



International
Labour
Organization

CHILDREN WORKING ON THE STREETS OF ANKARA: PROBLEMS AND NEEDS



Authors

Prof. Kasım KARATAŞ

Asst. Prof. Seda ATTEPE ÖZDEN

R.A. Ahmet EGE

R.A. Engin FIRAT

R.A. Ferman ERİM

R.A. Harun ASLAN

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This study was carried out with children living in poverty on the greyish streets of Ankara, engaged in street work and carrying a heavy burden on their shoulders, and their families; professional practitioners working with them; representatives of civil society organizations and public institutions. We have thus received support from various institutions and persons during the study. We could not have realized this study without their support.

To children who have shared their working and living environment with us and answered our questions with sincerity and to their families, we owe the biggest gratitude. This study will be considered to have attained its goal, if it contributes to our understanding of problems and needs of children, “innocent faces of the streets”, no matter how small.

The main will and contribution for starting this study originated from the Ankara Provincial Directorate of Family and Social Policies. We would like to thank the managers and employees of the Provincial Directorate, particularly social worker Yaşar Çavdar Kolbüken, for facilitating our work.

We would like to express gratitude to all professionals and representatives of local administrations, public institutions and non-governmental organizations for sharing their knowledge and experience with us during focus group meetings and individual interviews.

We owe particular gratitude to Önder Foundation which has enabled us to connect with Syrian children and their families and to the Sociologist Güliz Demirci working at Altındağ Municipality and our interpreters Halid Alhalef and Yaser Snouber.

We would like to thank also to the Mukhtar of Önder Neighbourhood Nuri Aygül, Mukhtar of Ulubey Neighbourhood Niyazi Köroğlu, Mukhtar of Keklikpınarı Neighbourhood Keziban Akçay, Mukhtar of Kızılırmak Neighbourhood Cengiz Yağ

and Mukhtar of Yukarı Yahyalar Neighbourhood Cüneyt Meşe who have provided us with their opinions, observations and facilitating support during the study.

Our work would have been very difficult without the facilitation of Ankara Police Directorate, Juvenile Department managers and employees, particularly in our contacts with children engaged in working / begging on the streets of Ankara. They shared their knowledge and experience with us in their working environment; and we saw the magnitude of their self-sacrifice and patience with which they worked. We owe them sincere gratitude for their support and assistance.

We would like to express our gratitude to Emre Uysal and Ayşe Varol, our students practising at the Ankara Provincial Directorate of Family and Social Policies, Department for Children In Need of Protection and Support within the Family. They have provided us with technical support.

We would like to thank also the managers and staff members of Altı Nokta Körlere Hizmet Vakfı (Six Dots Foundation for the Blind) for having provided the research team with a working environment.

PREFACE

Historically, the concept of childhood and needs of the child cannot be defined independently from the social production relations and adults' attribution of value to children. In this context, perception of the child as a means of production and the importance of the quantitative presence of the child in creating added value have made the child labour a social phenomenon. Urban capital created by industrialization and growth of the middle class have resulted in a change of perspective towards child education and society's responsibilities towards the child. As a result, "modern childhood paradigm", which claims that childhood involves characteristics and needs different from that of adulthood, has ended up dominating our era.

Cultural and political patterns shaped by modern childhood paradigm created an extensive impact on many fields ranging from clothing to toys, from rights to education to privileged position in the healthcare system for children from middle and upper class children; while for children and parents who have experienced migration and who are struggling to exist in their lives defined by new the new poverty, childhood bears a different meaning.

When exploring child labour, it is very important to consider the connection between migration and new poverty concepts. Migration waves caused by changing relations of production and war in both national and trans-national level have brought about squatter settlements concentrating in suburban areas of big cities, internalized and chronic poverty, experiences of social exclusion and child labour.

In the background of the problem of children engaged in street work in Turkey, lies the mechanization in agriculture and industry underway since 1950s and internal migration waves caused by various internal conflicts that arose after 1990s. Factors such as changes in the social structure created by these waves of migration, increased adult (parent) unemployment and loss of social and economic capital have

translated into use of child labour and vulnerability of child on the street and informal sector.

We seem to have developed a significant body of knowledge and literature, ready to be turned into practise, thanks to studies and researches carried out for children engaged in street work. However, the multi-sector structure related to the phenomenon of street work, social variables and political developments bring about new problems and needs.

The civil war going on in Syria has triggered a big wave of migration, primarily into Turkey. The presence of migrants, composed mostly of children and women and spread all over the country under “temporary protection status” has further complicated the problem of children engaged in street work. First of all, the problem has become visible on the streets of almost all Turkish cities. In terms of migration, Turkey is one of the countries bearing the heaviest burden of the Syrian civil war, a war with impacts at global scale. One aspect to this burden is the sudden quantitative growth of the problem of children sent to beg/work in streets. Available means have started to fall short of solving this ever growing and expanding problem affecting the streets of Turkish cities. Solutions developed for children of Turkish nationality are not functional any more due to a variety of cultural and psycho-social challenges. Protective and preventive role of the education system and social services cannot fulfil expected results unless they are reassessed under the new circumstances. Problems such as the language barrier at first, the problem of social cohesion interacting with social exclusion, legal status of Syrian children and traumatic effects of the war have created urgent need for new studies and regulations in the field of services developed for children engaged in street work.

This study, carried out in the province of Ankara, has been designed in consideration of this specific need and for the purpose of exploring new results. We attached importance to understanding the impacts of the ongoing migration mobility and identifying the magnitude and boundaries of the problem in connection with the

perception of the child engaged in street work and children's experiences of the street.

Every social problem also creates an opportunity for coming up with a lasting solution. This opportunity might as well be viewed as a contribution to humanity's "coping" capacity. This study will be considered to have attained its goal to the extent it sheds light on social services to be developed for children working on the streets of the city.

ABSTRACT

The problem of children working on the streets is one of the major problems of child welfare field. This problem in Turkey has become more complicated with the arrival of Syrian children.

This study has been carried out with Turkish and Syrian children who are working on the streets of Ankara and with their families. To be able to understand the different aspects of the phenomenon and to reach the reliable and valid suggestions about the solution, we also interviewed workers and representatives from non-governmental organizations and public institutions. The main aims of the study are to examine the general characteristics of the children working on the streets of Ankara, to find out the risks that children encounter, to provide suggestions to the policy makers and raise awareness of the society.

This study used a mixed method. The study involved 92 children, 43,5% of whom were Syrian. The mean age of the children was 13 and most of the participants were boys. Children's work was determined by gender and age.

Most of the children experienced migration process. Children in this study generally work in waste collection. Nutrition of children is poor. None of the Syrian children go to school. Children live in nuclear families that are generally crowded and they live in slums. Nearly one third of the children are exposed to physical violence. More than half of the children experience undesirable treatments and accident risks.

As a result, it has been observed that the problem of children working on the streets is complicated and has multi-dimensional aspects. The risks of the streets for children are diverse. Thus it is important to include different partners in the solution of the problem.

Key words: Children working on the streets, poverty, child labour, risks on the streets, migration.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	ii
PREFACE	iv
ABSTRACT	vii
TABLE OF CONTENTS	viii
LIST OF TABLES	xi
THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK	1
Who is a child?	1
Working Children	3
Children working/sent to work on the street	6
Causes of the phenomenon of children working on the street	13
Migration 13	
Poverty and Unemployment.....	16
Family and Relations 17	
Culture 19	
Examples from the world	20
Children Working/Sent to Work on the Street and Risks	21
Risks in the Street 21	
Physical, Sexual and Psychological Abuse.....	22
Impact of the Street Work on Education	23
Health Problems of Children Engaged in Street Work	28
Substance Addiction 31	
Delinquency 34	
Families of children working on the street	38
International and Social Instruments	39
European Social Charter 39	
United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child	41

International Labour Organization Minimum Age Convention no 138	42
Convention no 182 concerning the Prohibition and Immediate Action for the Elimination of the Worst Forms of Child Labour	43
Constitution of the Republic of Turkey	45
Turkish Civil Code 46	
Public Health Law 48	
Labour Law 48	
Vocational Education Law.....	50
Organizations Related to Service Provision	51
Situation of Syrian Migrants.....	57
FINDINGS AND INTERPRETATION	68
Place of Interview	68
Socio-Demographic Characteristics of Children.....	71
Information on Children’s Health and Nutrition Status	73
Information on Children’s Education Status	80
Information on the Children’s Families	84
The Housing and Neighbourhood Inhabited by Children	87
Information on Children’s Working and Income Situation	91
Migration Experiences of the Children Working on the Street.....	98
Information on Life and Risks in the Street	101
Children’s Proposals for Solutions Concerning Street Work	117
CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS	120
Conclusion.....	120
Results of Interviews with Children and Families.....	122
Conclusions Drawn From Meetings with Relevant Institutions and Non-Governmental Organizations, Experts, Mukhtars and Police Officers	125
Proposals.....	128
REFERENCES.....	135

ANNEXES.....	148
ANNEX-1. Child Quantitative Form.....	148
ANNEX-2. Form for In-Depth Interview with Families	155
ANNEX-3. Form for Focus Group Meeting With Non-Governmental Organizations	158
ANNEX-4. Form for Focus Group Meeting With Law Enforcement Officers	159
Annex-5. Directives for In-Depth Interview with Children Working on the Street	162

LIST OF TABLES

Chart 1. Place of Interview	68
Chart 2. Gender of Children	71
Chart 3. Children's Average Age	72
Chart 4. Breakdown of Children's Place of Birth.....	72
Chart 5. Average Height and Weight of Children.....	73
Chart 6. Breakdown of Children's Disease Situation	74
Chart 7. Presence of Family Members with Chronic Disease	75
Chart 8. Do the Children Have any Disability?	75
Chart 9. Children's Average Time of Sleep.....	76
Chart 10. Average Number of Meals Children Have	76
Chart 11. Do Children Have Breakfast, Lunch and Dinner?	77
Chart 12. How do Children Get Food When Working on the Street.....	78
Chart 13. Do Children Smoke or Use Substance	79
Chart 14. Presence of People Using Substance in the Social Circle of the Children	79
Chart 15. Children's Education Status.....	80
Chart 16. Reasons of Children's Dropping out of School	82
Chart 17. Is it difficult to work on the street and attend school at the same time	83
Chart 18. Children's Family Structure	84
Chart 19. Average Number of Siblings and Working Siblings	85
Chart 20. Whether Mother and Father are Living Together	85
Chart 21. Do the Fathers Use Violence on Mothers	86
Chart 22. Do the Father Use Violence on the Child and Siblings	86
Chart 23. Presence of a Household Member with a Disability	87
Chart 24. Neighbourhoods Where Children Live	87
Chart 25. Type of Housing Inhabited by the Children.....	88
Chart 26. Number of Rooms in the Housing	89
Chart 27. Number of Individuals Living in the Houses Inhabited by Children	90
Chart 28. Do Children Have Friends in their Neighbourhood Who also Work	90
Chart 29. Parents' Working Situation	91
Chart 30. Average Monthly Income of the Children's Household	92
Chart 31. Do children's households have side income?	92
Chart 32. Age When Children Were First Sent to Work on the Street	93
Chart 33. Type of Work Done by Children	94
Chart 34. Types of Works Previously Done by the Children on the Street	95
Chart 35. How Children Perceive Their Family's Economic Situation	96
Chart 36. Children's and Their Parents' Migration Situation	98
Chart 37. Causes of Migration of the Children and Their Parents	99

Chart 38. How long the children and their parents have been living in Ankara	100
Chart 39. Have You Ever Spent the Night in the Street?.....	101
Chart 40. Time of the Child’s Returning Home and Time Spent on the Street During the Day.....	102
Chart 41. Means of Returning Home for Children	103
Chart 42. Do Children Sustain Physical Violence When Working on the Street	103
Chart 43. Who Uses Violence n the Children Working on the Street	104
Chart 44. Has the Child Ever Been Taken to the Police Station	105
Chart 45. Risks Involved in Working on the Street according to Children	106
Chart 46. Do Children Find It Advantageous to Work on the Street	109
Chart 47. Advantages of Working on the Street according to Children	110
Chart 48. From Whom Do Children Ask For Help When in Trouble	111
Chart 49. Type of Assistance Expected by Children When Working on the Street.....	112
Chart 50. Do Children Face Undesirable Treatments When Working on the Street	113
Chart 51. Undesirable Treatments for Children.....	113
Chart 52. Children’s Reactions to Undesirable Treatments.....	114
Chart 53. Children’s Having an Accident.....	115
Chart 54. Types of Accidents Children Had.....	115
Chart 55. How Children Protect Themselves from Excessive Heat or Cold	116
Chart 56. What kind of a change in your life would make you give up working on the street?.....	117

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

Who is a child?

Defined as a special stage of human development, childhood is a relatively new concept. The child as a physical and social reality, however, coincides with human history. Development of new approaches on child education influenced by ideas of enlightenment in the 17th and 18th century led to the discovery that children were different from adults. Scientific studies on children conducted in the 20th century allowed us to better understand them and childhood was placed in a particular position in stages of human development. Definition of child and childhood varied depending on the period and cultural context. Universal definition of child as an individual having different needs depending on the age and maturity, facing different problems and having different powers and responsibilities was adopted, to a great extent, by joint efforts in the 20th century. (Karataş, 2000).

Despite coinciding with human history as a physical and social reality, “childhood” defined as a particular stage of human development is a relatively new concept. Up to the 17th century, the child was considered as a group responsible for serving adults. Even the words used in relation to children were the same as those used for servants, soldiers and butlers. In the middle ages, the child was viewed as a miniature copy of the adult. Child mortality rates were very high and children were allowed to join the adult life, wars for instance, as of a very early age, 12 or 13. (Tan, 1989; Bumin, 1998).

The foundation of the concept of childhood as understood today was laid in the 17th century with mandatory education. (Onur, 2007). Industrialization in the late 18th century and 19th century forcibly changed the social structure. (Koşar, 1992). Changing social structure led to a change in family order as a result of which nuclear family emerged. Expansion of the middle class resulted in increased value attributed to the child. From 1850 to 1950, the perception of typographic childhood stage

reached its culmination. After 1950s, “electronic childhood” stage emerged with the development of technologies such as TV, computer and internet. Thus, children found a bigger room in the adult world (Şirin, 2006).

Industrial revolution brought about a more intensive use of child labour in production. Children whose labour was used in conditions amounting to misery attracted society’s attention. Scientific studies and literary works started to raise this issue. First reactions yielded their fruit when in 1802 the “Health and Morals of Apprentices Act” was adopted in the English Parliament (Yeşil, 2009).

This Act required that:

- *Children were to work no more than 12 hours a day,*
- *They were not to work at night,*
- *If apprentices stayed with the employer day and night, the employer was to set up separate dormitories for girls and boys,*
- *Children were to be given education to learn how to write and read,*
- *Children were to be provided with one clothing once a year.*

Increased exploitation of child labour in production premises that developed with the industrial revolution led to serious debates, which later on resulted in declining use of child labour in production. The following instruments are of special importance in this process;

Declaration of the Rights of the Child issued by the League of Nations on September 26th, 1924,

Declaration of the Rights of the Child issued by the United Nations on November 20th, 1959,

Convention on the Rights of the Child issued by the United Nations on November 20th, 1989.

These international texts define children as persons in need of special care and protection and state that all children need to be provided with all means required for their development without discrimination. Despite these international efforts, children's use as cheap labour has continued (Gün, 2010).

UN Convention on the Rights of the Child defines a child as any human being under the age of eighteen, unless the age of majority is attained earlier under a state's own domestic legislation. Even if domestic legislation in some cases accept that majority is attained at an earlier age, it may still consider everyone who have not turned 18 as a child. For instance, Turkish Juvenile Protection Law makes a definition aligned with and even more advanced than the Convention on the Rights of the Child in that it defines a child as "any individual that has not yet completed age eighteen, regardless of whether they have reached full legal age earlier".

Childhood refers to a stage of development defined generally by age. This being the case, age limits (criterion) may differ from one society to the other and from one period in time to the other. There are also some religious, traditional and legal criteria affecting the definition of childhood stage. Whatever the criterion used, childhood stage requires special protection as physical, mental and social development are underway in that stage. Physical development and emotional development continue in this stage, with intellectual, language and thinking capability still maturing. Childhood also sets the stage for socialization within the systems of interaction available to the child (Karataş, 1993: 85).

Working Children

Child labour is a cause of concern in Turkey as in many other countries. Children in urban areas work on the street, in industry, trade and service sector; while those in rural areas mostly work in agriculture as seasonal worker or unpaid family worker depending on the types of job and season.

