandım artık. Doktordan öyle bir kâğıt aldım, pazartesi iş başı yaptım. Gelmeyenlerin hepsine veriyorlar kırbacı. Yaz savunmayı, götür disipline filan. Bana geldi, uzattım kâğıdı. Kimse bir şey demedi. Bu tür yollara başvuruyorduk yani artık. Herkes birini öldürüyordu. Kiminin babaannesi, kimin dedesi... Yalandan dolandan izin alıyorlardı.

67. (Erdal): Online takip edilmeyen kişiler takip edilmedikleri noktada işlerini olması gerekenden yavaş yapıyorlar. Tempoyu düşürüyorlar. Özellikle vardiya bitmeye yakın yapacağı bir iş daha varsa o an uğraştığı işi diğer işe geçmemek için sürüncemeye bırakıyor. Ona başlamamak için elinden gelen gayreti gösteriyor. Hâlbuki normal çalışma temposunda çalışsa vardiya bitimine on dakika kala elindeki işi bitirse diğer işe geçecek. Ama onu da yapmıyor. On beş dakika oyalanıyor. Ya temizlik yapıyor ya dokuma hızını makinede 30 m dk. ile geçmiyor da 20 m dk. ile geçiyor. Yeni doku bağlamamak için uğraşıyor.

68. (Mert): Takip eden yoksa 10 dakikalık molayı 30 dakikaya çıkarıyor. Mesela bizim bölümde vardiyanın birinde ustabaşı yok. Onlar kendi yakalanana kadar devam ediyor. Yakalandığı zaman tekrar eski düzenine biniyor. İşçi iki dakika bile fazla kullansa onu kar görüyor mesela.

69. (Erdal): Şöyle bir kaytarma yöntemi de var. Kendisi kolay işleri alabiliyor, rahat rahat çalışıyor, çok uğraştırmıyor. Ondan sonraki vardiyaya çok uğraştırıcı, problemli işler kalıyor. Bu şekilde birbirlerinin haklarını yediği de oluyor yani.

70. (Nazan): Zor iş nasıl oluyor. Bazı kumaşlar var, müşterisi hassas. Onun hatası olmaması, daha dikkatli bakması gerekiyor. Veya küçük küçük parçalar oluyor birleştirmesi gerekiyor. Kolaylık zorluk işletmedeki adam da hâkim olduğu için kumaşlara...

71. (Erdal): Bir de aktif kaytarma var. Adam mesela çalışıyor gibi görünüyor ama çalışmıyor. Mesela dokumadaki sorumlular. Bakıyorsunuz adamın müdahale edeceği hiçbir arıza yok. Adamın o sırada ne yapması lazım, eksiklik filan varsa dolanıp tamamlaması lazım. Makinenin ayarlarını kontrol etmesi lazım, kötü çalışan varsa onunla ilgilenmesi lazım, yani yapılacak iş mutlaka ki vardır. Ama öyle yapmıyor. Bilgisayarın başında bekliyor. Ne zaman arıza kodu girilirse hemen koşuyor onu yapıyor. Ama o sırada hiç çalışmıyor yani.

72. (Nazan): Aslında iş tanımında var bu yani. Biz makine yoğun bir işletmeyiz. Kontrol ucu açık bir şey değil aslında bizde. Standart olması gereken bir şey. Bizde makine çalışıyor, adam bakıyor ya...

73. (Oğuz): Gece vardiyalarında işçinin uykusu geliyor çünkü benim olduğum makinenin fazla bir işi yok. Girişinden kumaşı giriyorsun. Çıkışında takip ediyorsun. Sadece makine etrafında dolaşıyorsun. Gözle yani. Elle müdahale 35 dakikada bir. Sadece 1:50lik kumaş kesmek onun dışında bir şey yok pek. Sıkılıp uyukluyorlar bazen.

74. (Veli): On dakikalık molaya 20 dakika kalmak da dinen şeydir. Namaza gidiyor mesela arkadaşlar yarım saat. Bu da mesela dinen haram.

75. (Nazan): Birbirlerinden de şikâyet ediyorlar, diyor hep namaza gidiyor arkadaşı için. Ahlaki olarak namazdan da soğuyor. Namaza gidicem diyip kaytaran da oluyor namaza gitmeyip. Günahı boynuna artık. İşte o dengeyi ustabaşının kurması gerek.

76. (Deniz): Tuvalete bir girerdik 3 tane tuvalet var 30 kişi kapıda bekliyor. Zaten adam biliyor 30 dk. da gelmeyeceğini sırasının ama elini açardı teli oyun onardı. Facebook'a Youtube'a girerdi. Whatsapp'ta yazışırdı. Kime girer sigara içerdi. Kesinlikle bu tür şeyler oluyordu. Bu da işverenle alakalıydı. Çünkü insanlar uzun çalışıyor, strese giriyor, istirahat saatleri kısa, 10 dk. çay molası var. Bu adam 10 dk. çay ise sigara içse hop kalkıyor. Çalışmak gerçekten kolay bir şey değil hani böyle etüt ola bir yerde başında amirlerinin beklediği bir yerde hadi hadi hadi ile çalışmak insanın zaten psikolojik olarak beynini yoruyordu. Vücudunu yoruyordu. Adam ne yapacak kafasını dağıtması için mecbur kendini bir şeyler evermesi lazım. Ya yandakiyle sohbet edecek. Onun imkânı yok

makine çalışıyor. Adam mecbur eline telefonu alıyor, gidiyor tuvalete, biraz sigara içiyor oyun oynuyor kafasını rahatlatıyor. Bunun hatanın yüzde yetmişi patrondan ve çalışma şartlarının ve istirahat saatlerinin kısa olmasından kaynaklanıyor kesinlikle.