Exploitation of the child labour is not a new phenomenon. There has been a marked increase in child labour over the last years as a direct result of poverty. Child poverty is a widespread problem in Turkey (Ertürk and Dayioğlu, 2004; Özbay, 1999). Nowadays, the labour of unaccompanied migrant children (unaccompanied minors) has emerged as a new problem due to increased migration in Turkey (Atasü-Topçuoğlu, 2012). There is need for comprehensive studies and holistic measures that take into account factors pushing the child into labour market.

Labour of children under the age of 18 in heavy and hazardous conditions is an issue of particular concern. Having adopted the Convention concerning the Prohibition and Immediate Action for the Elimination of the Worst Forms of Child Labour, Turkey has committed to prohibit such form of child labour. According to the “Time-Bound Policy and Program Framework for the Prevention of Child Labour” prepared by the Ministry of Labour and Social Security to eradicate worsts forms of child labour, worst forms of child labour are defined as “working on the street, working in heavy and hazardous jobs in small and medium enterprises, working in agriculture, outside family works, in paid travelling and temporary agricultural works”.

The priority should be given to the prevention of child labour in the first place. Pending the realization of this objective, measures should be taken to protect children in their working environment. Special measures should be taken for their education not to be disrupted, working conditions should be improved, health inspection should be intensified, social security rights should be enforced and working child should be paid a decent remuneration for his/her labour. All sorts of neglect and exploitation in the work place including abuse in particular should be prevented.

The Child Labour Survey carried out in 2012 October, November and December puts the number of children aged 6-17 across Turkey at 15 million 247 thousand persons. 66,5% of them are in urban, 33,5% in rural areas. 91,5% of children attend

school, while 8,5% do not. By age sets, the rate of school attendance is 97,2% in the age group 6-14, and 74,7% in the age group 15-17. (<http://www.tuik.gov.tr/PreHaberBultenleri.do?id=13659>).

Employment rate among children in the age group 6-17 working in economic activity is 5,9%. Employment rate in this age group remained at the same level as in 2006, but the number of working children has increased by 3 thousand persons. Employment rate of the children is 2,6% and %15,6 in the age group 6-14 and 15-17 respectively. 44,8% of children employed in the age group 6-17 across Turkey live in urban, and 55,2% in rural areas. 68,8% are boys and 31,2% are girls. (<http://www.tuik.gov.tr/PreHaberBultenleri.do?id=13659>).

The less economic power families have, the more children participate in labour. The primary reason for children's working is to "support family budget". Children working on the street may sometimes be the only wage-earning person for some poor families. Primary reason of child labour is poverty. Additional factors include problems caused by unplanned migration and urbanization, unemployment of adult members of the family, traditional culture related to child labour and failure of effective enforcement of the legislation related to minimum working age, which lead to increased use of child labour.

Child labour is one of the problem areas of labour life in terms of child health and education as well as informal employment. Long working hours particularly under difficult conditions have a negative impact on children's psychological and physical health. Working children discontinue education in many cases, while children working and attending school at the same time cannot have a satisfactory achievement at school, which means that they drop out of school and are deprived of qualifications needed for future work. Working children are exposed to all kinds of abuse and exploitation.

In order to put an end to child labour, it is necessary to eradicate factors that encourage and thus legitimize child labour. Goal of education for all is the most

important instrument in preventing child labour. This goal may be achieved by providing basic education free of charge, creating a healthy (adequate healthcare, water and sanitation etc.) and safe education space, eliminating gender inequality in education and ensuring girls' enrolment.

Children working/sent to work on the street

The phenomenon of children working and living on the street is gradually becoming one of the most serious social problems in the world. Social and economic reasons underlying the phenomenon should be handled first, with main measures being developed at structural level. Studies conducted with street children in Turkey identify their problems and needs, but there has been no research valid for the entire country.

The emphasis should be placed on protective, treating and rehabilitating actions for children still living on the street. As in many other issues, the phenomenon of street children is a multi-sector, multi-professional and multi-disciplinary area, which means that cooperation and coordination between sectors are important. It is imperative that relevant professions and disciplines work together with a team spirit. Various actors including families, social services, schools, law enforcement (juvenile police and gendarmerie), healthcare institutions, non-governmental organizations and professional organizations need to take actions addressing this problem in an effective cooperation and coordination.

There is a lack of adequate data on children sent to work and living on the street in Turkey. Despite numerous small-scale studies on this matter, the most comprehensive report of the last couple years has been published by the Turkish Grand National Assembly (TGNA). The report of the TGNA Investigation Committee (March 2nd, 2005) set up in order to investigate reasons pushing children to the street and identify problems faced by children sent to work and living on the street and to take necessary measures has identified the following reasons pushing children to the street; migration and related urban sprawl, poverty, overpopulation, low level of

education of the family, disintegrated family, coercion, domestic violence and conflict, physical-emotional-sexual-economic abuse, lack of affection, indifference, failure to adequately enforce rights of the child and unfair income distribution. Main threats affecting children living/working on the street are; violence (violence by friends or others), substance addiction (glue, bally, marijuana, pills, alcohol, cigarette and other drugs), involvement in crime (theft, bodily injury and being forced to join crime syndicates), sexual abuse and exploitation as instrument of commercial sexual abuse (harassment, rape, forcible prostitution), health issues (physical and psychological problems caused by substance abuse and unfavourable living conditions).

In Turkey, actions taken to save children from the street, reintegrate them to the family following a social rehabilitation, refer children with substance abuse problem to treatment and integrate them to school or economy are implemented under the Prime Ministry Circular no 2005/5 on “Service Model for Children Living/Working on the Street” in cooperation and coordination of relevant public institutions and agencies, local administrations, universities and NGOs.

Psycho-social support services for children with substance addiction living on the street are provided by Children Support Centres. These Centres implement a psycho-social support program to meet children’s basic needs, identify physical, emotional, psychological and social needs for necessary interventions, enable them to get back to their family and immediate circle of relations or to prepare them for other social service models; and carry out actions to minimize the trauma suffered by children facing social threats on the street, address their behavioural disorders and shift them from street life to a regular life.

Basic approach in addressing the issue of children working and living on the street is to prevent them from working and ending up in the street in the first place. Therefore, protective and preventive actions need to be prioritized. At the heart of preventive and protective actions lies the empowerment of the family. A more

effective protective system should be developed for children working and living on the street through involvement of the central government, local administrations and non-governmental organizations. Means of cooperation and coordination between various organizations working in this field should be developed.

At the heart of the issue of children living and working on the street lies population growth rate, migration, urbanization and changes in family structure. Families overwhelmed by unemployment and poverty end up getting disintegrated and have difficulty coping with difficulties. Various factors including unfair income distribution, disintegrated families, unemployment and lack of social services prompt children to work and finally live on the street. Studies conducted point to a growth of the problem in all its aspects. With every passing day, more families are economically marginalized, which is at the origin of many problems (Karataş, 2000: 2-6; Yeşil, 2009).

The phenomenon of children working and living on the street is increasingly becoming one of the most important social issues in the world. Supported by marginalization tendencies increased by globalization, it is virtually becoming a lifestyle for certain families and children. Most significantly, this phenomenon is also becoming more acceptable by the society. At the heart of this phenomenon, lie structural social and economic reasons.

The concept of street children was coined by Henry Mayhew in 1851. This designation has become more common in literature after the UN International Year of the Child (1979). (Günşen İçli, 2009: 13).

UNICEF (1986) makes three categories of children on the streets of developing countries, depending on the family support they have:

- *Children with continuous relation with their family*
- *Children with occasional relation with their family*
- *Children completely deprived of family support*

Street child is defined as “any girl or boy who has not reached adulthood, for whom the street has become her or his habitual abode and/or sources of livelihood, and who is inadequately protected, supervised or directed by responsible adults” (UNICEF, 1986: 2).

As a result of different studies conducted in various countries In 1990s, street children were classified in two categories (Atauz, 1997):

- **Children of the street:** *Children struggling on their own in their daily life deprived of family support. This group is smaller than children on the street.*
- **Children on the street:** *Children who receive gradually less support from their family, have to share the family’s responsibility for livelihood by working on the streets and markets and who go back home in the evening most of the time. Their family links are becoming gradually weaker.*

Street children are defined as follows by the Council of Europe’s Working Group on Children (Uluğtekin, 1997: 5):

“A child below the age of 18 and living on the street for short/long period of time may be defined as street child. These children wander here and there like a loose cannon and maintain relation with groups of friends and relations in the street. Officially, they may indicate their parents’ home or a social welfare institution as their address. Most strikingly, they have relations, in some degree, with persons responsible towards them such as parents, teachers, social worker etc. or they have no relation with them”.

In another attempt of classification, street children are classified in following categories depending on their relations with families (Konanç et al., 1990):

- 1) *Those living with their family and working only at weekends and during summer holiday,*

2) *Children living with their family, having communication problems and working while attending school,*

3) *Children working with their family but have never attended school or dropped out of school, living permanently,*

4) *Children who live with their family but have domestic problems; whose relations include persons with alcohol, drug addiction problems and previous crime history; who display maladaptive behaviours including running away from home and committing crimes, but who work on the street most of the time,*

5) *Children who usually engage in theft, pickpocketing and begging, occasionally work, with family members having similar behaviours and most of whom have never attended school,*

6) *Children who live permanently or temporarily with their family, who have come to the city to work, dropped out of school and permanently work,*

7) *Children with no contact with family or abandoned by the family, living on the street, committing crimes most of the time, displaying maladaptive behaviours including glue sniffing, prostitution etc and working occasionally.*

As may be seen, concepts of children of the street and children working on the street are intertwined.

Children working/sent to work on the street occupy a particular place in the field of child labour. Some of these children have family supervision and support but work for economic reasons, while others have loose family links are more vulnerable to abuse. Therefore, children working on the street constitute an important source of children living in the street.

Studies show some common characteristics of children working on the street (Atauz, 1990; Konanç, 1993; Zeytinoğlu, 1994, Türkmen and İlik, 1994; Atauz, 1997; Uluğtekin, 1997):

- *Most children start working at primary school stage even earlier.*
- *The poorer the family is, the earlier children start working.*
- *Most of the times, fathers work whenever they find work in the informal sector, but are jobless at other times.*
- *The fact that the child has never attended school causes the child to start working on the street at a very young age.*
- *Works performed by children have common characteristics in that they require no capital or little capital, require no skill, allow swift change of work and do not necessitate permanence.*
- *Children work mostly in most crowded centres of the city.*
- *While most of the children work on the street during the whole day, other may attend school and work on the street at the same time thanks to dual-time system (some children go to school in the morning, other in the afternoon).*
- *Most of the children in Diyarbakır work more than 7 hours a day. There are similar findings for other cities.*
- *Most of the children start to work very early in the morning.*
- *Families mostly send boys to work. However, the poorer the family is and the weaker family links are, the more likely girls are to work. Mother and girls do not usually work outside the home.*
- *Most common reasons for punishing children include failure at school and failure to bring home enough money.*
- *While children mostly work to contribute to household budget, culture of hemşerilik (social networking of people who have roots in the same hometown) plays a role in their finding work, family help and support are influential in both finding and maintaining a work.*

- *Children with loose family ties have less and irregular nutrition, they may even have to spend the whole day hungry.*
- *There are some cases where children who underperformed at school due to working and poverty and who had to drop out of school want to get back to school.*

“According to the study, one child out of five in the world is compelled to work, working children are deprived of a healthy environment and fundamental freedoms, are sent to work in conditions harmful for their physical, social, cultural, emotional and educational development. As of 2008, there were 1 billion 586 million children aged 5 to 17 across the world, 306 million of who were working. The number of working children declined only by 17 million as compared to 2004, but this decline is not valid for all groups. For example, from 2004 to 2008, child labour in the age group 5-14 went down from 196 million to 176 million, while labour among children in the age group 15-17 increased by 2 million and went up from 127 million to 129 million. This rate is 4,5 points higher for boys than for girls. So, 16 boys out of every 100 aged 15-17 were in employment. As a whole, one child out of five aged 5-17 seems to be in employment”. (DİSK-AR, 2012).

Over the last couple of years, Turkey has received an intensive wave of external migration. People are coming to Turkey, as a transit and destination country at the same time, mostly from Syria and many other countries through irregular migration. Among children of Syrian families, who took refuge in Turkey due to civil war in Syria and are living in Turkey under “temporary protection status”, the prevalence of working and begging on the street has reached eye-catching dimensions. Reports of these cases in printed media show alarming levels:

“With the number of Syrian refugees increasing in İstanbul, the number of children working and begging on the street is increasing in parallel” (http://www.zaman.com.tr/bolge-haberleri_mendil-satan-suriyeli-cocuklar-suruculere-zor-anlar-yasatiyor_2284196.html).

“The issue of children working on the street is on the rise with the arrival of Syrian refugees. Hard work of the Police is not enough to keep children away from the street. Last week, 92 children begging on the street were collected from the street and handed over to their families, but the situation is becoming alarming with the number increasing every week” (<http://www.gazeteekspres.com/haber-endiselendiren-artis-30387.html>).

“Syrian children aged 8 to 15 collect waste plastic, iron, steel, cardboard and paper from garbage all day long and earn 10-20 lira ... With no home to go, almost all of the children spend the night at scrapyards in an unhealthy environment” (<http://www.ajanshaber.com/suriyeli-cocuklar-atik-toplayarak-gecimini-sagliyor-haberi/171908>).

Causes of the phenomenon of children working on the street

Migration

Internal migration has become an issue on the top of Turkey’s agenda after 1950. Migration in this period has been mostly from rural to urban areas. Individuals and families experiencing migration, be it direct, gradual or between cities, face various challenges. Migrants’ adaptation and integration to the city are influenced by various factors (Karataş et al. 2002).

Even if it may be defined as spatial change of place, migration may deeply change the lives of both individuals and societies at the end of the day. (Göktürk and Kaygalak, 2001). Because, migration may define not only voluntary transition from one place to the other, but also an involuntary movement. Involuntary migration from the East and South-Eastern Turkey over the last 20-30 years has resulted in a fast urban sprawling (Karakuş, 2010).

Over the last four – five years, Turkey has faced a new wave of migration. “Turkey has received Syrians fleeing the conflict in Syria that broke out in March 2011 and it

did this in compliance with international law and universal principles of human rights and principles of “open door policy” and “non-refoulement” and provided “temporary protection”. This wave of migration started with 252 Syrians fleeing from Syria into Turkey on April 29th, 2011 (Kap, 2014).

Turkish Ministry of Interior, Directorate General of Migration Management and United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) announced that the number of Syrian refugees who have taken refuge in Turkey over the last 4,5 years since 2011 was 2.072.290 as of October 12th, 2015. This figure covers only registered Syrians and arrivals from the border continue, a little though. As of November 2015, the number of Syrians in Turkey is said to stand around 2,2 million including those unregistered (Erdoğan and Ünver, 2015).

Out of 2.072.290 (registered) Syrian refugees in Turkey, 1 million 123 thousand are children and young people below the age of 18. 14% of these children and young people (286 thousand) are aged 12 to 17; 20,2%, (433 thousand) are aged 5 to 11; and 20% (415 thousand) are aged 0 to 4 (Erdoğan and Ünver, 2015).

Erdoğan and Ünver (2015) suggest that these figures allow us to make important conclusions:

- *There is a significant number of children and young people who are “unaccompanied” or who have lost either parent and come from very traumatic background.*
- *600-700 thousand of Syrians in Turkey are in the school age. This is an extraordinarily high number. What’s more, these children and young people have a serious non-schooling problem, primarily due to not speaking Turkish.*
- *Schooling rate among Syrian children at school age (age group 6-18) is as low as 15-20%. This is primarily due to shortcomings in creating school-class possibilities. There is also a marked resistance of conservative Syrian families with mostly rural background when it comes to sending girls to school after*

the aged of 12-13. Low rates of schooling of boys, however, is due to their working, informal though.

- *Syrian population in Turkey increasing day by day, grows further through births. The fact that there are 415 thousand children aged 0-4 is noteworthy. Despite serious lack of data and problems caused by failure to share available data, it is possible draw some conclusions from the available data and the duration of stay of Syrians in Turkey. We might conclude that a significant portion of these 415 thousand children aged 0-4 – approximately 150 thousand and even 200 thousand of them- were born in Turkey. This number alone provides extremely important knowledge for predicting the magnitude and future of Syrians in Turkey.*

Hundreds of thousands of Syrian refugees are known to work informally. Particularly in textile and agriculture, it is known that children are commonly sent to work (Erdoğan and Ünver, 2015).