77. (Mahmut): Kamera sistemi ilk geldiğinde bir tepki oldu tabii. Ama alıştı sonra işçiler. Fabrikada telefon kullanmakta yasak, ama işçiler makinelerin arasından, köşesinden öyle mesajlaşıyorlar. Hani o arada elbisesini kaptırsa, bir yerini kaptırsa ne olacak. Ben diyorum işiniz olduğunda, sigara içeceğinizde söyleyin, haberim olsun. Ama şu ana kadar şikâyet ettiğim de olmadı.

78. (Bahadır): İşçiler arasında kurulu saat gibi olanı vardı. Dakikası gelince işi bırakıp tuvalete koşuyor adam. Tuvalet ihtiyacı için değil ya. Sigara içmeye giderler çoğunlukla. 10 dk. istirahat zaten yetmiyor adama. Gidiyor vakit geçiriyor tuvalette. Arkadaşınla tam oturacan muhabbet edecen, anons gelir tam askeri usul iş başına diye.

79. (Yamin): Bir de benim özelliğim var sinirlenince şarkı söylerim. Ses duyulmadığı için bağıra bağıra söylerim ki sinirim boşalır. Ben böyle şarkı söyleyerek bir şekilde isyanımı bastırırım. Yoksa insanın canına tak ettiği zamanlar oluyor. Makineye sinirleniyorsun, ustaya sinirleniyorsun. Kimi mesela mesajlaşır biriyle, kimi ustasıyla postasıyla şakalaşarak çözer. Herkesin kendine ait bir taktiği vardır.

80. (Cafer): Vicdansız insanlar var eldiveni bir defa kullanıp hemen çöpe atıyor. Tüyü bitmemiş çocuğun hakkı var o eldivende çöpe atıyorlar. Sen şu kalemi İki satır yaz çöpe at. Olur mu böyle bir şey. Git Allah'tan korkma akşama kadar 5 tane eldiven harca. Vermiyoruz demezler. 1 hafta boyunca kullanıyordum eldivenleri atmaya kıyamıyorum. Biz o malzemeyi nasıl iyi kullanırsak o malzeme bizim çocuğumuza geri dönecek. Bunu düşünmeyen insanlar var ne diyeceksin.

81. (Yamin): Her makinemin tarağını yıkardım ben. Çünkü makinenin düzenli çalışması icap eder. Makine arza vermesin düzgün çalışsın ki ben de vardiya boyunca rahat edeyim. Makine çalıştığı sürece ben rahat ediyordum. Makine durmadığı sürece sen gezersin. Bazı arızaları da kendin düzeltmek mecburiyetindesin. Artı dokuduğun kumaşta da hata çıkarsa o da senin sorumluluğun. Sürekli ustayı beklemek gibi bir şey yok.

82. (Cemil): Bende iş ahlakı haddinden fazla vardı. Sonuçta bir yerde çalışıyorsun. Adamın malına zarar verirsen bu dinen sıkıntı. Adam sana diyor ki 10 saat çalışıcan. 1 saat mola hakkın var diyor. Sen beş dk. molaya gidersen işini savsaklarsan o hak tabii. Malına zarar verirsen hak. Ben karton bölümünde çalışıyordum. Bir tane ya da 2 tane fire çıkardı. Ben onu atmazdım kenara alırdım. Çizerdim üzerini onu bir daha kullanırdım. E bunların hepsi hak.

83. (Cavit): Bazen her şeyi göz önüne aldığım anlarda oldu. Çünkü insanız yani. Sonra diyorsun kendine Cavit bak burada takken var, bazı kişilere Allah'ın izniyle namaza başlattın, bunlar Allah'ın izniyle senden bir hadis öğreniyorlar. Bu yüzden bazen sabır ediyorsun yani. Ondan sonra hemen gidiyom abdest

alıyom. Çünkü SAV Peygamberimiz diyor ki, öfkelendiğiniz zaman abdest alın. Su ateşi alır gider. Çok sinirli olduğunuz zaman da yere çökün. Eğer ki yere çöktüğünüz zaman siniriniz geçmiyorsa yere yatın. Ben bunu yapıyom bazen işin aslı. Camiye gittiğim zaman sinirli olduğumda hemen yere yatıyom.

84. (Cavit): Bak Müslüman biraz uyanık olur. Ben 11 senedir Boytaş 2'de çalıştım ve daha sonra Boytaş 1'e geldim. Ben geldikten sonra hiç tanımadığım bir müdür dedi ki "sen şurada değil de şurada çalış." O arada biraz sürtüşmemiz oldu. Bana "çalışamıyorsan kapı burada" dedi. Ona "sana bir hadis okuyayım mı?" dedim. Gözlerini açtı bana baktı. Çünkü laf yerinde güzeldir. Efendimiz Sav'ın bir devesi vardı ve bu deve hiç yenilmezdi, dedim. Kendisi güçlü ya güya yukarda. Ve dedim müşfiklerin de bir devesi vardı ve üstü yükle dolu olduğu halde diğerini geçti dedim. Etraftakiler de ya Resul Allah nasıl oluyor da sizin devenizi geçerler, dedi. Dünyada hiçbir güçlü bir şey yoktur ki yenilgiye uğramasın, dedi. O da ona kapak oldu tabii. Anladı. Aradan biraz zaman geçti, kendi çıktı gitti. Gördün mü? Bazı şeyler sabır işi yani.

85. (Cemil): Bize zam yapılmayan süreçte ne oldu? Boydak ailesi kendine 8 kişilik jet aldı mesela. O yıl da naptı işçiye yüzde sıfır zam verdi. Ama TV'ye çıkıp da 2007'de şu kadar ciro çektim diyor. Hak neyse onu vereceksin. Benim adam gibi yaşamam için. Bak canlı şahitsin çocuk arıyor çorap istiyor. E bende para olmazsa napam. Eve gittiğin zaman bir kere çocuğuna mahcup düşüyon. Onun gözündeki imajını düşün. 4 yaşındaki çocuk bana çorap alacak diyor. Onu söyleyen çocuk almadığın zaman onun karşılığını mutlaka sana söyler. Ya kötü babasın, der. Seni sevmiyorum, der. İşçi de öyle mecbur mahcup düşüyor. Çalışmazsa karısı ile kötü olacak. Çevreye karşı kötü olacak. İşçi olmak zor ya.

86. (Olgun): Ben düşünüyorum: Tabiatın kanunumu bu acaba diyorum. Yıllardır bu sömürme sistemi değişmiyor. Ben işçiyim ama modern köleyim. Her şeyimiz var ama köleyiz. Ben de isterim Hollanda'ya tatile gitmeyi, ya da yurtdışına ama gidemiyorum işte. Benim yıllık iznimi bitiriyor. Atıyorum çocuğum rahatsız ben bugün işe gidemedim. İzin veriyor, ama onu yıllık izinden gösteriyor. Bana mesela şu an 6 gün tatil. Benim 18 günlük yıllık iznimden gitti yedi gün. Benim günahım ne. Ben de bir insanım. Yaz gelince eşimi tatile götürmek istiyorum ben. Çocuğumu Çanakkale'ye götürmek istiyorum. Şu an bile eksiye düştüm bile iznimden.

87. (Oğuz): Grev zamanı eğer Boyteks ve İstikbal'de çıksaydı Boydak zarara girerdi yani. Bir gün sürse bile, bir günde biz 35 bin metre kumaş üretiyoruz. Boytaş bir vardiyada sekiz trilyon zarar etmiş. Ki bizim orayı geçin, aşağı Boyteks dediğimiz bir yer var, asıl Boyteks yatak kumaşı üretiyor. Ora kapattığı zaman gitti. Ama işçi sayısına, yerine, alanına göre baktığımızda en çok parayı bizim ora kazanıyor. Şu an halının ciroyu bizim ora kapatıyor. Aylık 800 bin metre kumaş üretiyoruz, metresini 12 dolardan satıyoruz. 1 hafta işçilik, iki hafta giderler, diğer iki haftası kar.

88. (Kayhan): İki günlük ürettiği kumaş bütün işçilerin maaşını, sigortasını, yolunu karşılıyor.

89. (Kayhan): Kendi vakıfları var oraya gidiyor.

90. (Ercan): Cebe gidiyor. Biz de daha 9'un 5'in hesabını yapıyoruz.
91. (Kayhan): Ama holding bünyesinde en az maaşı da burası veriyor.

92. (Oğuz): Bu duruma eşitsizlik diyemeyiz; ama baktığın zaman olması gereken bu zaten. Ben orada sadece çalışanım. Ben orada olmasam benim cebime de para girmeyecek. Yani bir şekliyle patron senin işverenin.

93. (Kayhan): Her saniye zarar eder. Ama birlik olamıyoruz. Herkes aynı anda kapatsa, ama yalakalar var işte yapamıyorsun. Şu an bankaya borcu olmayan yoktur diye düşünüyorum. Bir işsiz kaldığını düşün, kimse de öncülük yapmak istemez dimi. Baytaş'ta herkes çıktı, komple yürüdü onlar. İçeriden adamları vardır illaki müdürlerin. Burası büyük firma ben gitsem yerimi doldurur.

94. (Olgun): Biz ek avans çekemiyoruz. Kendi aramızda işçiler hemen örgütleniyor. Atıyorum benim paraya ihtiyacım var durumumu anlatıyorum arkadaşlara. Ha kendi aramızda 10 lira 5 lira öyle söyleyeyim ben sana o şekilde destek olunuyor bizde. Gidip bir firmaya diyemiyorsun benim şuraya ödemem var, sıkıntım var. Olmuyor.

95. (Sedat): Başka da sıkıntılarımız oluyor ama mesela biz maddi yönden sıkıntıya düşsek kimse söyleyecez veya manevi yönden. Birbirimize söylüyoruz.

96. (Cafer): Herkes bir değil. Senin niyetin iyi oluyor. Fakat karşı tarafınki art niyetli olabiliyor. Herkes kendi çıkarını düşünüyor. Sen de öyle olmak zorundasın yoksa ezilirsin. Fabrikada iyi niyetli olmak bir işe yaramıyor. Bir yerden sonra iş uyanıklığa bürünüyor. Çok iyi niyetlisin ama. İki kişinin işini sana yükledikleri zaman olmuyor. Öyle bir sistem var ki insanlar birleşmiyor.

97. (Olgun): İşyerinde 1-15 kişi örgütlenme yapıyorsun, konuşuyorsun herkes fikren ortak, iş ciddiyete geldiğinde diyorum arkadaşlar 10 kişi varız gelin patronla, müdürle bu yemek mevzunu konuşalım, bu şartları konuşalım. Herkes tamam diyor, yarın olduğunda birinin çocuğu hastalanıyor, biri işe gelmiyor, anlıyorsun ki insanlar hak ediyormuş. Tek başına vardığınız zaman da olmuyor.

98. (Kayhan): Bağırıyoruz, çağırıyoruz sağa sola vuruyoruz. Geçen mesela pantolonum yırtık. Sendikanın sözleşmesinde de var. Ama mesela her gün her vardiya gelip gezdiğini ben görmedim sendikacının.

99. (Cafer): Sendika kimin sendikası? Patronun sendikası. Bizim arkamızda durmaz. Her zaman işverenin yanındadır.

100. (Bahadır): Toplu sözleşme döneminde temsilcilerin başı bir ayrı kıçı bir ayrı oynuyordu. Fabrika önlerinde toplanıyok şimdi. Boytaş 1 olarak herkes meydana toplanıyor. 4 orada, 2 orada toplanıyor. Herkes kendi bünyesinde sesini duyurmaya çalışıyor. Toplanınca müdürler, şefler yüksek yerlere çıkıyor işte konuşmak için. Sendikacılar da hep onların arkasında duruyor. Bizim paramızla bize karşı duruyor yani adamlar.