It is estimated that 300 thousand of more than 2,2 million Syrian refugees are working. This includes, unfortunately, significant numbers of those that may be qualified as “child labourer”. It may even be observed that the chances of employment are higher for Syrian children and young people below 18 years old than for Syrian adults.

Change of environment and living conditions due to migration result in financial difficulties, which increase the incidence of children’s performing various works on the street for migrant families.

Main causes indicated for children’s working on the street are rural exodus and subsequent failure to adapt to urban conditions, poverty and sub-standard living conditions. Indeed, studies conducted attribute children’s working to an interaction of multiple factors including poverty of the family, unfavourable housing, challenging living conditions, unemployment and low education levels of parents, various health

problems and unprepared migration. (Şişman, 2006; Ferguson, 2006; Alptekin, 2011).

Poverty and Unemployment

Although observed all over the world, poverty is a multi-faceted problem faced in particular by under-developed and developing countries. It is noteworthy that poverty in Turkish cities increase with migration. Urban poverty refers to insufficient income for individuals as well as many other adverse conditions like exclusion from urban areas and deprivation of fundamental rights (Türkdoğan, 2003).

Being born to a poor family means various forms of deprivation for children. For instance, children start working (on the street) at a very young age to earn money instead of going to school. Starting working on the street means running risks such as cigarette, drug addiction, tendency to crime and exposure to violence (Kulca and Korkmazlar, 2003).

Poverty of families increase after migration, which prompts these families and their children to work. Possibility of receiving education being limited for children of Syrian refugee families, these children tend to work on the street most of the times.

The primary cause of children's engaging in street work is low socio-economic level. The wish to "earn income" is the main factor pushing children living in poor environments and families to the street. Actually, children give all or most of their income to their families. In some cases, the child working on the street is the only person earning income for some poor families. The use of child labour is further encouraged by the unemployment or very low wages of adult members of the family, difficulties faced by children in enrolment and maintaining education.

Karataş (1993: 86; 2009:) attributes child labour to the following causes:

- Poverty is the most fundamental cause of children's working/being sent to work. Children are usually sent to work to contribute to household income.

Main determinants of poverty are low level of economic development and more importantly, unequal distribution of income.

- Another important cause is limited education possibilities in a country. Lack of educational infrastructure and other factors preventing children from accessing education mean that children who cannot enter or drop out of education system either join the labour market or are left unemployed.
- Other important causes of the use of child labour include rapid population growth, rural exodus and external migration. Rapid population growth increases children's share in total population. Child population had been proportionally increasing in Turkey for a long time. Although this tendency has come to a halt over the last years, child population still constitutes a big part of total population. This requires increased allocation for investments in social services intended for children. In undeveloped economies which fail to meet these needs, children inevitably start working very early in their life.
- Given that the pace of rural exodus is not proportional to availability of urban services and employment, problems such as unemployment and poverty emerge, causing a wider use of child labour.
- Higher prevalence of agriculture, small manufacturing and service sector in an economic composition and insufficient organization of these fields result in increased demand for child labour.
- Lack of legislative arrangements is another important reason of the use of child labour. However, the fact that legislative provisions are in place is not a preventive variable on its own. Insufficiency of legislative provisions and enforcement should be considered together.
- Another important cause of child labour is social insensitivity, ignorance and neglect.

Family and Relations

Family may be defined as a group of individuals with blood-relation. Family is also a social unit with biological, economic, social and legal aspects that sustain human

offspring, contribute to individuals' socialization, maintain mutual relationships and transmit social values from one generation to the other (Orhan, 2003).

Family may mean different things to an adult and a child. For the child, family is a place where s/he gets prepared for joining social life and such participation slowly occurs within the framework of variables such as age, gender, education, profession etc. This being the case, poverty prevents families from having desirable living conditions; financial difficulties and other problems affect inter-family relationships. Under such circumstances, families cannot fully meet children's needs and cannot provide them with means of healthy socialization. However, the importance of family is attributed to its being a primary institution of socialization (Karataş, 2001; Güngör, 2003; Can Beritan, 2003; cited by Karakuş, 2010).

Yavuzer (2006) suggests that family relationships lay the basis of the child's attitudes towards other individuals in life, objects and life in general. In other words, children supported within the family and grow up in tolerance are set to be effective, free and successful in future. Otherwise, children would have problems in adult life.

Growing up in a family which teaches children their rights, protects and applies these rights enables individuals to adopt these values and live in respect of the rules later on. However, in family circumstances with intensive violence and abuse, children grow up to become adults without any awareness of rights who infringe rules and reflect relations of violence and abuse to their life. Studies indicate that most of the children with criminal tendencies come from a background of violence in their family and environment. Report of Turkey Children's Summit 1993 show that all of the children pushed to the street ran away from home for reason of violence and battery and the only thing they wish is some affection and not to be beaten (Çeltikçi, 2010).

Variables such as migration, urbanization and poverty transform families in terms of structure, function and patterns of inter-family relationships. Relationships so transformed normalize the child's employment to earn a livelihood of the household and exert a heavy pressure for children to work. Children's being sent to work

becomes only an interim solution for the problems, in that children sent to work drop out of school or are forced to work and attend school at the same time. As understood, inter-family relationship is another factor for the child's working on the street. The conclusion is that the child tends to work on the street due to loose or broken family ties or pressure of the family.

Culture

"Culture is a pattern of all material and immaterial behavioural arrangements achieved by the members of a particular society in order to have more satisfaction than they can find in nature. It includes all knowledge, belief, arts, morals, customs, traditions, habits and social institutions developed by humans as members of the society" (Baymur, 1978, s. 271). Another definition suggests "culture is the life style learnt through circumstances of the civilization.(...) culture is learning and culture is acquired through learning" (Ergun, 2000: s. 19). From the perspective of these definitions, the culture related to the use of child labour is part of behaviours learnt. When the traditional culture related to the use of child labour is combined with other reasons such as lack of effective implementation of legislation on minimum working age, it may find an extensive space for exercise.

It is known that the use of child labour is related not only to financial difficulties but also to traditions of families and societies. In this context, there is a cultural aspect in the fact that children, viewed as labour force in the village, are also used as labour when in the city. Another reason is low levels of trust placed in education. Thinking that children cannot acquire adequate knowledge and skill at school, families may refer their children to work instead of school.

It takes time for families who migrated from rural to urban areas to adapt to urban life. Meanwhile, children, who used to work in villages and fields, tend to continue working in cities when under the pressure of poverty and unemployment. Working on the street, as a widespread form of child labour, is a type of behaviour backed by the culture surrounding the child.

Below is a list of some reasons of sending children to work on the street:

- *Poverty*
- *Increasing costs of consumption.*
- *Inadequate fight against poverty and social benefits*
- *Lack of means to meet basic needs*
- *The child's wish to raise his/her family's and his/her own living standards by working*
- *Absence of another family member at working age, for instance cases where the father is not alive.*
- *Disease or disability of the father, preventing him from working*
- *The child's having no parents alive or living away from parents*
- *Unemployment of adult family members (for instance of the father).*
- *Adults' loss of their job or shut-down of businesses due to economic crises*
- *Children's finding a job more easily, child labour's being cheap*
- *Failure to meet the most basic needs of the family*
- *The child's being obliged to contribute to the household budget*
- *Low level of education*
- *Families' negative perspective of the education*
- *Values, attitudes and behaviours in the family promoting child labour*
- *Outside influence*

Examples from the world

All over the world, children work because of economic reasons including poverty and helping the family. 60% of the children living on the street across the world do so in order to financially help the family (Albayrak 2009). A national research conducted in Brazil found that children working/living or begging on the street do so to “save themselves” and “contribute to the household budget” (SDH, 2011; cited by Rosenblatt, 2015).

It was found in China that street life had a negative effect on children's subjective well-being (Cheng and Lam, 2010). A study in Philippines observed that street children with no regular relation with their family ran a greater risk of drug abuse (Njord et al., 2010). Studies in general suggest that living conditions of the children working on the street are full of serious risks.

There are interesting findings on working children and their living conditions in different countries (Polat, 2002):

- *9% of the population in Mexico City is comprised of street children.*
- *A study conducted in Brazil's Rio De Janeiro put the rate of children living on the street at 26%.*
- *It was found that 92% of the street children in Guatemala are exposed to sexual abuse.*
- *Most of the children in Colombia are engaged in marginal work such as selling flowers at cemeteries, carrying baskets at marketplaces and wiping car glasses. There are more than 350 children working in three big cemeteries of Bogota.*
- *Children aged 5-7 on Kenya's and Sri Lanka's beaches are reported to sell items such as works of handcraft and beach outfits.*
- *Street children in Bangladesh live on collecting wastes such as vegetables, plastics, paper, cardboard, toothpaste tube or lid, broken glass and metal scrap from garbage. Wastes so collected are then sold to factories through middlemen.*
- *The number of children aged 12-16 in Thailand engaged in sex work to live is estimated to stand around 800,000.*
- *There are about 1,5 million children living on the streets in Philippines. There are about 50 to 75 children in the capital Manila.*

Children Working/Sent to Work on the Street and Risks

Risks in the Street

Working has negative effects on children's personality and development. Many studies suggest that working on the street involves various risks for children and

disrupt their healthy development (Nalkur, 2009). Children's working conditions involve risk of accident, theft and abuse, lack of enough time to play and lagging behind in education (Bromley and Mackie, 2009).

According to a study, 34,98% of children working on the street did not find it safe to work on the street. For this, they indicate the following reasons: mistreatment by adults (22,34%), drunk people being around (21,28%), risk of kidnap (10,64%), risk of traffic accident (9,57%), presence of municipal police (9,57%), their money being stolen (5,32%), exposure to sexual abuse (3,19%) and other reasons (18,08%) (Çırak and Çivitci, 2004; cited by Yeşil, 2009).

Literature classifies risks faced by children working/sent to work on the street in four main categories; physical, sexual and psychological abuse; risk of disease, substance addiction; risks related to education and being pushed to crime. All these risks annihilate children's possibility to freely develop their personality and create a negative impact on physical, psychological and social development of the child.

Children sent to work on the street; keep standing for a long time in any weather condition, perform works that are risky for their hygiene and health, have their education disrupted, have an unbalanced and inadequate nutrition, are forced to work beyond the capabilities of their age, are exposed to deviant behaviours such as substance use, committing crimes etc and are deprived of possibility of adequate rest and leisure. Working children cannot find adequate time and possibility for normal actions for their age such as play, sports and cultural activities.

Physical, Sexual and Psychological Abuse

Children working on the street work in an environment involving high risks of exposure to physical and sexual abuse (Karabulut, 2000). Spending most or all of the day on the street, away from protection of the family and society, children may be exposed to all forms of abuse and exploitation by adults, gangs composed of older children, alcoholics and drug addicts living in the street (Tor, 2010).

In another study, 11,64% of children working on the street stated that they were sexually abused. 18,49% said their friends were sexually abused. Of these children, 52,94% said they were sexually abused by strangers, 11,76% by drunkards, 5,88% by neighbourhood friends, 5,88% by glue sniffers and 23,53% by others. 14,38% of the children working on the street declared they smoked; but did not use other harmful substances such as volatile substance, glue and drug (Çırak and Çivitci, 2004; cited by Yeşil, 2009).

Relations between the children working on the street and policemen/municipal policemen/security personnel are important in terms of risk of abuse. Atauz (1990) found that under normal circumstances there were peaceful relationships between the children and policemen, but relations were strained in cases where children committed offences, engaged in roguery or ran away from home. The same study found that children were mistreated and sustained violence by policemen when taken to the police station; policemen found such violence dissuasive and educative, while children normalized it.

Children working on the street try to deal with risks of the street by being united and forming groups. For instance, Tunç (1998) said that children working on the street slept in groups in abandoned buildings or commercial blocks and by doing so prevented attempts of sexual abuse. Zeytinoğlu (2000) observed that group attachment was very strong among begging children, in that when something happened to one of them, the others protected this child.

Impact of the Street Work on Education

Under the law no 6287 that entered into force in Turkey in 2012, mandatory education covers primary school (4 years), secondary school (4 years) and high school (4 years) education. In this system, of the children aged 60 to 66 months old, those who are ready for development are enrolled to primary school upon the written demand of their parents, while others are referred to pre-school education (Göksoy, 2013: 32-33).

People who migrate to big cities for various reasons not only face difficulties in integrating and adapting to urban life but also encounter economic difficulties. These difficulties adversely affect inter-family relations and straining monetary problems necessitate children's working and contributing to the family livelihood. This being the case, education status of working children is inevitably affected. The education status of children working and living on the street is closely related to whether they maintain strong links with the family or not.

In cases where the family influence, supervision and care continue while children work on the street to contribute to the family budget, children's education may be relatively affected. Some of these children work because the family wants, while others want to work themselves. These children, working after school hours, at week-ends, in between the semesters or during summer holidays, spend a shorter time on the street. They return home once the daily working time is over. Such children and their families may have a more positive approach towards education.

For some other children working on the street, family provides less care and supervision. Most of the times, children are forced to work. The child does not return home unless they earn a certain amount of money, failing which s/he may be subjected to violence. Time of returning home for such children is usually irregular. Most of the families or family substitutes in such cases have a negative approach towards education. They do not attach much value to children's education, which also changes the child's approach towards education in a negative way. The child may not have been enrolled in education at the first place, or may later on drop out of school as a result of absenteeism caused by working.

Children of the street, whose family ties are either completely broken or very weak, find themselves compelled to drop out of school in all cases.

It is known that children working on the street cannot acquire the habit of regular homework-doing and cannot find adequate time and appropriate environment for doing homework. A study found that 43,02% of children sometimes did their

homework in time, while 33,72% never did it in time. 33,72% of the children declared that they did not have appropriate atmosphere to do homework at home, 51,16% said they sometimes had appropriate conditions at home. 61,63% said that they did not have enough time to study (Keskinılıç Kara and Çalık, 2012: 685).

Even though in rare circumstances the family structure, the family's opinions of education, the child's perspective of education and his/her interests and abilities could enable these children to be attached to school and to succeed at school, the working environment of the street and working hours directly or indirectly affect their education in a negative way. In other words, the street gives rise to numerous risks for children's education. These risks can be summarized as below:

1. Children spend the time remaining after school on the street, get tired due to the work, cannot find enough time to do homework, go to the class unprepared and fail at school. Children having less and less success at school end up being alienated from school.
2. Due to failure at school and other reasons, they get into conflict with teachers and school managers as well as with their friends.
3. Rules applicable to the working environment are usually incompatible with school environment. Attitudes, behaviours, rules and habits carried from the street to the school by the child contradict the expectations of schools, which causes new conflicts. They have difficulty obeying school rules.
4. Children attribute less and less value to education and school due to the money they make and they want to spend more time working.
5. While working on the street, they may make wrong friends and wrong role models and may, in their turn, serve as negative role models for their friends at school, which causes them to get away from school more and more.

6. Acquiring negative behaviours such as vulgar power, foul language, lies etc. in order to cope with rough conditions on the street, children may carry such manners of communication to school, which adversely affects their relationship and communication with their school-mates, teachers and managers. They frequently run the risk of being subjected to disciplinary inquiries, which may result in their exclusion from the school.
7. Children who start working on the street very young are deprived of possibilities to develop their academic abilities. Their interests and abilities not being correctly identified by their teachers, such children would be deprived of chances of receiving enough support.
8. Being used to the relatively freer atmosphere of the street, children may have trouble obeying school rules, which may pave the way for numerous conflicts including disciplinary inquiries.
9. These children mature earlier than their peers due to the street work and as a result they start finding time spent at school less valuable.
10. Responsibilities for contributing to the family livelihood prevail over responsibilities related to education.
11. They get distracted very easily in classes due to the fatigue caused by the work, which may cause conflicts with their teacher and subsequently failure at school.
12. The more time the child spends on the street, the less frequently they go to school. Being more and more disconnected from their friends and school environment, these children are more likely to drop out of school.
13. These children may display aggressive attitudes such as damaging the equipment and tools in the classroom, doors and windows of the school and

belongings of their teachers and mates in order to attract adequate attention and develop leadership.

14. For the child, studying is a desire that will never come true, working is a mandatory door opening to the future. For the child, the street means freedom, solidarity and working space on one hand; and deadlock plagued by crime and dangers on the other hand.
15. When kept away from school, children working on the street cannot adequately participate in social activities that are important for psycho-social development.
16. When deprived of mandatory basic education, children cannot adequately develop their mental and physical abilities and personality.
17. Children deprived of education are more vulnerable to deviated behaviours such as substance use and crime-committing.
18. The family does not provide adequate care of children working/living on the street and cannot teach basic normal behaviours to them. Children, who cannot complete this shortcoming at school, may be oriented towards certain sources of identification on the street.
19. Children working on the street display intertwined behaviours of alienation such as coming late to the school, absenteeism and dropping out of school.
20. Children alienated and disconnected from school cannot acquire adequate professional knowledge and skills required for adulthood.
21. Girls working on the street run a bigger risk of early marriage.
22. When their education is terminated, they cannot receive health checks provided at school.