101. (Deniz): Çay ocağında olsun yemekhanede olsun çalıştığımız fabrikada bir vardiyada 500 kişi çalışan bir fabrikaydık. Herkes grup grup oturur. Sağcısı bir yanda oturur solcusu da. Kafa yapısı benzeyenler birlikte oturur. Menzilciler, Süleymancılar, Nurcular vardı. Fetöcü işçi olarak pek fazla yoktu ama diğerleri ayrı ayrı gruplar oluştururdu. Birkaç sefer beni bile çağırdılar. Kendi aralarında bir araya gelirler hafta sonu sohbet ederlerdi.

102. (Oğuz): Günlük hayattan sohbetler ederiz yani. İki gündür gece de sıkılıyoruz, gece siyasete sarıyoruz. CHP ile AKP'lileri birbirine düşürüyoruz. Kenara çekilip seyrediyoruz. CHP'liler ortaya laf atıyor. Her şeye de muhalifler. Kayseri'den çok oy çıktı ama tanıdığım 3-4 kişi vardır CHP'li. Atatürkçüyüz, komünistiz diyorlar.

103. (Olgun): Ha makine başına gelince yine esprili bir muhabbetimiz var o ayrı bir şey. O şekilde zaman geçiriyoruz. İş yerindeki arkadaşlarımız akrabalarımız değil ama bir parçası. İnsanlarla yeri geldiğinde tekme tokat dövüştüğümüz oluyor kendi aramızda. İnsan psikolojisi, yeri geldi mi oturup çay içebiliyoruz, birbirimizi anlayışla karşılayabiliyoruz en azından. İşçinin halini işçi anlıyor gene. Patron anlamıyor, patron anlasa, işçi bu duruma düşmezdi.

104. (Saffet): Şimdiye kadar bizim orada olmadı. Belki oluyordur ama ben kendi makinem ve yan makinemi tanırım. Genelini tanımam. Pek işim olmaz. Ha nasıl olur en fazla kendi makinemden arkadaşlarla mangal yakmaya giderim.

105. (Halim): Bizim orada çeşitli bölümler vardır. Herkes kendi bölümündekilerle takılır. Sürekli birlikte çalıştıkları için samimi bir ortam vardır. Sonuçta 10 saatin fabrikada geçiyor. Ailemizden çok birbirimizi görüyoruz. Her şeyden konuşuruz. Film, dizi, televizyon, futbol, siyaset...

106. (Yaşar): Benim diğer işçilerle fazla diyalogum yoktur çünkü bir sıkıntım varsa Ömer'le görüşürüm. Ömer'e danışırım, Ömer'e sorarım. Ömer ne düşünüyorsa ben de onu düşünüyorumdur yani.

107. (Deniz): 2015 yılı şubat ayında sendika sözleşme yapmak için uğraşıyordu. Bir ay filan da zaman geçtiydi üstünden. Sendika mücadele etmiş gibi gözüküyordu ama eski işçiler farkındaydı ki sendika kesinlikle orada mücadele yürütmüyordu. Zaten bu anlaşma daha önceden yapıldı yani kendi kanaatimle edindiğim bilgilere göre. Anlaşmanın adı konuldu fakat sadece göstermelik olarak işçinin nabzını yoklamak için işte belli bir yüzde otuzunu alalım davası 2014'ün son aylarına başlamıştı. Ankara'dan öz ağaç iş sendikasının genel sekreteri geldi genel başkanı geldi fabrika içinde geziyorlar. İşte işçileri tetikliyorlar arkadaşlar bu sene düşündüğünüzün üzerinde zam alcaz. Aman işinize bakın. Aman işinizi ihmal etmeyin sürekli çalışın. Patronla kötü olmayalım. Emin olun şu kelimeyi ben müdürlerin hepsinden duydum. "Beklentinizin üzerinde kesinlikle güzel bir zam alacaksınız." Biz biliyorduk bir şeyler döneceğini ama bir yandan da inanmak istiyorduk yani. Çünkü 12-13 senedir fabrikadayız adam gibi zam alınmamış zaten ekonomik kriz tavan yapmış. Herhalde söylediklerine göre bir zam alacaz dedik bizde, inandık. Biz de işçileri o şekilde motive ediyorduk. Ustabaşıydım ben o zaman. Toplantılarda

filan bakın arkadaşlar bu sene beklentimizin üzerinde güzel zam yapılacak işinize sahip çıkın. İşinizi aksatmayın filan gibisinden...

108. (Deniz): İkinci toplantıda lavaboya gidiyordum. Bir grup toplanmış oraya sohbet ediyor. Vardım dedim hayırdır ne oluyor? O ara baktım içerdeki temsilciler var. Kapıyı kapattı temsilciler. Toplantıdan geldik de dedi. E sonuç? Patron yüzde 3 teklif etti ama biz direniyok. Adam yüzde üçe direniyor yav. Sen yüzde üçün neyine direniyon dedim yav. Bu kadar insana sen küfrediyon o zaman dedim ya. Ben buradan kendime hakaret çıkarırım, küfür çıkarırım dedim. Yok dedi arkadaşlar bu daha başlangıç... Neye bağlayacan dedim sen yüzde üç ile başlamış bir anlaşmayı kaça bağlayacan. Yüzde otuza mı bağlayacan dedim. En fazla yüzde dokuz yaparsın sen dedim ya. Sence makul bir zammı dedim. Zaten o konuşmalar oldu içeride bir sinir hali oldu insanların üzerinde. İnsanlar yüzde üçü, beşi duyunca orada tabii. Çünkü 2007'den bu yana zam alamadığımız için insanlarda bir birikim vardı. Biraz korku biraz endişe acaba nolur...Zam verirler mi vermezler mi. Zam vermezlerse yürüsek işte isyan etsek veya da başkaldırsak acaba bu bize nasıl geri döner. Çünkü bunları daha önce deneyimlememişiz.

109. (Deniz): Fabrikada zaten bir laf girsin 10 dk. sonra hepsi duyar. O gün akşam gündüz vardiyası çıkışında evlere dağıldık. Akşam telefonlaştık. Arkadaşlardan filan telefon geldi dediler ki Boytaş 4-5 ayaklanmış. Makineleri kapatmışlar. Yüzde üç zammı protesto ediyorlar filan. E bizde iyice umutlandık. Dedik sabahta biz gidelim. Sabah oldu, ama gece bunları yatıştırmış bölüm amirleri, müdürler filan. Sabah oldu biz vardık fabrikaya herkes birbirinin gözüne bakıyor. Bir kıvılcım olsa da bir şeyler yapsak gibisinden. Dedik demek ki bu kıvılcımı ateşlemek gerekiyor. Gittim diğer bölümlerden toplandık arkadaşlara dedim ki hadi böyle olmaz bırakalım makineleri. Sabah işe başladık ben ustabaşıyım zaten. Gider gezerim kimse bana neredesin diye sormaz. Diğer bölümleri gezdim geldim. Zaten ben diğer bölümleri gezerken sendikacılar filan bana bir baktı. Birkaç tanesi de peşimde geziyor da hani yanıma gelemiyor. Arkadaşların yanına varıyorum böyle fısır fısır konuşuyoruz kendi aramızda. Aradan 10 dk. 15 dk. geçmedi. Baktım milletin içinde herkes toplandı 1-2 derken herkes makineyi kapattı. Tabii kapatmayan onursuz arkadaşlarımız da vardı orada. Tuvalete saklanan, gelmeyen. Daha sonra bunlar ödül aldı. Tabii birer ikişer gün ücretli izin kullandı. Biz bunları sonradan öğrendik tabii.

110. (Deniz): İlk önce makinelerin başında toplandık fabrikanın tam ortasında. Üretim müdürü geldi kendi çapında açıklama yapmaya başladı. Arkadaşlar işte provokatörlerin gazına gelmeyin. Bu gerçek değil, istediğiniz zammı vereceğiz. Ama birazcık zaman gerekiyor, bekleyin sendikanız direniyor. Tabii o arada sendika hiç piyasada yok. O ara bana telefon geldi dediler Boytaş 2-3-4-5 komple iş bıraktı. Kapıya çıktılar siz de çıkın. Müdür orada konuşmaya yapıyordu aradan bağırdım arkadaşlar Boytaş 2-3-4 5 komple iş bırakmış, haydin kapıya. O ara herkes birbirinin gözünün içine baktı zaten çıkak mı çıkmayak mı diye. Tereddütte kaldılar. Biraz erkek olun, adam olun, yürüyün dedim yav. Öyle deyince tabii hep beraber çıktık kapıya 400-450 kişiye yakın kapıya çıktık.

111. (Deniz): Zaten 10 dk. 15 dk. kapıda yine topladılar bizi işte zammınızı alacağız aman gitmeyin işinizi bırakmayın bu yasadışı eylem oluyor bilmem ne.

İşten çıkarılır tazminat alamazsınız. Taa oradan insanlara korku vermeye çalıştılar. Çıktım orada da konuşma yaptım. Dedim müdürüm bak benim 3 tane çocuğum var. 2 tanesi okul okuyor. Benim çocuğum sabah okula gitti ben çocuğumun cebine 3 milyon para soktum benim zoruma gitti ağladım serviste dedim ya. Çıkarsana Allah aşkına cebinde kaç para var bir de ben çıkarayım herkes görsün ikimizin cebindeki para farkını da dedim. Sen çocuğunu dedim alıyorsun çarşıya götürüyorsun üstünü başını giydiriyorsun lokantada yemeğini yediriyorsun. Ben dedim ayda değil yılda iki üç sefer bunu yapamıyorum. Artık yeter dedim yav. Bizi buraya kadar getirdiniz dedim.

112. (Bahadır): Başımız yoktu. Geleni taşla, gideni taşla. O ara CHP'den biri geldi. Beyaz bıyıklı, eli yüzü düzgün bir adam yani. Geldi, arabadan indi. Arkadaşlar dedi, anlaşıldığı kadarıyla sizin bir temsilciniz yok dedi. İçeriyle bağlantı kuracak bir sözcünüz yok, dedi. Eğer müsaade edersiniz sizin adınıza içeriyle ben görüşeyim, dedi. Sizin isteklerinizi, dileklerinizi ileteyim, dedi. Oradan birkaç kişi zıpladı işte biz CHP istemiyok. Oltaklanmaya geldin buraya, şöyle böyle. Yani tutumsuz bir ortam vardı yani. Bu da sendikamızın olmadığından kaynaklanıyor. Sendika aramıza gelse arkadaşlar şöyle yapmamız gerekiyor dese bizim tutumumuz şu dese. Bu grev ortamında sizin yapmanız gereken şu, bunun dışına çıkmayın, bundan sonra bizim görevlerimiz var dese... Yok, artık işçi sahipsizliğiyle hani bir buzağıyı ahırda tutarsın kış boyu, yazın bir bırakınca böyle palazlanır coşar ya. İşçi de öyle oldu yani. Sahipsiz, boşta kim gelse saldırıyor. Çünkü burasına geldi yani insanların sahipsizlik.