23. When they have not received adequate education, they have little self-confidence. They cannot place trust in the future.

Health Problems of Children Engaged in Street Work

Street work means difficult conditions for children including primarily unhealthy and unbalanced nutrition. Children working on the street usually have one or two meals a day. They remain hungry for a long time and they may opt for unhealthy foods such as bagel or buns when they eat. Compounded by long working hours, this situation poses risks for children (Altıntaş, 2003).

It is known that children working on the street suffer from malaise, muscle weakness, intestinal problems, genital problems, dental problems, trauma and injuries such as fracture (Ögel and Yücel, 2005; cited by Karakuş, 2010).

Children working on the street suffer from psychological problems in addition to physical problems. A study found that depressive symptom levels of children working on the street were higher than other children (Erdoğan, 2012). Main reason of incidence of depression among children working on the street is the difficulties of the street life such as hunger, exposure to dangers, substance use and weakness of support systems (Ögel et al., 2005; cited by Karakuş, 2010).

Altıntaş (2003) found in his study that children had usually poor health. Scavengers and shoe-shiners were found to have pale skin and scavengers were found to spots on their skin.

Another study reported that children working on the street faced various problems and risks such as upper respiratory tract infections, dermatological problems, use of alcohol and drugs, exposure to negative effects of shoe-shine and polishes, lifting heavy goods and catching parasites (Okumuş, 2009).

Some of the most serious health problems affecting children working on the street include mental and psychological problems. Indeed, children deprived of affectionate

inter-family relationships based on respect and trust develop serious psychological problems. Their psychological health would be gradually deteriorated by exclusion, loneliness, insecurity, helplessness and pressures they face. There is also a substantial risk of sexual abuse.

Addictions of tobacco, alcohol and drugs cause some additional psychiatric problems such as hallucinations, disorders of judgement etc. Another frequent condition is upper respiratory tract diseases caused by negative effects of open air. Diseases that are not treated in time may turn into chronic diseases. Street fights and conflicts in which they frequently get involved may result in injury and death.

Poor, irregular and unhealthy nutrition causes primarily gastrological and digestive tract diseases. Living and working conditions, obligation to remain and live outside at all times, objects they contact with such as garbage diminish the resistance of the body, weakens immune system and increases the risk of catching diseases.

The risks of catching sexually-transmitted diseases are higher for teenagers living in the street due to becoming sexually active at a very young age, engaging in active sexual intercourse without appropriate protection and having sexual relations in return for money. Some of the teenagers living in the street are reported to catch sexually-transmitted diseases and unwanted pregnancies.

Below is a list of physical and psycho-social problems faced by children working on the street:

Physical Problems

- Health conditions cause by lack of adequate hygiene
- Exposure to adverse climatic conditions
- Poor and unbalanced nutrition
- Food poisoning caused by nutrition

- Stunting. Being shorter than peers, being frail
- They run significant risk of accidents, including occupational accidents
- Exposure to violence in the street
- Untreated acute health conditions turn into chronic diseases
- Health problems remaining undiagnosed and untreated
- Exposure to sexual abuse
- Greater vulnerability to contagious diseases
- Malaise, muscle weakness, gastro-intestinal problems, respiratory problems, dermatological problems, genital problems, tuberculosis, asthma, dental problems, trauma and injuries such as fracture
- They don't take care of their health and live day by day
- Diseases caused by inadequate cleanliness
- Traffic accidents

Psycho-Social Problems

- Insecurity, unworthiness, lack of belonging and similar feelings cause intense anger and hatred, which results in resorting to violence and drugs
- Personality and behavioural disorders
- Sexual abuse
- Intensive stress and stress-related psycho-somatic disorders
- Depression, self-mutilation, destructive behaviours and suicide

- They are exposed to violence and exclusion in street relations. These may deeply mark their personality.
- Very low self-respect, unworthiness etc. cause anger against society
- Deprivation of sense of belonging
- Exclusion from the society
- Prejudiced approaches
- Tendency to crime, participation in criminal organizations
- Substance use
- They may be physically harmed or crippled. They may have to bear sequels for a lifetime
- Difficulties in accessing health services
- Children may get their bodily integrity harmed, in order for them to beg more easily. For instance, they may get their hand or fingers cut.
- They are excluded by other people due to their outfits and cleanliness situation. They are ridiculed and scorned
- Anti-social behaviours and personality characteristics
- Behavioural disorders
- Difficulty in adapting to school
- Difficulty in adapting to social rules
- Inter-family discordance
- Transferring street rules to collective living spaces

Substance Addiction

Primary reasons of substance addiction include: wish to get rid of sense of loneliness, wish to forget one's fears, making oneself feel relaxed, insecurity, inter-family unrest, envy, curiosity, encouragement of friends, feeling of growing up, inter-family violence, wish to resist family and feeling of revenge. Children working on the street may take up using substances under these influences.

Substance addiction pushes children to crime and affect their physical and mental health and result in their marginalization.

Children on the street usually use easily accessible and cheap substances. When they use these substances, they lose self-control, have hallucinations and may harm beloved ones, themselves and environment. These substances cause irreparable damage to the brain.

There is a close relation between working on the street and substance use. Studies found that children working on the street get into habits of using drugs and addictive substances (Kızmaz and Bilgin, 2010).

A study conducted in Diyarbakır found that “42,5% of children start using one of the addictive substances after starting to work on the street, and 13,5% of these children using addictive substances use a substance other than tobacco” (Bilgin, 2009).

A significant number of children working on the street are reported to start using substances with the influence of friend. Wish to be gain recognition in the circle of friends is an important factor (Güngör 2008).

Below are some reasons why children working on the street start and keep using substances:

Reasons of Starting Using Substances

- Exposure to violence within the family
- Neglect of family
- Lack of supervision
- Ease of accessibility
- Cheap (bally, glue, extacy)

- Negative influence of friends
- Criminal organizations making benefits
- Society's negative attitudes towards these children
- Curiosity
- The fact that the child already smokes
- Wish to be recognized and belonging to a group
- Viewing substance use as an indicator of adulthood
- Staying in the street, particularly at night
- Wish to feel secure
- Wish to break traditions and authority
- Avoiding or getting rid of problems
- Suspension from school
- Helplessness about the future
- Strict discipline
- Insecurity
- Wish to prove oneself
- Inability to express one's feelings and thoughts
- Multiple children
- Sense of loneliness

- Wish to attract attention
- Wish to belong to a group
- Presence of family members using substance
- Failure at school
- Inadequate coping skills
- Living/working on the street
- Disintegrated family
- Lack of role models in the family and environment and lack of guidance
- To get warm

Delinquency

It is known that socio-economic level and environmental conditions are very important in terms of delinquent behaviours of children (Yavuzer, 2006). Street work is one of the factors for children's delinquency. A study suggested that destructive tendencies children nurture may prompt them to delinquency and cause them to harm themselves (Atauz, 1990).

Another study reported that most of the children going to school and working on the street at the same time joined neighbourhood gangs and school gangs, these children had some friends who got arrested and some family members were convicted or imprisoned (Güngör, 2008).

"Main factor in delinquency of children or young people is the street life and struggle to survive as well as wish to gain status and to gain recognition" (Permien & Zink, 2005: 203; cited by Okumuş, 2009).

Children working on the street may also be victims of crimes, like frequent cases of sexual abuse and violence.

Children getting involved in delinquency include those in the age group 12-16, children at mandatory school age. Usually, children running away from home and school and coming from disintegrated, crowded and indifferent families get involved in delinquent behaviours. Other groups of children who are under risk of becoming delinquent include those who are uneducated, have low socio-economic level, are under the influence of other people and were sexually abused. Children using substances run high risk of becoming delinquent.

The risk of delinquency is higher among children who cannot meet their basic needs, who believe they have nothing to lose in life, who are purposeless and who have an intense feeling of insecurity and failure. These risks are further compounded by lack of order and supervision, wish to make easy money and desire to defy social rules.

Types of crimes in which children get usually involved include extortion, theft, pick-pocketing, bodily injury, murder, fight, gangster acts, smuggling, harassment, rape, forcible confinement, drug use, prostitution etc.

Why do children become delinquent?

1. Exclusion of the child by the family and close friends
2. Pressure and suffering
3. Low education
4. Feeling of revenge
5. Fear
6. Attempt to look different
7. Being labelled due to previous delinquency

8. Given that children don't have legal capacity, they may have been directed/forced to have committed certain crimes by adults.
9. Direction by peers or the child's group of friends. The child may tend to become delinquent in order to gain status and not to be excluded by the group in which he lives.
10. It is common to join gangs and groups with criminal tendencies for reason of belonging and need for security. Emulating the group leader, wish to gain recognition and respect.
11. Lack of social-legal dissuasion
12. Desensitization
13. Sustaining sexual abuse
14. Domestic violence and taking social models. It is known that they try to imitate certain high-profile criminals glorified by the society. These models may be a TV serial or cinema character
15. Attraction attention
16. Economic difficulties
17. Migration
18. Vulnerability of children living on the street to danger
19. The child may commit a crime to procure harmful substances used
20. Use of the child by rings
21. Gaining social power by propagating fear
22. Meeting the needs for protection and shelter

23. Not knowing from whom to ask for help
24. The wish to make easy money may play a role in trying illegitimate means
25. Absence of a protective and supervising family or individual
26. Stigmatization of the children working on the street by the society
27. Delinquency may be common in the immediate circle of people around the children
28. These children may be directed by others to commit crimes for the purpose of generating monetary profit
29. Means of mass communication, visual media in particular, promoting mafia-like crime syndicates
30. The wish to make one's presence more noticeable, prove oneself and stand out within the society by committing crimes
31. Wish to defy social rules and institutions
32. Difficulties in meeting certain requirements and obligation to meet such needs play a role in delinquency
33. There may be a connection between the feeling of failure and delinquency
34. The rate of delinquency is high, since these children spend most of the time outside
35. The child may commit crimes more readily for lack of expectations and goals in life, because he has nothing to lose
36. Exposure to violence in the working environment may cause the child to adopt negative role models. Out of the anger against the person who

inflicted violence on him, he may turn to violence against others weaker than him

37. As long as the child lives and works on the street, he becomes alienated from school, which increases delinquent tendencies.

38. Children working on the street may be exposed to mistreatment (battery) and sexual abuse by the adults on the street and consequently may commit crimes for self-defence

Families of children working on the street

Families of children working on the street are usually socio-economically disadvantaged. Many studies found that the families of children working on the street could not meet their basic needs and street work was a result of the poverty of families (Güngör, 2013; Atauz, 1990; Öztürk, 2008).

Below are the main characteristics of the children working on the street and their families:

- *These are families with multiple children.*
- *These children's fathers and elder brothers are unemployed most of the time during the year*
- *Families live in shanty homes with sanitarily uninhabitable conditions*
- *Most of them are children of migrant families*
- *Most of the times, families do not know, follow or monitor what their children do on the street*
- *Most of the mothers in the families do not speak Turkish and are illiterate. Most of the fathers are just literate*
- *Some of the families want their children to work to contribute to the family budget, while some others want it so that the child does not wander around doing nothing*

- *Most of the adults working in the family do work in unskilled jobs*
- *There is hardly anyone working with social security*
- *Three out of every four children want to continue their education*
- *Children work until midnight in order to earn more money for their families or not to be beaten*
- *Some of the children working on the street for a long time during the day spends the money they earn in video-game arcades, and so children conflicting with their families start spending the night on the street*
- *There are significant numbers of children who are sexually assaulted and abused by adults and peers*
- *Some of the children working on the street get into contact with groups of children living in the street at all times and gradually turn into glue-sniffers and start partially living in the street*
- *Theft is the most common crime encountered among children. There are also children involved in bodily injury and murder*
- *Violence is very common between children*
- *One out of every four child identified is either a substance user or volatile substance user*
- *Children working on the street spend the day on crowded avenues, market places and parks and the night in spaces that are open round the clock such as bars, cafes-restaurants, coach stations (www.aile.gov.tr/dosya/?id=83; cited by Yeşil, 2009).*

International and Social Instruments

European Social Charter

Opened for signature in 1961 and put into force in 1965 by the Council of Europe, the European Social Charter is a binding convention of the CoE. European Social Charter may be viewed as the counterpart of the European Convention of Human Rights in the field of economic and social rights. This Convention was revised in 1996 and gradually replaced the previous one since 1999. Having signed the

Convention in 1996, Turkey took reservations on certain articles which are: Four weeks of paid annual leave (Article 2/III), decent remuneration (Article 4/I), the right to organize (Article 5) the right to bargain collectively (Article 6).

Article 7 of the Convention is related to the right of children and young persons to protection. Under this Article, with a view to ensuring the effective exercise of the right of children and young persons to protection, the Parties undertake;

- to provide that the minimum age of admission to employment shall be 15 years, subject to exceptions for children employed in prescribed light work without harm to their health, morals or education;
- to provide that the minimum age of admission to employment shall be 18 years with respect to prescribed occupations regarded as dangerous or unhealthy;
- to provide that persons who are still subject to compulsory education shall not be employed in such work as would deprive them of the full benefit of their education;
- to provide that the working hours of persons under 18 years of age shall be limited in accordance with the needs of their development, and particularly with their need for vocational training;
- to recognise the right of young workers and apprentices to a fair wage or other appropriate allowances;
- to provide that the time spent by young persons in vocational training during the normal working hours with the consent of the employer shall be treated as forming part of the working day;
- to provide that employed persons of under 18 years of age shall be entitled to a minimum of four weeks' annual holiday with pay;
- to provide that persons under 18 years of age shall not be employed in night work with the exception of certain occupations provided for by national laws or regulations;

- to provide that persons under 18 years of age employed in occupations prescribed by national laws or regulations shall be subject to regular medical control;
- to ensure special protection against physical and moral dangers to which children and young persons are exposed, and particularly against those resulting directly or indirectly from their work

United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child

The Convention on the Rights of the Child is the convention signed and ratified by the biggest number of countries in world history. Adopted at the General Assembly of the United Nations on November 20, 1989, this Convention entered into force on September 2, 1990. Being the most commonly adopted instrument of human rights since then, this Convention contains some provisions intended for protecting the rights of the child universally. Turkey signed the Convention on the Rights of the Child on October 14, 1990 and put it into force after ratifying on January 27, 1995. All over the world, 20 November is celebrated as the Universal Children's Day.

Human rights of the child as mentioned in the Convention are treated under four main categories: Rights related to life, development, protection and participation. The governing principles of the Convention are non-discrimination between children, observing the best interests of the child, right to life and development and right to participation.

Article 32 of the Convention contains some protective provisions related to employment of children and gives some responsibilities to the Parties. Under this Article,

1. States Parties recognize the right of the child to be protected from economic exploitation and from performing any work that is likely to be hazardous or to interfere with the child's education, or to be harmful to the child's health or physical, mental, spiritual, moral or social development.

2. States Parties shall take legislative, administrative, social and educational measures to ensure the implementation of the present article. To this end, and having regard to the relevant provisions of other international instruments, States Parties shall in particular:

- (a) Provide for a minimum age or minimum ages for admission to employment;
- (b) Provide for appropriate regulation of the hours and conditions of employment;
- (c) Provide for appropriate penalties or other sanctions to ensure the effective enforcement of the present article.

International Labour Organization Minimum Age Convention no 138

International Labour Organization adopted the Minimum Age Convention on June 6, 1973 to completely abolish the child labour and in relation to the minimum age in admission to employment (ILO Convention no 138). Convention 138 is among the fundamental conventions of ILO. This Convention was adopted by Turkey through the law dated January 23, 1998 and no 4334. Article 90 of the Constitution of the Republic of Turkey, ILO Conventions ratified shall have the force of law and prevail over texts of domestic legislation in case conflict.

Article 1 of the Convention reads “Each Member for which this Convention is in force undertakes to pursue a national policy designed to ensure the effective abolition of child labour and to raise progressively the minimum age for admission to employment or work to a level consistent with the fullest physical and mental development of young persons”.

Article 2 reads “Each Member which ratifies this Convention shall specify, in a declaration appended to its ratification, a minimum age for admission to employment or work within its territory and on means of transport registered in its territory; subject

to Articles 4 to 8 of this Convention, no one under that age shall be admitted to employment or work in any occupation”.