113. (Deniz): Diğer fabrikadan gelen lider vasıflı arkadaşlarla bir araya geldik. Dedim napıyok. Dedik merkez çeliğin önüne gidiyoruz. Normalde biz çarşıya yürümek istedik. Diskten gelen sendikacılar da çarşıya yürürseniz grup dağılır dedi. Dağıldığı zaman da hiçbir şey ifade etmez dediler. Oradan toplandık. Aşağı yukarı 3500 kişi filan vardı. Hiç tanımadığımız fabrikalardan bize destek veren işçi arkadaşlarımız oldu. Gece vardiyasında olan arkadaşlarımız evine kendi araçlarıyla çıkıp gelen arkadaşlarımız oldu. Aşağı yukarı 4000 kişilik bir grupla merkez çeliğin önüne yürüdük. Yürüdük ama bu bir hırstı. Sinirdi. Patlamaydı. O yüzden başımızda bize yol gösterecek insanları toplayacak, şunu şöyle yapalım diyecek hiç kimse yoktu. Biz kendi çapımızda sesimizi duyurmaya çalışıyorduk. Ama 4000 bin kişiye ne kadar sesini duyurabilirsin ki…Sendikayı tabii o ara hala yanımızda göremiyoruz. Sendika hiç piyasada yok. Vardık ki merkez-çeliğin orda sendika patronların yanında. Patronlarla beraber kol kola giriyor. Bizden taleplerimizi soruyorlar. Hani niye böyle ettiniz, biz istediğinizi verecez filan. Biz yüzde 30 diye bağırıyoruz. Üst yönetimin aldığı karar doğrultusunda Memduh Bey konuşacak sizinle dedi. Ondan sonra insanlar önce Şükrü baba diye çağırdılar. Bir babalık yapar diye beklediler. Şükrü Boydakta onlardan taraf olduğundan geri tekrardan insanlar Şükrü Boydak'ı da yuhalayarak saf dışı ettiler. Ondan sonra zaten kim çıksa yuhalamaya başladılar. Çünkü artık öfke patlama noktasına geldi. O çıkıyor yapacak bir şeyim yok diyor. Öbürü çıkıyor diyor yüzde otuz verirsem ben batarım. Sendika zaten hiç piyasada yok işçinin yanında durmuyor. E artık bu insanlar da patlama derecesine geldi. Kim çıktıysa yuhaladı. Oradan sendika başkanı mıydı ön tarafta duran birisi işçiyi bağırdı azarladı işçiyi. En ön saflardan birinde de ben duruyordum zaten. O işçiye bağırınca benim canım sıkıldı elimde de meyve suyu vardı, karnımızda acıkmıştı kaç saat orada duruyorduk. Üstümüzde giyecek bir şey yok üşüyoruz kış günü.

Meyve suyundan bir yudum aldım almadım bu oradan bağırınca benim canım sıkıldı lan şerefsiz dedim sen işçiye bağıracak kadar büyüdün mü meyve suyunu aldım tam alnının ortasına vurdum. Bu ara bir baktım arkadan para, sac çakmak geliyor bunlar da içeri kaçtı. Tabii yukarıdan bu arada dört beş kamera bizi çekiyor.

114. (Deniz): Gece olunca işçiler açlık, yorgunluk ve bitkinlikten yavaş yavaş dağılmaya başladı. Dedik sözleştik orada yarın sabah gelelim servisler direkt buraya getirsin. Yarın sabah devam edelim diye anlaştık. Saat gece 1 gibi dağıldık. Sabah oldu servislerin çoğunu kaldırmadılar. Çoğu bölümler getirmediler. Gelen servisler de fabrikanın önüne çektiler ve fabrikaların önünde iki kişi dâhil birlikte bekletmedi güvenlik kimseyi. 2 kişi bir araya gelince gruplaşma oluyor diye "hadi içeri girin, beklemeyin" diyorlardı. Ondan sonra zaten bir sessizlik hâkim oldu içeride. Pişman olan bu işten acaba gitmeseydik keşke diyen arkadaşlarımızın olduğunu duyduk. Gaza geldim gittim diyen arkadaşların olduğunu duyduk. Ama bu düşünceye kapılmayan yüzde seksen 90 olduğuna eminim. Çünkü gelen işçilerin yüzde doksanı eski işçiydi. Ezilen işçiydi. Hakkını alamadığını biliyordu. Çünkü İstikbal grubu son 10 yılda aşırı derecede büyüdü. İşçisi büyüdü mü kesinlikle büyümedi.

115. (Cemil): Ben o zaman gece vardiyasındaydım. Biz kendi bölümümüzü çıkardık dışarıya. Tuvalete saklananlar oldu. Bir yerde de deşifre olmamak için çıkıyor. Çıkınca naptı geri planda durdu. Adam arkanda duruyor. Cemal şunu da söyle. Sana hem gaz veriyor. Hem geri planda duruyor. E sen sürekli kameraların önündesin. Konuşuyorsun filan ben bir baktım ağız ağza gelmişim sendikacılarla. Birazda liderlik pozisyonun varsa o dürtü seni en öne getiriyor.

116. (Halim): Yürüyüş gece başlamış. Biz gündüz vardiyasında başladığımız zaman. Baktım arkadaşlar işi bırakmışlar. Kaliteci olduğumuz için üretim ne yaparsa biz de onların üzerine testlere gidiyoruz. Baktık hepsi dışarı çıkmışlar. Bir koordinasyon sağlayanlar oldu. Toplanalım Boytaş 1 2 3 Holdinge yürüyelim vesaire. Orada yönlendirmeleri oldu artık kim yönlendirdi ise. Zaten o yönlendirenleri işten çıkardılar. Kamera kayıtlarına bakıp. Yüzde yirmi zam aldık ama…. Aslında eyleme katılmayanlar patronun yalakası.

117. (Cavit): Ben bazen o kadar sinirleniyorum ki. Takke kafamda Allah'ım yardım eyle diyorum kendi kendime bazen. Çünkü niye hocam diyorlar bana orda. Şimdi ben onlara karşı yalan söylesem sözümde durmasam bu sefer örnek almazlar beni. O zaman lafın, konuştuğun tesir etmez. Yani arkadaşlar Allah razı olsun yanımda bile küfür etmezler. Demek ki kişilere güzel bir şey bırakmışım. Boytaş 2'nin o gün imamı yürüyüşte ne demiş biliyor musun? "Arkadaşlar tamamdır birliğimizi yaptık ama akşam oldu evimize dönelim" dediği için bu sefer de ona da yuh çektiler. Hemen haber kanalı ne yazmış. Boytaş 2'nin imamı Boydakları savundu yazmışlar. Bu olaylar neden oldu? Demek ki Boydaklar bu işçilerin hakkını verememiş. Demek bir sıkıntı vardı ki o kadar millet sokağa döküldü yani. Demek ki işçinin hakkından gitgide kısıyorsunuz yani.

REFERENCES

Ackroyd, S., & Thompson, P. (2016). Unruly subjects: Misbehavior in the workplace. In S. Edgell, H. Gottfried & E. Granter (Eds.), *The Sage handbook of the sociology of work and employment* (pp. 185-204). London: Sage Publications.

Anner, M. (2015). Labor control regimes and worker resistance in global supply chains. *Labor History, 56*(3), 292-307.

Ashcraft, K. L., & Mumby, D. K. (2004). *Reworking gender: A feminist communicology of organization*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Atasoy, Y. (2009). *Islam's marriage with neoliberalism: State transformation in Turkey.* London & New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Atasoy, Y. (2017). *Commodification of global agri-food systems and agro-ecology: Convergence, divergence and beyond in Turkey*. London & New York: Routledge.

Ayata, S. (1987). *Kapitalizm ve küçük üreticilik: Türkiye'de halı dokumacılığı*. Ankara: Yurt Yayınları.

Ayata, S. (2004). *Bir yerel sanayi odağı olarak Gaziantep'te girişimcilik, sanayi kültürü ve ekonomik dünya ile ilişkiler.* In S. İlkin, O. Tekelioğlu & M. Güvenç (Eds.), *İlhan Tekeli için armağan yazılar* (pp. 559-590). İstanbul: Tarih Vakfı Yurt Yayınları.

Aydoğanoğlu, E. (1991). *Fabrikada emek denetimi*. İstanbul: Evrensel Basım Yayın.

Baldoz, R., Koeber, C., & Kraft, P. (2001). *Making sense of work in the twenty-first century.* In R. Baldoz, C. Koeber & P. Kraft (Eds.), *The critical study of work*: *Labor, technology and global production* (pp. 3-21). Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Balkan, N., Balkan, E., & Öncü, A. (Eds.). (2015). *The neoliberal landscape and the rise of Islamist capital in Turkey*. New York: Berghahn Books.

Barral, S. (2014). Paternalistic supervision of labor in Indonesian plantations: Between dependence and autonomy. *Journal of Agrarian Change, 14*(2), 240-259.

Bedirhanoğlu, P. & Yalman, G. (2009). Neoliberal küreselleşme sürecinde Türkiye'de yerel sermaye: Gaziantep, Denizli ve Eskişehir'den izlenimler. *Praksis, 19*, 241-267.

Braverman, H. (1974). *Labor and monopoly capitalism*. New York: Monthly Review Press.

Budd, J. (2011). *The thought of work*. New York: Cornell University Press.

Buğra, A. (1998). Class, culture, and state: An analysis of interest representation by two Turkish Business Associations. *International Journal of Middle East Studies*, *30*, 521–539.

Buğra, A. & Savaşkan, O. (2014). *New capitalism in Turkey: The relationship between politics, religion and business*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar Publishing.

Burawoy, M. (1979). *Manufacturing consent: Changes in the labor process under monopoly capitalism*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Burawoy, M. (1985). *The politics of production: Factory regimes under capitalism and socialism.* London: Verso.

Burawoy, M. (2012). *The roots of domination: Beyond Bourdieu and Gramsci.* Berkeley: University of California.

Can, K. (1997). "Yeşil Sermaye" laik sisteme ne yaptı? *Birikim*, *99*, 59-65.

Carter, B., Danford, A., Howcroft, D., Richardson, H., Smith, A. & Taylor, P. (2011). 'All they lack is a chain': Lean and the new performance management in the British civil service. *New Technology, Work and Employment*, *26*(2), 83-97.

Cengiz, K. (2013). *"Yav işte fabrikalaşak": Anadolu sermayesinin oluşumu: Kayseri-Hacılar örneği*. İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları.

Chakrabarty, D. (1994). *Labor history and the politics of Theory: An Indian angle on the Middle East*. In. Z. Lockman (Ed.), *Workers and working classes in the Middle East: struggles, histories, historiographies* (pp. 321-335). Albany: State University of New York Press.

Cizre-Sakallioglu, U. & Yeldan, E. (2000). Politics, society and financial liberalization: Turkey in the 1990s. *Development and Change*, *31*(2), 481-508.

Clawson, D. & Fantasia, R. (1983). Beyond Burawoy: The dialectics of conflict and consent on the shop floor. *Theory and Society, 12*(5), 671-680.

Collinson, D. L. (1988). "Engineering humor": Masculinity, joking and conflict in shop-floor relations. *Organization Studies*, *9*(2), 181-199.

Collinson, D. L. (2005). Dialectics of leadership. *Human Relations*, *58*(11), 1419-1442.

Cressey, P. & MacInnes, J. (1980). Voting for Ford: Industrial democracy and the control of labor. *Capital & Class*, *4*(2), 5-33.

Demir, Ö., Acar, M., & Toprak, M. (2004) Anatolian tigers or Islamic capital: Prospects and challenges. *Middle Eastern Studies, 40*(6), 166-188.

Doğan, A., E. (2007). Mekân üretimi ve gündelik hayatın birikim ve emek süreçleriyle ilişkisine Kayseri'den bakmak. *Praksis,16,* 91-122.

Durak, Y. (2011). *Emeğin tevekkülü*. İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları.

Edwards, R. (1979). *Contested terrain.* New York: Basic Books.

European Stability Initiative, (2005). *Islamic calvinists: Change and conservatism in central Anatolia*. Berlin and İstanbul: European Stability Initiative.

Filiztekin, A. & I. Tunalı. (1999). Anatolian tigers: Are they for real? *New Perspectives on Turkey, 20,* 77-106.

Fineman, S., & Y. Gabriel. (1996). *Experiencing organizations.* London: Sage.

Friedman, A. (1986). Developing the managerial strategies approach to the labor process. *Capital & Class, 10*(3), 97-124.