States may raise the minimum age limits previously specified. The minimum age limit shall not be less than the age of completion of compulsory schooling and, in any case, shall not be less than 15 years. However, a Member whose economy and educational facilities are insufficiently developed may, initially specify a minimum age of 14 years.

The minimum age for admission to any type of employment or work which by its nature or the circumstances in which it is carried out is likely to jeopardise the health, safety or morals of young persons shall not be less than 18 years (Art.3).

Convention no 182 concerning the Prohibition and Immediate Action for the Elimination of the Worst Forms of Child Labour

The Convention no 182 concerning the Prohibition and Immediate Action for the Elimination of the Worst Forms of Child Labour was adopted by ILO on June 17, 1999. Turkey adopted it through the law dated January 25, 2001 and no 4623. Each Member which ratifies this Convention shall take immediate and effective measures to secure the prohibition and elimination of the worst forms of child labour as a matter of urgency.

It is stated in the preamble of the Convention that the Convention is related to the prohibition and elimination of the worst forms of child labour. The Convention makes a correlation between the worst forms of child labour and the unmet needs of their families; underlines the importance of the support to be provided to the families and free basic education to be provided to the children; and mentions the requirement for an immediate and comprehensive action plan in order to remove the children concerned from all such work and to provide for their rehabilitation and social integration.

It is stipulated that each Member which ratifies this Convention shall take immediate and effective measures to secure the prohibition and elimination of the worst forms of child labour as a matter of urgency (Article 1).

For the purposes of this Convention, “the term the worst forms of child labour comprises: all forms of slavery or practices similar to slavery, such as the sale and trafficking of children, debt bondage and serfdom and forced or compulsory labour, including forced or compulsory recruitment of children for use in armed conflict; the use, procuring or offering of a child for prostitution, for the production of pornography or for pornographic performances; the use, procuring or offering of a child for illicit activities, in particular for the production and trafficking of drugs as defined in the relevant international treaties; work which, by its nature or the circumstances in which it is carried out, is likely to harm the health, safety or morals of children (Article 3).

State Parties shall;

After consultation with the organizations of employers and workers concerned, shall identify where the types of work so determined exist (Article 4).

Take measures to secure the enforcement of the provisions of this Convention (Article 5).

Each Member shall design and implement programmes of action to eliminate as a priority the worst forms of child labour (Article 6).

Each Member shall take all necessary measures to ensure the effective implementation and enforcement of the provisions giving effect to this Convention (Article 7).

Each Member shall, taking into account the importance of education in eliminating child labour, take following measures to: (Article 7)

- prevent the engagement of children in the worst forms of child labour;
- provide the necessary and appropriate direct assistance for the removal of children from the worst forms of child labour and for their rehabilitation and social integration;
- ensure access to free basic education, and, wherever possible and appropriate, vocational training, for all children removed from the worst forms of child labour;
- identify and reach out to children at special risk; and
- take account of the special situation of girls.

Each Member shall designate the competent authority responsible for the implementation of the provisions giving effect to this Convention

Constitution of the Republic of Turkey

Constitution of the Republic of Turkey stipulates “Family is the foundation of the Turkish society and based on the equality between the spouses. The State shall take the necessary measures and establish the necessary organization to protect peace and welfare of the family, especially mother and children (Article 41).”

The protection of the child and role of the State enshrined in the Constitution are not limited to the abovementioned.

According to the Constitution, no one shall be deprived of the right of education. Primary education is compulsory for all citizens of both sexes and is free of charge in state schools. The State shall provide scholarships and other means of assistance to enable students of merit lacking financial means to continue their education. The State shall take necessary measures to rehabilitate those in need of special

education so as to render such people useful to society (Art. 42). No one shall be required to perform work unsuited to his/her age, sex, and capacity. Minors, women, and physically and mentally disabled persons, shall enjoy special protection with regard to working conditions (Art. 50). The State shall take necessary measures to protect youth from addiction to alcohol and drugs, crime, gambling, and similar vices, and ignorance (Art. 58). The Constitution of the Republic of Turkey considers children in need of protection as “persons requiring special protection in the field of social security” and states that in order to ensure their reintegration into the society, the State shall take all kinds of measures and establish the necessary organizations or facilities, or arrange for their establishment.

Turkish Civil Code

The definition of child made in the Turkish Civil Code complies with international standards. Under the Code, everyone below the age of 18 is a minor (child). As a whole, the Civil Code attaches particular importance to the principle “protection of the weak”. Provisions related to the protection of the child are given under the chapters on law of persons, family and inheritance. The provisions contained in the Book on the Law of Family in particular are interesting.

Within the union of family established through marriage, spouses shall be responsible for taking care of the children and their education and supervision together (TCC, Art. 185).

Each of the parents has to right to ask for being allowed to have personal relation with the child that is not under his/her custody or that has not been entrusted to his/her custody and shall be responsible for abstaining from damaging the other’s personal relationship with the child and from preventing the child’s education and upbringing (TCC, Art. 323, 324).

The parents' duty of care shall continue until the child becomes major. If the child's education continues after attaining the age of majority, then parents shall be responsible for taking care of the child until the completion of the education, to the extent of their situation and conditions and to the extent expected from them (TCC, Art. 328).-

The child who is not major shall be under the custody of his/her parents. Unless there is a legal justification, custody shall not be taken away from the parents. Unless the judge deems it necessary to appoint a guardian, major children in respect of whom a restriction has been declared shall remain under the parents' custody (TCC, Art. 335).-

Spouses shall also be responsible for taking care of their minor foster children. The spouse that exercises custody over his/her child shall be appropriately assisted by the other spouse; shall represent him/her for the needs of the child to the extent required by the situation and conditions (TCC, Art. 338).-

Parents shall make and apply the necessary decisions about the child's care and education by considering his/her benefit. The child is obliged to obey his/her parents. Parents shall allow the child to regulate his/her life the extent of his/her maturity; they shall take his/her opinions on important matters into consideration as much as possible. The child cannot leave the house without taking his/her parents' consent and he/she cannot be taken away without a legal reason (TCC, Art. 339).

Parents shall educate the child according to their resources, and provide and protect him/her physical, mental, psychological, ethical and social development. Parents shall provide the child, especially physically and mentally disabled one, with general and professional education appropriate to his/her skills and tendency (TCC, Art. 340).

If physical and psychological development of the child is found to be in danger or the child is abandoned morally, the judge may place the child with another family or

in an institution by taking him/her from the parents. If stay of the child within the family disturbs the peace of the family to a degree that cannot be expected to be born by the family or there is no other way under the circumstances, the judge may take the same measures upon the request of the parents or the child. If the parents or the child cannot afford to pay the expenditures rising from these measures, they shall be born by the State (TCC, Art. 347).-

Public Health Law

The Public Health Law, which entered into force in 1930, contains quite progressive provisions related to the protection of children. Even though some of these lost validity as a result of subsequent legal provisions, the law still contains some provisions still in force. The law stipulates that children under a certain age cannot be employed, children in a certain age group shall not work than eight hours a day, and children in another age group cannot be employed at night works after 8 p.m. even though there has been some changes in the age groups prescribed in the law, the basic philosophy of the law is maintained in current legislative texts (PHL, Art. 173, 175).

The provision prohibiting the employment of children below the age of eighteen at bars, cabarets, dance halls, teahouses, restaurants and Turkish baths is still valid (PHL, Art. 176). There is a provision stipulating that pregnant women cannot be used in heavy services that would harm her health and the baby's health within the three months preceding delivery. This provision is intended to protect the mother and the baby (PHL, Art. 177). –

Labour Law

The provision of the Labour Law, heading “Working Age and Prohibition of Child Labour” reads:

“Employment of children who have not completed the age of fifteen is prohibited. However, children who have completed the full age of fourteen and their primary education may be employed on light works that will not hinder their physical, mental and moral development, and for those who continue their education, in jobs that will

not prevent their school attendance. Children who have not completed the age of fourteen may be employed in activities of arts, culture and advertisement that shall not disrupt their physical, mental, social and moral development and shall not disrupt education for those who are still schooled, provided that such employment be based on a written contract and a permission be obtained for each activity in each case.

In the placement of children and young employees in jobs and in the types of work where they are employable, their security and health, physical, mental and psychological development as well as their personal suitability and capability shall be taken into consideration. The job the child performs must not bar him for attending school and from continuing his vocational training, nor impair his pursuance of class work on a regular basis.

The types of works where employment of children and young employees who have not completed the full age of eighteen is prohibited and the works where young employees who have not completed the age of eighteen may be permitted to work, as well as the light works and working conditions in which children who have completed the age of fourteen and their primary education may work shall be determined in a regulation of the Ministry of Labour and Social Security to be issued within six months (1)(2)

The working time of children who have completed their basic education and yet who are no longer attending school shall not be more than seven hours daily and more than thirty-five hours weekly. The working time of children engaged in activities of arts, culture and advertisement, on the other hand, shall not be more than five hours daily and more than thirty hours weekly. However this working time for children who have completed the age of fifteen may be increased up to eight hours a day and forty hours a week.

During the education period, the working time of pre-school children and children still attending school must fall outside their training hours and shall not be more than two hours daily and ten hours weekly. Their working time during the periods

when schools are closed shall not exceed the hours foreseen in the paragraph four above.

Governing principles and procedures related to the scope of activities of arts, culture and advertisement, and issuance of working permit to children engaged in these activities, age groups and times of work and rest by type of activity, working conditions and payment of the remuneration shall be set forth in a Regulation to be issued by the Ministry of Labour and Social Security in consultation with the Ministry of Family and Social Policies, Ministry of Culture and Tourism, Ministry of Health, Ministry of National Education and Higher Council of Radio and Television” (Article 71).

Other provisions contained in the Labour Law in relation to the child labour are as follows:

“Boys under the age of eighteen and women irrespective of their age must not be employed on underground or underwater work like in mines, cable-laying and the construction of sewers and tunnels” (Prohibition of employment in underground and underwater work, Article 72).

“Children and young employees under the age of eighteen must not be employed on industrial work during the night” (Prohibition of night work, Article 73).

Vocational Education Law

Vocational Education Law no 3308 sets forth principles related to the training of apprentices, interns and masters and vocational training to be provided at schools and enterprises. Article 10 of the Law sets forth conditions to be fulfilled to be an apprentice:

- *Having completed the age of 14 and not having completed the age of 19.*
- *Being a primary school graduate in minimum.*

- *Having a body constitution and health situation strong enough to perform the work in question*

The law also contains some provisions on remuneration, leaves and social security of apprentices.

Public Health Law is another national legislative text in this field. This Law has the following articles related to child labour:

- *Article 173 – It is prohibited to employ children below the age of twelve at any industrial facility such as factories and workshops and in mines as labourer or apprentice. Girls and boys aged twelve to sixteen shall not work more than eight hours a day.*
- *Article 174 – It is prohibited to employ children aged twelve to sixteen for night work after 8 p.m.*
- *Article 175 – Night works and underground works shall not last more than eight hours within a 24 hour period for all workers.*
- *Article 176 – Local municipalities shall prohibit the employment of children below the age of eighteen at bars, cabarets, dance halls, tea houses, restaurants and Turkish baths. .*

Organizations Related to Service Provision

International Labour Organization (ILO) is the most important organization providing services universally in relation to children working on the street. In 1991, International Labour Organization launched the International Programme on the Elimination of Child Labour (IPEC). IPEC programme is intended for assisting countries in eliminating child labour, raising awareness across the world and to gradually ensure elimination of child labour. Turkey joined the ILO/IPEC Programme in 1992.

IPEC Programme deems it necessary to adopt national policies on the issue and ensure the participation of all relevant institutions and agencies. It is possible for

outstanding public institutions such as the Ministry of Labour and Social Security, Ministry of National Education, Ministry of Health, Ministry of Family and Social Policies and local administrations to assume responsibilities to eliminate child labour.

IPEC Programme Document identifies the following target beneficiary groups (Yeşil, 2009):

- *Children working at organized and marginal industrial production sectors (factories, industrial organizations, handicrafts etc.),*
- *Children working in organized marginal sector in agriculture,*
- *Children working in commercial and service sectors such as restaurants and garbage collection,*

Priority shall be given the following groups of children;

- *Children working at factories, small businesses or in agriculture in dangerous conditions,*
- *Children forcibly used as labourer in agriculture, industry or service sectors,*
- *Children living and working on the street without family support.*

A comparison of the results of the Child Labour Survey of October 1999 and October 1994 shows that from 1992 to 1999 there was a significant decline in the rate of children employed in the age group 6-14, which is a target group for ILO IPEC programme. The results of the Child Labour Survey of October 1994 had found that 8,5% of children in the age group 6-14 were working in an economic activity. This rate was found to have decreased to 4,2% in October 1999 (<http://www.ilo.org/ankara/areas-of-work/child-labour/lang--tr/index.htm>).

“In Turkey, National Paper on Child Policy was published on March 23-24, 1989; and following preparatory works including identification of working children done with a

broad participation, National Child Policy Congress was convened in Ankara on May 26-27, 1989. The adoption of the Declaration of the Rights of the Child by Turkey resulted in increased efforts in this field. The Report of the National Child Policy Congress of 1990s classified working children in three categories: first group consisting of children working as child labourer, second group consisting of children working as apprentice and third group consisting of children working and living on the street. One of the most important observations of these meetings underlined “the use of child labour cannot be eliminated without deep transformations in economic, social and cultural fields; coercions will put children in a more unprotected position, and therefore the priority should be given to measures that will be beneficial for children in the short term” (Fişek, 2002; cited by Yeşil, 2009).

According to the Law no 2828 on Social Services and Child Protection Agency; Child in Need of Protection means; “a child whose physical, mental and moral development or personal safety are in danger and;

1. who does not have mother or father, or both,
2. whose mother or father or both are not known,
3. has been abandoned by mother or father or both,
4. is neglected by mother or father and left vulnerable to all forms of social dangers and bad habits such as prostitution, begging and using alcoholic beverages or drugs and pushed to vagrancy”.

Under this definition, children sent to work on the street need to be considered as a Child in Need of Protection (CNP). Day Centres for Children and Young Persons, at the disposal of children working and living on the street, have served these children. The Regulation on Centres for Children and Young Persons dated 30.09.2001 sets forth the function of these Centres: “Rehabilitation and social reintegration of children

living in the street and exposed to social dangers and of children and young persons sent to work on the street”. Article 2 of the Regulation sets forth the duties of Centres for Children and Young Persons attached to Social Services and Child Protection Agency and of units affiliated to these centres as follows:

- Protecting children and young persons living and working on the street from risks that may jeopardize their physical, psychological and emotional development,
- Helping them meet their basic needs,
- Providing them with temporary accommodation services when needed or arrange the provision of such service,
- Carrying out all kinds of social service interventions and rehabilitating professional activities that will enable them to be self-sufficient at the end of a certain period of time,
- Carrying out actions for the family and society.

Article 8 of the Regulation sets forth the functions of the Centres in a more detailed manner as follows:

- a) preparing and implementing social service programmes required for protecting children living and/or working on the street from all dangers they may face in the street,
- b) Keeping all administrative and professional records and documents related to children,
- c) Carrying out necessary actions for job-oriented training and placement in a job of children and their families, cooperating with relevant organizations and ensuring coordination,
- d) Enabling economically deprived children and families to benefit from sources and institutions of social assistance,

- e) Analysing the situation of children and their families and take necessary actions under the Law 2828 related to children that should be placed under protection,
- f) Organizing all kinds of social, cultural and sportive events for children to socialize,
- g) Preparing and implementing all kinds of social service programmes for children living and working on the street, their families and society,
- h) Cooperating with relevant public and voluntary organizations and persons and ensuring coordination,
- i) Collecting, through mobile teams, qualitative and quantitative data on children living or working on the street; interpreting and analysing such data; identifying strategies and professional responses; taking necessary professional actions to this end,
- i) Organizing in-service training programmes for staff members of centres and stakeholder organizations and persons in relation to problem areas and practises,
- j) Engaging in all kinds of professional contacts, cooperation and coordination with external units on health, education, law, trade, employment, social security and similar areas,
- k) Managing all kinds of businesses and transactions related to the Centre and carrying out other relevant activities.

When the Ministry of Family and Social Policies was founded in 2011, agencies affiliated to the Social Services and Child Protection Agency were transferred to the new Ministry, and in 2013 centres for children and young persons were shut down and functions of these centres were handed over to social service centres. For the time being, there is no organization/agency affiliated to the Ministry of Family and Social Policies that directly serves children living and working on the street. When one calls the Helpline 183 about these children, the person that answers the phone tells that the police should be contacted.