Gartman, D. (1978). Marx and the labor process: An interpretation. *Insurgent Sociologist, 8*(2–3), 97–108.

Geniş, A. (2006). *İşçi sınıfının kıyısında: Küçük sanayi işçileri üzerine bir inceleme*. Ankara: Dipnot Yayınları.

Gough, J. (2003). *Work, locality and the rhythms of capital accumulation*. London: Continuum.

Güler, H. (2014). *Patron baba ve işçileri: İşçi sınıfı, köylülük ve paternalizm*. İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları.

Gündoğdu, İ. (2015). *Yerel emek rejimi: Kayseri'de emek pazarı, emek süreci ve yeniden üretim,* In G.Yücesan-Özdemir (Ed.), *Rüzgâra karşı: Emek süreçleri ve karşı-hegemonya arayışları* (pp. 195-224). İstanbul: NotaBene Yayınları,

Günok, M., Z. (2018). *Emeğin prokrustes yatağı: Sınıf mücadelesi ve emek denetimi*. İstanbul: NotaBene Yayınları.

Harvey, D. (1982). *The limits to capital*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Hawkins, B. (2008). Double agents: Gendered organizational culture, control and resistance. *Sociology, 42*(3), 419–436.

Hodson, R. (2004). *Dignity at work.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hoşgör, E. (2011). Islamic capital/Anatolian tigers: Past and present. *Middle Eastern Studies, 47*(2), 343-360.

Keskintaş, O. (2016). Anlatıcı, zaman, mekân ve mistik deneyim açısından mitler ve iktidar ilişkisinin incelenmesi. *Anemon Muş Alparslan Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi, 4*(1), 125-147.

Knights, D., & D, McCabe. (1998). "What happens when the phone goes wild?" BPR, stress and the worker. *Journal of Management Studies, 35*(2), 163-194.

Knights, D., & Willmott, H. (1990). *Labor process theory.* Basingstoke: Macmillan.

Martin, R., Sunley, P., & Wills, J. (1996). *Union retreat and the regions: The shrinking landscape of organized labor.* London: Jessica Kingsley.

Marx, K. (1976). *Capital*. London: Penguin Books.

McCabe, D. (2014). Making out and making do: How employees resist and make organizational change work through consent in a UK bank. *New Technology, Work and Employment, 29*(1), 57-71.

Nichols, T., & Suğur, N. (2004). *Global business, local management: Turkish workers and modern factory*. Basingstoke: Palgrave MacMillan.

Ollman, B. (2003). *Dance of dialectics: Steps in Marxist method*. Urbana and Chicago: University of Illinois Press.

Öniş, Z. (2004). Turgut Özal and his economic legacy*:* Turkish neo-liberalism in critical perspective. *Middle Eastern Studies, 40*(4), 113-134.

Özcan, Z. (2014). *Bir Anadolu hikâyesi: Boydak modeli*. İstanbul: Zaman Yayıncılık.

Öztürk, Ö. (2013). *Türkiye'de İslamcı büyük burjuvazi*, In N. Balkan, E. Balkan, & A. Öncü (Eds.) *Neoliberalizm, İslamcı sermayenin yükselişi ve AKP* (pp. 181-213). İstanbul: Yordam Kitap.

Özuğurlu, M. (2008). *Anadolu'da küresel fabrikanın doğuşu: Yeni işçilik örüntülerinin sosyolojisi*. İstanbul: Kalkedon Yayınları.

Pamuk, Ş. (1998). Globalization, industrialization and changing politics in Turkey. *New Perspectives on Turkey, 38*, 267-273.

Roberts, J. M. (2002). From reflection to refraction: Opening up open Marxism. *Capital & Class, 26*(3), 87-116.

Scott, J. C., (1985). *Weapons of the weak: Everyday forms of peasant resistance.* New Haven: Yale University Press.

Silver, B. J. (2003). *Forces of labor: Workers movements and globalization since 1870.* New York: Cambridge University Press.

Stewart, P., & Garrahan, P. (1995). Employee responses to new management techniques in the auto industry. *Work, Employment & Society, 9*(3), 517-536.

Suğur, N. (1995). *Small firms in a developing economy: A social and economic case of the Ostim Industrial Estate at Ankara Turkey*. Bristol: University of Bristol.

Suğur, N., Nichols, T., & Suğur, S. (2004). Türkiye'de toplam kalite yönetimi uygulamaları: Beyaz eşya, otomotiv ve tekstil sektörü üzerine bir araştırma. *Ankara Üniversitesi SBF Dergisi*, *59*(2), 127-150.

Temelli, C. (2015). Müsiad'ın söylem ve pratiklerinde İslam ve kapitalizm ilişkisi. *Ardahan Üniversitesi İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Fakültesi Dergisi*, *1*(2), 45-52.

Thompson, E., P. (2006). *Avam ve görenek.* İstanbul: Birikim Yayınları.

Thompson, P., & Newsome, K. (2004). *Labor process theory, work and the employment relation*. In B.E. Kaufman (Ed.) *Theoretical perspectives on work and the employment relationship* (pp. 133-162), Cornell: Cornell University Press.

Vardar, N. (2009). *En makbul insan üreten insandır.* İstanbul: Atlantis İletişim.

Wardell, M., Steiger, T., & Meiksins, P. (1999). *Rethinking the labor process.* Albany: State University of New York Press.

Weil, D. (2014). *The fissured workplace*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Wood E. M. (1991). *The pristine culture of capitalism: A historical essay on old regimes and modern states*. London: Verso.

Yavuz, H. (2006). *The emergence of a new Turkey: Democracy and the AK Parti.* Salt Lake City: University of Utah Press.

Young, S. (1992). A framework for successful adoption and performance of Japanese manufacturing practices in the United States. *The Academy of Management Review*, *17*(4), 677-700.

Yücesan-Özdemir, G. (2003). Hidden forms of resistance among the Turkish workers: Hegemonic incorporation or building blocks for the working- class struggle? *Capital & Class*, *27*(3), 31-51.