The objective of the Regulation on Establishment, Duties and Functioning of the Juvenile Department Directorate of the Police Organization published in the Official Gazette dated 13.04.2001 and no 24372 is “to organize services to be provided by the police for the children who are in need of protection, exposed to neglect and abuse, found, fleeing home or the institution, refugee, unaccompanied, living in the street, sent to work on the street, incapable of telling his residence address, subject to a measure of protection, reformation and/or treatment, exposed to delinquency, suspected of having committed an offence, unidentified”.

In the Police Organization, the juvenile units carrying out duties given in the legislation related to the children are Specialization Units established at the level of the Juvenile Branch in Provincial Police Directorates and the Juvenile Bureau in District Police Directorates. The staff members of these units are composed of police officers who have received in-service training on child-specific services, development characteristic of children in the age group 0-18, behavioural sciences, interviewing techniques and communication skills.

“In Turkey, Municipalities also provide services for children. The first action taken in Turkey in this regard is the Pilot Project for Children Working on the Streets of Ankara launched by Ankara Metropolitan Municipality together with ILO/IPEC. This project was implemented with ILO support until 1997 and then the Municipality continued to implement it on its own. In 1993, In Ankara’s Sıhhiye Parking Lot, “Centre for Children Working on the Streets of Ankara” was opened” (Yeşil, 2009).

“In 1996, İstanbul Metropolitan Municipality launched the project “Protection and Social Reintegration of Street Children. Short term objectives of the Project were; to set up service stations in areas (Taksim-Tarlabası and Kadıköy-Bostancı) with significant population of street children and through these stations to provide services of healthcare, nutrition, cleaning, care, psycho-social support and education. The long term objective is to construct a “Street Children Village” that

provides all rehabilitation services including accommodation. The planned services were designed to be initially provided in locations with important population of street children, with service stations to be set up in these places" (Yeşil, 2009).

"In 1998, Gaziantep Metropolitan Municipality opened "Güvenevi" (Home of Safety) and "İlkadım Evi" (Home of First Step) to serve children working/living on the street within the framework of Street Children Project. Boys under 16 years old who recently started to live/work on the street, who did not get into the habit of using volatile substances or drugs or who make an effort to get rid of such habits are referred to Güvenevi. The objective is to meet children's needs for nutrition, cleaning, clothing and accommodation, enable the child to get in dialogue with his family and if possible to hand over the child to the family and if not possible to accommodate the child in Güvenevi for a limited period of time (3 months) and meanwhile to refer the child to education and to vocation" (Yeşil, 2009).

Another organization that provides services for children working on the street is non-governmental organizations. Polat (2002) says there are 21 associations that work on this matter in Turkey. Out of these organizations, Foundation of Street Children of Turkey and Association of Children of Hope are mentioned as the most active ones.

Situation of Syrian Migrants

After a civil war broke out and conflict of interests started in Syria, many Syrians had to flee the country, which resulted in many Syrians migrating to Turkey.

The most recent report published on Syrian migrants is the report issued by TİSK in November 2015. According to the report, there are about 2,2 million Syrian migrants in Turkey, 54% of these migrants are below the age of 18 and most of these children could not receive education (Erdoğan and Ünver, 2015).

The report "Syrian Children in Turkey" is another study published by UNICEF in September 2015. The numbers given in that report are similar to those in TİSK

report. This report talks about children's needs for education, accommodation and health (UNICEF, 2015).

Another study is the field study carried out by Assoc. Prof. Serap Özer from Bahçeşehir University and Assoc. Prof. Selçuk Şirin from New York University. This study was conducted in Gaziantep's Islahiye Camp in 2012.

The report issued by the Research Centre for Asylum and Migration in 2013 is another one. This report revises actions taken by NGOs working for migrants such as Human Rights Association, Helsinki Citizens Assembly, and Turkish Crescent etc.

Numerous studies on Syrians in Turkey have been conducted and reported by the media. These reports cover or focus, in particular, on Syrian children who could not continue education and ended up working on the street.

According to the report published by the Human Rights Watch, there are more than 400,000 Syrian children living in Turkey and not going to school. This report refers to the adoption, in 2014, of the regulation allowing Syrian children to go to Turkish public schools as an important step, but Human Rights Watch states that fundamental barriers such as language issue, problems of social integration, economic difficulties and ignorance about the relevant policy continued one year after the adoption of the regulation (Human Rights Watch, 2015).

According to the Report on Situation of Syrian Refugee Children in Turkish Public Schools drafted by İstanbul Bilgi University Children Research Unit and published in September 2015, the Temporary Protection Regulation that entered into force in 2014 set forth the legal status and legal framework applicable to Syrian refugees.

As regards the access to education, the Circular no 2014/21 on Education and Training Services for Foreigners was developed. This Circular covers actions and procedures related to coordination of education-training activities for foreigners, in

particular for students at compulsory school age, access to education and provision of quality education services, carrying out the actions in coordination with relevant units and institutions and taking necessary measures in emergencies.

The report “The Hidden Crisis: Armed Conflict and Education”, (UNESCO, 2011) prepared by UNESCO in 2011 points that children who cannot continue education had more problems than other children.

The news reported by BBC Turkey told the story of Riyad (12) and his elder brother Iyad (13) who migrated from Damascus to Turkey four years ago and wanted to be doctor, continued to go to school in Turkey, but could not fully understand courses because of language barrier and could not socialize with their friend in the classroom. The news cite some numbers given by the Ministry of National Education, according to which there are about 230 thousand children going to school in Turkey. Education in camps is delivered by Syrian teachers and students are given 6 hours of mandatory Turkish course each week (http://www.bbc.com/turkce/haberler/2015/10/151006_suriye_selin).

In 2014, Al Jazeera reported news of working children. The news talk about two 10-year-old children called Aisha and Uud who sell biscuits to support their family. The news tell that the families did not have the heart to send their children to work when in Syria but once in Turkey had no choice but to let them work. Another story in the same news is about 12-year-old Umran Hilal and 15-year-old Hasan Al Ganim who sell smuggled cigarettes (<http://www.aljazeera.com.tr/al-jazeera-ozel/suriyeli-cocuklarin-buyuk-yuku>).

The news reported in September 2015 by American CBS channel told the story of Syrian children employed with very low wages in İstanbul. The channel reported that there were 1,1 million Syrian children at school age in Turkey, but a small number of them could go to school, and the rest who worked did work under very hard conditions (<http://www.imctv.com.tr/cbs-suriyeli-cocuklar-istanbulda-calismaya-zorlaniyor/>).

OBJECTIVE OF THE STUDY

The overall objective of the study is to find out information on children working on the street (including Syrians) such as demographic characteristics, nutrition and health, education, housing inhabited and neighbourhood, working status and income, migration, life and risks faced in the street by the child as well as migration history of children's families, problems such as delinquency and substance use and unemployment in the family, to put forward proposals to relevant public institutions to help them develop policies and to raise awareness in the society about the issue. To this end, we tried to find out answers to the following questions:

1. What are the demographic characteristics of children working on the streets of Ankara?
2. What are the health and nutrition conditions of children working on the streets of Ankara?
3. What is the education status of children working on the streets of Ankara?
4. What are the structure, characteristics and problems of families of children working on the streets of Ankara?
5. What are the information on the housing and neighbourhood inhabited by children working on the streets of Ankara and their families?
6. What is the working and income status of children working on the streets of Ankara and their families?
7. What are the information on migration history of children working on the streets of Ankara and their families?
8. What are the information on working and living conditions on the street and risks faced by children working on the streets of Ankara?

METHODOLOGY

This study covers children working on the street including Syrian children within the borders of Ankara Province's Çankaya, Yenimahalle and Altındağ Districts and their families.

The study used a mixed model, which combines the use of quantitative and qualitative study designs.

Data sources of the study and data collection techniques, tools used in the study and data collection process are given below:

1. Child Interviews:

In child interviews, the interview form prepared by the study team was used. The interview form contains 78 closed-ended, semi closed-ended and open-ended questions under the following sub-topics;

- Demographic characteristics
- Health and nutrition
- Education
- Family
- Housing and neighbourhood
- Working and income
- Migration
- Life and risks on the street

Face-to-face interviews were conducted with children working on the streets, including Syrian children, within the borders of Çankaya, Yenimahalle and Altındağ districts. The interviews were conducted in children's neighbourhoods, working environments and homes by the following members of the research team;

Prof. Kasım Karataş

Asst. Prof. Seda Attepe Özden

R.A. Ahmet Ege

R.A. Engin Fırat

R.A. Ferman Erim

R.A. Harun Aslan

During the interviews, we were supported from time to time by the Social Worker Yaşar Çavdar Kolbüken from the Provincial Directorate of Family and Social Policies, Sociologist Güliz Demirci from Altındağ Municipality and interpreter Halit Adhalef who helped us in our interviews with Syrian children. The research team had difficulty in engaging long enough to have full interviews with Syrian children selling paper handkerchiefs, wiping car glasses or begging on urban roads and crossroads, the most noticeable group among working Syrian children. As we had instead were short interviews and observations from distance. However, the team could interview Syrian children in Önder and Uluğbey neighbourhoods, where they are concentrated, thanks to, in particular, Önder Foundation which made available to us spaces and interpreter.

In addition, in order to have further information on children taken to Ankara Provincial Police Juvenile Branch, the research team examined the file information on children who were subjected to proceedings on January 11th, 12th and 13th 2016. The information so accessed on a total of 69 children through file reviews are given under each relevant topic. This information is shortly named “file information”.

Interviews were conducted smoothly in general and lasted 40 minutes in average per child. The data obtained from child interviews were transferred to electronic media through SPSS, presented in charts and interpreted according to the objectives of the study.

2. In-depth interviews with children:

In all the interviews with children, open-ended questions given in the form were used. Additionally, with some children identified during interviews, in-depth interviews were conducted by using the semi-structure interview form prepared in advance. These interviews dwelt in detail on personal data of the children, their education status, type of street work and risks they faced. In-depth interviews with children were conducted by the research team given above in the same spaces as in child interviews and lasted in average 30-40 minutes. When consented by the child, in-depth interviews were audio recorded and then analysed by social work students practising at the Provincial Directorate of Family and Social Policies.

Both the answers given to open-ended question given in the interview form and data obtained from in-depth interviews were analysed and interpreted under the relevant topic.

3. In-depth interviews with families:

In-depth interviews with families were conducted by using the semi-structured interview form prepared by the research team. During these interviews, the issues related to the age, profession, working status of family members; the family's migration history; type of housing; how the child started to work on the street and risks faced in the street, delinquency and substance use status of family members and unemployment were elaborated.

In-depth interviews were conducted by the research team given above in the same spaces as in child interviews and lasted in average 30-40 minutes. In-depth interviews with families were conducted with an adult representing the family (preferably father, mother) and when consented by the interviewee, were audio recorded and then analysed by social work students practising at the Provincial

Directorate of Family and Social Policies. Data obtained from in-depth interviews were analysed and interpreted under the relevant topic.

4. Focus group meetings and in-depth personal interviews with experts engaged with children as service providers and representatives of governmental and non-governmental organizations serving children

Focus group meeting:

1. Focus group meeting with experts

Participants:

1. 3 professionals experienced in working with children working on the street
2. 2 professionals working at local administrations (Çankaya Municipality and Metropolitan Municipality centre for children working on the street...)
3. ILO representative
4. Social Workers Association
5. Association for Prevention of Child Neglect and Abuse
6. Federation of Individuals with Difficult Conditions
7. Agenda: Child Association (Gündem Çocuk)
8. International Child Centre

2. Focus group meeting with representatives of organizations

Participants:

1. 3 Police Officers from Juvenile Department
2. 2 members of Çankaya and Metropolitan Municipality Police Team

3. Two professionals from Directorate General of Migration Management and Ankara Provincial Directorate
 4. AFAD representative
 5. KIZILAY (Red Crescent) representative
-
3. Focus group meeting with Önder Foundation manager and staff members
 1. Three Syrian volunteers working at the Foundation
 2. One Foundation Manager

Personal Interviews:

1. Keklikpınarı Neighbourhood Mukhtar
2. Kızılırmak Neighbourhood Mukhtar
3. Önder Neighbourhood Mukhtar
4. Uluğbey Neighbourhood Mukhtar
5. Hüseyingazi Şehit İdris Aydın Police Station Commander
6. 2 Social Workers

The focus group meeting with experts engaged with children working on the street as service providers and with representatives of governmental and non-governmental organizations working in the same field was conducted within the framework of the focus group meeting form in the venue made available to us at Provincial Directorate of Family and Social Policies. The meeting covered the experiences of experts and non-governmental organizations working with children working/living on the street; their perspective of the children working on the street, children's needs, problems and risks they faced according to their experiences; their assessment of services provided to children and recommendations for solutions.

The meeting was audio recorded and then analysed by social work students practising at the Provincial Directorate of Family and Social Policies. Data obtained from focus group meetings were analysed and interpreted under the relevant topic.

FINDINGS AND INTERPRETATION

Place of Interview

Chart 1. Place of Interview

	Turkish		Syrian		Total	
	Frequency	%	Frequency	%	Frequency	%
Kızılırmak Neighbourhood	11	21,2	0	0,0	11	12,0
Hamamönü	10	19,2	0	0,0	10	10,9
Yukarı Öveçler	10	19,2	0	0,0	10	10,9
Karşıyaka Cemetery	5	9,6	0	0,0	5	5,4
Ankara Provincial Police Juvenile Branch	4	7,7	10	25,0	14	15,2
Keklikpınarı	4	7,7	0	0,0	4	4,3
Vatan Avenue	3	5,8	2	5,0	5	5,4
Konur Street	2	3,8	0	0,0	2	2,2
Özevler Neighbourhood	2	3,8	0	0,0	2	2,2
Demetevler	1	1,9	3	7,5	4	4,3
Lalegül	0	0,0	2	5,0	2	2,2
Önder Neighbourhood	0	0,0	23	57,5	23	25,0
Total	52	56,5	40	43,5	92	100,0

Places where the interviews took place are given in the Chart 1. Chart 1 shows that 52 out of the 92 interviews (56,5%) were conducted with Turkish children and 40 of them (43,5%) with Syrian children. Most of the interviews with children working on the street took place in Altındağ District. 25% of the interviews took place in Önder Neighbourhood, 15,2% at Ankara Provincial Police Juvenile Branch. By nationality of children, interviews with Syrian children took place, respectively, in Önder Neighbourhood (57,5%), Ankara Provincial Police Juvenile Branch (25,0%), Demetevler (7,5%), Lalegül and Özevler Neighbourhoods (5%). Interviews with Turkish children were concentrated in Kızılırmak Neighbourhood (21,2%),

Hamamönü and Yukarı Öveçler Neighbourhoods (19,2%).

The interviews were conducted in parts of the city where children and their families corresponding to the objectives of the study in terms of socio-economic characteristics were located. Önder and Kızılırmak neighbourhoods have significant informal sector activity and have been visibly affected by migration. Önder neighbourhood in particular has received significant numbers of Syrian refugees. A news story reported by daily Sabah in April 2014 read “Altındağ Önder neighbourhood has become the home of Syrian refugees in the capital”.

During routine patrols by the Ankara Provincial Police Juvenile Branch teams or upon complaints of the public, children selling paper handkerchiefs, wiping car glasses or begging on main roads, crossroads, in front of hospitals, in the most crowded places of the city such as Kızılay and Ulus are taken to the Juvenile Branch of the Police Organization.

Most of the children taken to the Juvenile Branch are Syrians. Officers of the Juvenile Branch report that these types of work used to be done by Turkish children, but it seems that with the arrival of Syrian migrants, these works were literally “taken over” by Syrian children. They also reported that the decline in Turkish children doing such works, which are categorized as “begging” regardless of apparent work (wiping car glass, selling paper handkerchief etc.) may also be attributed to some judicial actions taken recently. Under the Turkish Penal Code, a court case is filed against the families of children caught while begging on grounds that the families failed to fulfil their obligations arising from the Law of Family. Some of the court cases filed seem to have been concluded, which is reported to be dissuasive for the families.

After the children are taken to the police station, the police contacts their family according to the declaration of the children and an adult member of the family is invited to the police branch. As for the children who do not have the contact information of their families or who cannot/refuse to give such information, their families find out, somehow, towards the end of the working day that their children

have been taken to the police station and show up at the station themselves.

Under the Law of Misdemeanours, the amount of money found on the begging children is recorded in a report, taken from the child to be registered as revenue to the Treasury. According to the file information for three days, the amount of money found on 24 children varied between a minimum of 2 TL and maximum of 50 TL (average 22,50 TL). Police officers reported that they found some of the children could collect about 100 TL in 2-3 hours. At the time of our presence at the police station, two sisters aged 4 and 6 were taken into the station with 49 TL found on them despite the early hour of the morning.

Adults who come to take back the Syrian children report that they have no choice but to send children to work to earn the livelihood of the family and pay house rent and other charges. Some of them even declared they did not understand at all why police officers took actions about them. Upon this, officers declare that it is illegal in Turkey to make children work in such a manner and so they have to launch proceedings.

A form is drawn up containing identity of the children and their families, the reason why they were taken to the station, the type of work they did or whether or not they begged, and the person to whom the child was handed over. The person to whom the child is handed over is warned that if the children are found again while doing such activities, they will be sent to camps together with all the family. According to the file information, 52,2% of the children were handed over to their mother, 25,4% to their father, 4,5% to their elder sisters or brothers and 17,9% to other relatives such as grandfather, uncle or aunt.

Socio-Demographic Characteristics of Children

Chart 2. Gender of Children

	Girls		Boys		Total	
	Frequency	%	Frequency	%	Frequency	%
Turkish	8	15,4	44	84,6	52	56,5
Syrian	2	5,0	38	95,0	40	43,5
Total	10	10,9	82	89,1	92	100,0

Gender breakdown of the children interviewed for the study is given in the Chart 2. Most of the Turkish children interviewed are (84,6%) boys. Boys make up 95% of working Syrian children. A study carried out on the streets of Malatya found that most of the children working on the street were boys (69 boys, 6 girls) (Yeşil, 2009). An important reason why a significant majority of the working Turkish children are boys is the type of works performed by children. Actually, waste collection (paper, plastics, glass, metal etc.) is mostly done by boys. It was found that girls try to collect wastes together with an adult member of family or helps the family load the collected wastes to a vehicle. Another fact is that girls are left at home to take care of small children at home and do house work while adults and boys in the family work collecting wastes. In some of the family interviews, it was found that, as girls working was considered to be unacceptable for general social norms, the family hid this information. Such information was found out during conversations of the children present.

In addition to this study, the file information given by Ankara Provincial Police Juvenile Branch show that 68,1% of the 69 children taken to the branch were boys. We observed significant numbers of girls selling paper handkerchiefs, wiping car glass or begging on main roads, crossroads and in the most crowded parts of the city.

Chart 3. Children's Average Age

	Number(N)	Average
Turkish	52	12,75
Syrian	40	13,75
Overall	92	13,18

The average age of the children interviewed is given in the Chart 3. Overall average age of the children was found to be 13,18. The chart shows that, the average age of Syrian children (13,75) is relatively higher than that of Turkish children (12,75). The youngest child interviewed was 7 years old, while the oldest was 18. Another study (Hatiboğlu 2009) found that most of the children working on the street were in the age range 13-18, with the youngest at the age of 8.

According to the file information, average age of the 69 Syrian children was 10, with the youngest at the age of 4 and the oldest 17. Some the children wiping car glasses, selling paper handkerchiefs and begging in particular were found to be very young. These children usually do such work together with their sisters and brothers, relative children and even adults. They are sometimes used as “decoration to move people to pity” for the begging activity by adults. It was observed that small children who seemed to be alone in crowded places of the city were not actually alone; there was an adult or older children in an immediate distance who kept them under surveillance.

Chart 4. Breakdown of Children's Place of Birth

	Frequency	%
Ankara	18	19,6
Gaziantep	15	16,3
Adiyaman	7	7,6
Adapazarı	5	5,4
Kahramanmaraş	5	5,4
Corum	1	1,1
Şanlıurfa	1	1,1
Suriye	40	43,5
Total	92	100,0

The place of birth of the children interviewed is given in the Chart 4. The chart shows

that 19,6% of children working on the streets of Ankara were born in Ankara. It is understood from the place of residence of these children and family information that almost all of the parents of these children have migrated to Ankara from other provinces. The children most of whom were born in provinces of the South East Turkey (80,4%) such as Gaziantep (16,3%), Adiyaman (7,6%) experienced migration in person. Another study (Hatiboğlu 2009) reported that most of the children migrated to Ankara from other places. These findings suggest a correlation between migration and street work.

All of the Syrian children interviewed (43,5% of children interviewed) were born in Syria, mostly in Aleppo and vicinity and had to flee Syria because of the war.

Information on Children’s Health and Nutrition Status

Chart 5. Average Height and Weight of Children

		Number (n)	Total number of children	%	Average age	Average height/weight	Ideal average height/weight *	
							Male	Female
Height	Turkish	21	52	40,38	12,75	149,66	156.0	156.0
	Syrian	24	40	60	13,75	155,83	162.0	158.5
Weight	Turkish	31	52	59,61	12,75	47,87	48.0	48,8
	Syrian	28	40	70.00	13,75	50,00	52,8	51,8

* <http://www.eregliisrehberi.com/boykilo.htm>

Children’s height and weight could have been directly measured by the research team, as planned before. However, we gave up the idea as we thought that such measurements could make children and their families uncomfortable, as a result we received such information from the children. Height information could be obtained from 40% of Turkish children. The average age of the 21 children was found to be 12,75 years, which is lower than the average age of the 13-year-old. The average height of the 21 children was found to be 149,66 cm, which is lower than the ideal height (156 cm) for the 13-year-old.

Height information could be obtained from 60% of Syrian children. The average age of the 24 children was found to be 13,75 years, which is lower than the average age of the 14-year-old. The average height of the 24 children was found to be 155,83 cm, which is lower than the ideal height for the 14-year-old. Similar results have been obtained about the weight information.

The average weights of the children were found to be lower than ideal weight average, but with less difference than the height.

The average height of the children working on the street in Adana was found to be 153,80±0,01cm, and average weight 47,00±0,19 kg. “According to the Body Mass Index (BMI) assessment done by using NCHS (National Center For Health Statistics) standards, 80,60% of the children working on the street were found to be in the normal range” (Kesmen, 2007).

A common observation made by the research team was that children who participated in the research did not have normal appearance for their age.

Chart 6. Breakdown of Children’s Disease Situation

	Have a Disease		No Disease		Total	
	Frequency	%	Frequency	%	Frequency	%
Turkish	10	19,2	42	80,08	52	56,5
Syrian	10	25,0	30	75,0	40	43,5
Total	20	21,7	72	78,3	92	100,0

Children’s diseases according to their declaration:

- I had a leg operation
- I have asthma/shortness of breath
- I have a war injury on the leg
- I have a pain in the kidney
- Zinc, iron deficiency
- Dental abscess
- Sight loss
- I fell from third floor when in Aleppo, I cough
- Stuttering
- I had an arm operation
- Stomach disorder
- Light migraine
- Nervous disorder
- Sinusitis
- Squint

Chart 6 shows the disease breakdown of the children. 20 of the 92 children interviewed (21,7%) declared having some diseases. This rate is 19,2% for Turkish children and 25,0% for Syrian children.

It was observed during the interviews that most of the children interviewed had

seasonal diseases like flue, common cold etc, they coughed continuously, were unhappy and weary. Another study on the children working on the streets of Ankara found the health status of children to be poor and shoe-shining and garbage collecting children looked “pale” (Altıntaş 2003).

Chart 7. Presence of Family Members with Chronic Disease

	Chronic disease in the family				Total	
	Yes		No			
	Frequency	%	Frequency	%	Frequency	%
Turkish	12	23,1	40	76,9	52	57,1
Syrian	10	25,6	29	74,4	39	42,9
Total	22	24,2	69	75,8	91	100,0

Chart 7 shows the presence of family members with chronic diseases. This shows the 24,2% of children (22 children) declared that there were family members with chronic disease. This rate is 23,1% for Turkish children and 25,6% for Syrian children.

Syrian children and their families seem to be more disadvantaged both in terms of children with diseases and children having family members with chronic diseases.

In another study, 66 of the 91 children said there were members in their family with a health condition (Hatiboğlu 2009).

Chart 8. Do the Children Have any Disability?

	I have a disability		No disability		Total	
	Frequency	%	Frequency	%	Frequency	%
Turkish	5	9,6	47	90,4	52	56,5
Syrian	5	12,5	35	87,5	40	43,5
Total	10	10,9	82	89,1	92	100,0

Children’s disability condition according to their declaration:

- I have 50% loss of sight
- There is a war sequel (wound) on my leg
- I have one eye with complete sight loss
- Burnt hand
- Visually impaired
- I have visual defect
- I have platinum in the arm

- Psychological disorder, difficulty in using the finger
- Impairment in the left hand
- Visual impairment in one eye

Disability condition of the children interviewed is shown in the Chart 8. 10,9% of Turkish and Syrian children declared having a disability condition. Their conditions as declared by them is given above.

Chart 9. Children’s Average Time of Sleep

	Number (N)	Average
Turkish	48	9,06
Syrian	39	8,71
Overall	87	8,90

Chart 9 indicates children’s daily sleep length. The average sleep time is similar among Turkish children (9,06) and Syrian children (8,71). They seem to sleep enough for their age.

Chart 10. Average Number of Meals Children Have

	Number (N)	Average
Turkish	52	2,69
Syrian	40	2,15
Overall	92	2,45

Daily average number of meals children have is indicated in the Chart 10. Turkish children have an average of 2,69 meals a day, while Syrian children have an average of 2,15. Altıntaş (2003) reported in his study that children working on the street usually had one or two meals a day.

Chart 11. Do Children Have Breakfast, Lunch and Dinner?

	Breakfast				Total	
	Yes		No			
	Frequency	%	Frequency	%	Frequency	%
Turkish	40	76,9	12	23,1	52	56,5
Syrian	23	57,5	17	42,5	40	43,5
Total	63	68,5	29	31,5	92	100

	Lunch				Total	
	Yes		No			
	Frequency	%	Frequency	%	Frequency	%
Turkish	35	67,3	17	32,7	52	56,5
Syrian	27	67,5	13	32,5	40	43,5
Total	62	67,4	30	32,6	92	100

	Dinner				Total	
	Yes		No			
	Frequency	%	Frequency	%	Frequency	%
Turkish	41	78,8	11	21,2	52	56,5
Syrian	35	87,5	5	12,5	40	43,5
Total	76	82,6	16	17,4	92	100

Chart 11 shows whether children have breakfast. 42,5% of Syrian children and 23,1% of Turkish children do not have breakfast

An average of 32,6% of children in both groups do not have lunch, with no difference between the groups.

An average of 17,4% of all children do not have dinner. 21,2% of Turkish children and 12,5% of Syrian children do not have dinner.

According to the findings, breakfast and lunch are the most neglected meals. The most neglected meal Syrian children is the breakfast. Both groups neglect lunch at a similar percentage. As for the dinner, Turkish children seem to be more disadvantaged. Even if this information on meal does not provide any insight into the content and quality of the meal, it can still be considered as an important indicator of healthy nutrition.

Another study suggested that children working on the street had one or two meals a day, stayed hungry for a long time and ate unhealthy foods such as buns and Turkish

bagels bought outside as these are cheap (Altuntaş, 2003).

Chart 12. How do Children Get Food When Working on the Street

	Coming Home to Eat		Getting Food Outside		Retrieving from the Garbage		Not Eating When Outside		Total	
	Frequenc	%	Frequenc	%	Frequenc	%	Frequenc	%	Frequenc	%
Turkis	15	30,	23	46,	4	8,	7	14,	49	60,5
Syrian	9	28,	20	62,	0	0,	3	9,4	32	39,5
Total	24	29,	43	53,	4	4,	10	12,	81	100,

Answers given by the children interviewed to the question where they get food are shown in the Chart 12 in four categories. The most common way is to “get food outside” for both the Turkish children (46,9%) and Syrian children (62,5%). This is followed, in decreasing order, by “coming home to eat”, “not eating while on the street” and “retrieving food from the garbage”.

During the interview conducted in Kızılırmak Neighbourhood, it was observed that some families and children consumed waste foods. During one of the family interviews, a person coming back from waste collection brought in a plastic bag with mouldy bread in it and gave it to his spouse who showed it to us and said when they found such food, they brought it home and consumed it. One of the women interviewed said:

“My husband cannot work. Children go and collect wastes. That is how I can get something to eat. Believe it or not, I swear...we find that fats in the garbage and eat them. I have no gas bottle or cooker to cook. Don’t I want to have a cooker?.”

Chart 13. Do Children Smoke or Use Substance

		Yes		No		Total	
		Frequenc	%	Frequency	%	Frequency	%
Smoking	Turkis	6	11,5	46	88,5	52	56,5
	Syrian	10	25,0	30	75,0	40	43,5
	Total	16	17,4	76	82,6	92	100,0
Substance Use	Turkis	0	0,0	52	56,5	52	56,5
	Syrian	0	0,0	40	43,5	40	43,5
	Total	0	0,0	92	100,0	92	100,0

Chart 13 shows that 17,4% of the children smoke. It seems Syrian children smoke (25,0%) more than Turkish children (11,5%). All the children interviewed declared they did not use any substance.

Another study that investigated living conditions of the children working on the street found that these children usually did not get into bad habits such as smoking and drinking alcoholic beverages (Alparslan and Karaođlan, 2012).

Chart 14. Presence of People Using Substance in the Social Circle of the Children

	Yes		No		Total	
	Frequency	%	Frequency	%	Frequency	%
Turkish	12	23,1	40	76,9	52	56,5
Syrian	2	5,0	38	95,0	40	43,5
Total	14	15,2	78	84,8	92	100,0

It is known that children tend to say “no” to the question “do you use any substance” even when they do actually use. However, they may tend to give more realistic answers to the question whether there are any people in their social circle using substance. Information on the social circle gives important clues about the presence of risk for substance use.

Chart 14 on the substance use by people in the social circle of the children shows that in the social circle (school, work, family, neighbourhood etc...) of 14 children (15,2%), there are individuals using substance. According to the Chart, there seem to be more “people using substance in the social circle” of the Turkish children (23,1%) than that of Syrian children (5,0%).

Another study found that almost 60% of the friends of children working on the street used substance (Karakuş 2010).

Information on Children’s Education Status

Chart 15. Children’s Education Status

	Turkish		Syrian		Total	
	Frequency	%	Frequency	%	Frequency	%
Finished primary school	1	1,9	7	17,5	8	8,7
Going to primary school	14	26,9	0	0,0	14	15,2
Dropped out of primary school	7	13,5	17	42,5	24	26,1
Finished secondary school	1	1,9	0	0,0	1	1,1
Going to secondary school	19	36,5	0	0,0	19	20,7
Dropped out of secondary school	1	1,9	2	5,0	3	3,3
Going to high school	1	1,9	0	0,0	1	1,1
Dropped out of high school	1	1,9	4	10,0	5	5,4
Never been schooled / illiterate	7	13,5	10	25,0	17	18,5
Totalled	52	56,5	40	43,5	92	100

Chart 15 on children’s education status shows that when both groups are taken together, the highest education status is “dropped out of primary school” (26,1%). This is followed next by those “going to secondary school” (20,7%) and “never been schooled / illiterate” (18,5%).

Among the Turkish children, most still go to secondary school (36,5%), the second level of the compulsory education, followed secondly by those going to primary school (26,9%) and those who have never been schooled and are illiterate (13,5%) Cases of “never been schooled” and those who dropped out of school (dropped out of primary, secondary and high school) (30, 8%) make up a significant portion.

A study conducted with 70 children in Diyarbakır found that most of the children

interviewed were at primary school age and 4,2% of the children have never been schooled (Karakuş, 2010).

Those who dropped out of primary school make up 42,5% of the Syrian children. If we include those who dropped out of secondary school and high school, this rate 57,5% in total. Those who have never been schooled and are illiterate make up 25% of the children. None of the Syrian children interviewed is currently schooled.

This situation is reported from time to time by newspapers:

"Children are under serious threat as they do not speak Turkish and work on the street. These children are pushed to the street just to make a living. Spending the whole day on the streets, they cannot attend school, are pushed to delinquency and use substance. They live the whole day on the street and face various risks of the street. Scavenger children get up early in the morning and rummage in the garbage till late in the evening to contribute to the family budget. This problem must be solved through common sense and solidarity" (Demirci, 2015)

New York based Human Rights Watch published a 62-page-long report named "When I Picture My Future, I See Nothing", in which it says that more than 400 thousand Syrian children living in Turkey are not attending school. The Government of the Republic of Turkey adopted a policy in September 2014 that formally grants Syrian children access to public schools, but key obstacles including a language barrier, social integration issues, economic hardship, and lack of information about the policy, remain one year later, Human Rights Watch found.

In Önder Neighbourhood, where Syrians are concentrated, a school serves Syrian children during half of the day. However, the children have not been provided with adequate means.

A Syrian child summarizes as follows *"We are not going to school. They don't open a school for Syrians"*. Another Syrian child, referring to the importance of language and schooling says *"...There is no proper job. We are selling paper handkerchiefs*

to survive. If we spoke Turkish, we could work. There would not be any problem then". He says that not speaking a language encourages working on the street and begging.

Chart 16. Reasons of Children's Dropping out of School

	Turkish		Syrian		Total	
	Frequency	%	Frequency	%	Frequency	%
War and migration	0	0,0	14	58,3	14	42,4
Working	2	22,2	4	16,7	6	18,2
Academic failure	0	0,0	4	16,7	4	12,1
Health condition	1	11,1	2	8,3	3	9,1
Unfavourable conditions at school environment	3	33,3	0	0,0	3	9,1
Internal migration	3	33,3	0	0,0	3	9,1
Total	9	27,3	24	72,7	33	100,0

Turkish children seem to have dropped out of school for reason of internal migration, unfavourable conditions at school environment, working and health conditions. For Syrian children, the primary reason is war and migration as expected, followed by working, academic failure and health conditions.

A study on 198 children working on the street in Eskişehir found that 44,8% of children dropped out of school for economic reasons, 27,6% because the family wanted it, 17,2% of their own will and 10,3% for reason of academic failure (Şişman, 2006).

A Turkish child says he dropped out of school because he had to migrate with his parents *"I could attend school when in Gaziantep, but I can't in Ankara"*. Reasons for Turkish children's dropping out of school according to their declaration are *"I went to school for a couple of years, but I could not learn to read. That is why I left school"*, *"To work. We needed money"* and *"Because of the teacher"*. As the Chart 15 shows, none of the Syrian children interviewed attend school in Turkey. A Syrian child explains why he dropped out of school *"I went to school in Syria for two years, but*

then because of the war, dad did not send me to school any more”.

Chart 17. Is it difficult to work on the street and attend school at the same time

	Frequency	%
Yes	37	66,1
No	19	33,9
Total	56	100,0

Children attending a school were asked if it was difficult to work on the street and attend school at the same time. Chart 17 shows the answers. 66,1% of the children interviewed answered that working on the street made it harder to attend school.

According to another study, 76,9% of the children found that street work had a negative impact on academic achievement (Kızmaz and Bilgin, 2010).

Difficulties of Working on the Street and Attending School at the same time:

For Turkish children:

- Cannot find enough time to study
- Tiredness
- Lack of self-care
- Health problems
- Exclusion

For Syrian children:

- Have not time to go to school
- Loss of self-confidence

Concerning the negative effect of street work on school attendance, a child underlines that street work may cause exclusion at school *“I am not attending school, but I have younger sibling who are. When their clothes are dirty, they don’t go to school”*. Another Turkish child emphasizes link between the problem of being sent to work on the street and poverty *“When at school, you spend money, but here we earn money”*. Similarly, a Turkish parent makes a comment in the same line as that of the child who emphasized that school means expenditure *“The school principal wants clothes on them. But clothes cost 300 million per child. It makes 600 million for two children. That is why we did not buy it. Instead, we will go to Ulus, there we can find something cheaper”*. Another parent says that one of the reasons why children are sent to work is to meet expenditures for the school *“...They work*

together. We make a living and eat somehow. If we don't earn, we could not have something to eat. We would stay hungry. There is also school tuition fee. You see? Without working, you can't meet these needs". Additionally, a child working on the street talks about the physiological effect of being sent to work on the street and its indirect effect on school: "When I come back home, I feel tired. I fall asleep quickly. I cannot wake up in time in the morning, and I am late."

Information on the Children's Families

Chart 18. Children's Family Structure

	Nuclear		Extended		Total	
	Frequency	%	Frequency	%	Frequency	%
Turkish	42	80,8	10	19,2	52	57,1
Syrian	34	87,2	5	12,8	39	42,9
Total	73	80,2	15	16,5	91*	100,0

*One of the Syrian children interviewed did not have a family (unaccompanied).

Chart 18 gives answers to the question on family structure. Most of the Turkish children (75,0%) and Syrian children (87,2%) live in a nuclear family. 3 Turkish children interviewed (5,8%) live in broken families. None of the Syrian children declared living in broken families. The study found that family structures had differences as is mentioned in the literature. Hardships caused by women's poverty in particular may eliminate conditions for creation of single-parent family structure.

Another study found a similar result, with a significant majority of children working on the street (86%) living in nuclear families (Akşit, Karancı and Gündüz Hoşgör, 2001).

Chart 19. Average Number of Siblings and Working Siblings

	Number of Siblings		Number of Working Siblings	
	Number(N)	Average	Number(N)	Average
Turkish	51	5,21	48	2,29
Syrian	39	6,94	34	2,79
General	90	5,96	82	2,50

According to the Chart on number of siblings, the number of children's siblings ranged from 2 to 12. The number of working siblings ranged from one to seven. The average number of siblings for Syrian children is (6,94), which is higher than that of Turkish children (5,21). Similarly, the average number of working siblings for Syrian children is (2,79) which is higher than that of Turkish (2,29).

Another study found that the number of siblings of children working on the street ranged from 5 to 11 (Karakuş, 2010). Another study found that 52% of children working on the street had other siblings also working on the street and 3% had siblings living in the street (Çırak and Çivitci, 2004).

Chart 20. Whether Mother and Father are Living Together

	Turkey		Syria		Total	
	Frequency	%	Frequency	%	Frequency	%
Mother and father living together	48	92,3	29	72,5	77	83,7
Mother and father divorced or living separate	4	7,7	3	7,5	7	7,6
Mother and father married but living separate	0	0,0	1	2,5	1	1,1
Neither is alive	0	0,0	1	2,5	1	1,1
Mother not alive	0	0,0	1	2,5	1	1,1
Father not alive	0	0,0	5	12,5	5	5,4
Total	52	56,5	40	43,5	92	100,0

According to the Chart 20, mother and father are living together in most cases (83,7%). This rate is 92,3% for Turkish children and 72,5% for Syrian children. 7,7% of Turkish children are living in families which are divorced or living separate. The rate of Syrian children living in broken families for various reasons such as divorce, living separate or death is 27,5%. The effect of specific conditions caused by war is visible.

In another study conducted in Turkey, 43 out of 47 children (91,48%) declared their parents were living together (Alptekin, 2011).

Chart 21. Do the Fathers Use Violence on Mothers

	Yes		No		Total	
	Frequency	%	Frequency	%	Frequency	%
Turkish	11	21,2	41	78,8	52	57,1
Syrian	11	28,2	28	71,8	39	42,9
Total	22	24,2	69	75,8	91*	100,0

* One Syrian child did not answer the question as he did not have a family.

The answers given to the question “do your father use violence on your mother” is indicated in the Chart 22. According to the results, 24,2% of the children answered yes. This rate is 21,2% for Turkish children and 28,2% for Syrian children.

In the study conducted by Hatiboğlu (2009), 61% of the children studies declared that there was domestic violence at home.

Chart 22. Do the Father Use Violence on the Child and Siblings

	Yes		No		Toplam	
	Frequency	%	Frequency	%	Frequency	%
Turkish	20	38,5	32	61,5	52	57,1
Syrian	20	51,3	19	48,7	39	42,9
Total	40	44,0	51	56,0	91*	100,0

* One Syrian child did not answer the question as he did not have a family.

When asked whether their father use violence on them and their siblings, 38,5% of the Turkish children and 51,3% of the Syrian children declared their father used violence on them.

Chart 23. Presence of a Household Member with a Disability

	Yes		No		Total	
	Frequency	%	Frequency	%	Frequency	%
Turkish	17	32,7	35	67,3	52	57,1
Syrian	12	30,8	27	69,2	39	42,9
Total	29	31,9	62	68,1	91*	100,0

* One Syrian child did not answer the question as he did not have a family.

Chart 23 shows the situation on the presence of a household member with a disability. In average, 31,9% of the children declared that there was a household member with a disability. Rates are similar for Turkish and Syrian children.

A woman who said that she had no option but to beg with her children, as her husband could not work due to a chronic disease declared:

“...if my husband did not have that disease and did not have to do public service (due to probation), he would not send me there to beg.”

The Housing and Neighbourhood Inhabited by Children

Chart 24. Neighbourhoods Where Children Live

	Turkish		Syria		Total	
	Fre	%	Fre	%	Frequ	%
Kale Mahallesi - Atpazarı	10	19,2	0	0,0	10	10,9
Kızılırmak Mahallesi	10	19,2	0	0,0	10	10,9
Öveçler 2.cadde	10	19,2	0	0,0	10	10,9
Demetevler	5	9,6	7	17,5	12	13,0
Birlik Mahallesi	4	7,7	0	0,0	4	4,3
Keklikpınarı	4	7,7	0	0,0	4	4,3
Şentepe	4	7,7	0	0,0	4	4,3
Hüseyingazi	2	3,8	2	5,0	4	4,3
İsmetpaşa	1	1,9	1	2,5	2	2,2
Karşıyaka / Yahyalar	1	1,9	0	0,0	1	1,1
Keçiören	1	1,9	0	0,0	1	1,1
Hacıbayram	0	0,0	1	2,5	1	1,1
Mamak	0	0,0	1	2,5	1	1,1
Önder Mahallesi	0	0,0	10	25,0	10	10,9
Örnek Mahallesi	0	0,0	2	5,0	2	2,2
Siteler	0	0,0	2	5,0	2	2,2
Solfasol	0	0,0	3	7,5	3	3,3

Uluğbey	0	0,0	5	12,5	5	5,4
Ulus	0	0,0	3	7,5	3	3,3
Yenidoğan	0	0,0	3	7,5	3	3,3
Total	52	56,5	40	43,5	92	100,0

Chart 24 shows in which neighbourhood the children interviewed lived. According to the Chart, Syrian children mostly live in the following neighbourhoods: Önder Mahallesi (25,0), Demetevler (17,5), Uluğbey Mahallesi (12,5). Turkish children mostly live in Kale Mahallesi-Atpazarı (19,2), Öveçler 2. cadde (19,2), Kızılırmak Mahallesi (19,2).

The Chart shows that the children studied are not concentrated in a certain neighbourhood. It was observed that some of the neighbourhoods indicated above are not poor neighbourhoods in general; but the children inhabited the most unfavourable housings of these neighbourhoods.

Chart 25. Type of Housing Inhabited by the Children

	Slum House		Flat		Tent		Derelict Building		Total	
	Freque	%	Freque	%	Freque	%	Freque	%	Freque	%
Turki	40	76,	8	15,	4	7,	0	0,	52	56,
Syria	17	42,	21	52,	1	2,	1	2,	40	43,
Total	57	62,	29	31,	5	5,	1	1,	92	100

Chart 25 shows the type of housing inhabited by children. In decreasing order, children live in slum house (62,0%), flat (31,5%), tent (5,4%) and derelict building (%1,1). Turkish children mostly live in slum house (76,9), and Syrian children in flat (52,5). Karakuş (2010) found that 70% of the children working on the street inhabited slum-type buildings.

The fact that Turkish children working on the street may be attributed to poverty. Slums and slum-type houses provide appropriate spaces for works like waste collection. In some of the interviews conducted in Çankaya district (Keklikpınarı, Kızılırmak neighbourhood vb.), we observed incongruous situations where elegant

buildings stood next to dilapidated slum-type buildings that looked derelict. It was observed that these houses, abandoned by their owners long ago, were let out to these families with significant amounts of rent.

In neighbourhoods where Syrian families lived, it was observed that a house was shared by a couple of families. It was found that houses abandoned for urban transformation, particularly in vicinity of Ulus district, were let out to these families. It was declared that house rents went up due to increased demand in neighbourhoods such as Önder, Uluğbey. To the extent that a neighbourhood receives more Syrian families, their culture starts to penetrate that neighbourhood. We noticed signboards in Arabic on shops and new businesses opened to cater for consumption habits of Syrian families. Indeed, when developing solutions to meet families' needs, it is imperative to take into account the importance of traditional cultural habits and expectations. It was declared that distribution of free breads to Syrian families turned out to be useless in Önder and Uluğbey area, because the bread distributed looked very different than the bread normally consumed by Syrians and they threw them into the bin.

Chart 26. Number of Rooms in the Housing

	Number(N)	Average
Turkish	52	2,71
Syrian	40	2,82
General	92	2,76

Chart 27 shows the average number of rooms in houses inhabited by the children. The average number of rooms in the houses inhabited by Turkish children and Syrian children is close to each other (respectively 2,71; 2,82). When the average number of persons living in the housing is divided by the average number of rooms in the housing, we find that there is one room for every three persons. We found out that in many houses, the bedroom was shared by the adults and children particularly in winter.

A study investigated the characteristics of the housing inhabited by children

living/working on the street. It was observed that there were more than 2 rooms in the houses inhabited by 43,3% of 30 families (Subaşı Baybuğa and Kubilay, 2003).

Chart 27. Number of Individuals Living in the Houses Inhabited by Children

	Number (N)	Average
Turkish	52	7,65
Syrian	40	8,60
General	92	8,06

Average number of persons in the houses inhabited by the children is indicated in the Chart 26. The average number of individuals living in the houses of Turkish children (7,65) and of Syrian children (8,60) is close to each other, but higher for Syrian children.

According to TurkSTAT data, the average household size was 3,6 in 2014. The province with the biggest average household size was Şırnak (7,3 persons). So, the Chart shows that the average household size of the children interviewed is bigger than that of the province with the highest average household size in Turkey. In general, the children live in nuclear families with multiple children.

A study found that children working on the street came from families with multiple sibling, the household size ranged from 2 to 11 and the average household size was 5.87 (Şişman 2006).

Chart 28. Do Children Have Friends in their Neighbourhood Who also Work

	Yes		No		Total	
	Frequency	%	Frequency	%	Frequency	%
Turkish	47	92,2	4	7,8	51	63,0
Syrian	28	93,3	2	6,7	30	37,0
Total	75	92,6	6	7,4	81	100,0

Children were asked if they had friends in their neighbourhood who also worked on the street. Answers are given in the Chart 25. 92,6% of the children said there were other children in their neighbourhood who also worked. Children live in neighbourhoods where street work is a common culture, which contributes to

internalize it more readily.

Information on Children’s Working and Income Situation

Chart 29. Parents’ Working Situation

	Is mother working				Total	
	Yes		No			
	Frequency	%	Frequency	%	Frequency	%
Turkish	23	44,2	29	55,8	52	56,5
Syrian	5	12,5	35	87,5	40	43,5
Total	28	30,4	64	69,6	92	100,0

	Is Father Working				Total	
	Yes		No			
	Frequency	%	Frequency	%	Frequency	%
Turkish	38	73,1	14	26,9	52	56,5
Syrian	11	27,5	29	72,5	40	43,5
Total	49	53,3	43	46,7	92	100,0

Chart 30 shows the working situation of the children’s parents. 69,6% of the mothers do not work. 55,8% of Turkish children’s mothers and 87,5% of Syrian children’s mothers do not work. In average for all the children, 53,3% of fathers work. 73,1% of Turkish children’s fathers work while 72,5% of Syrian children’s fathers do not work.

Fathers of the Syrian children may not be working because of the employment policies on Syrian refugees. And the fact that children’s mothers are not working in general may be attributed to both the employment policy and gender. The high rate of unemployment of mothers and fathers is a piece of information that explains why children are working. We see the principle of “Where adults are unemployed, there is increased use of child labour”.

A study found that in the families of 57,1% of the children working on the street, there were 2-4 other members of the family were also working other than the child. These were usually the father and siblings of the child working on the street (Şişman, 2006)

Chart 30. Average Monthly Income of the Children’s Household

	Number(N)	Average
Turkish	44	1207,95
Syrian	37	1301,35
General	81	1250,61

Chart 31 shows the average monthly income of the children’s households, which is 1250,61 Turkish Lira. There seems not to be a significant difference between the average incomes of Syrian and Turkish children’s households. When compared to the household size, families’ average income, roughly equivalent to the minimum wage, shows the presence of a deep poverty pushing children to work on the street.

In a study, Alparslan and Karaoğlan (2012) found that 60% of the families had a monthly income that ranged from 401 to 700 TL. Our findings, however, seem to match with the data of TurkSTAT for 2014. Although the figures seem to match, the children and parents interviewed emphasized the issue of poverty many times. One said:

“I have nothing. Even not a fridge. I purchased the washing machine of the next door neighbour for 50 TL. It leaks electricity. That is all I got from neighbours, nothing else. I don’t have a proper bed to sleep on. I have no rugs to lay on the floor. I have nothing, nothing”.

Chart 31. Do children’s households have side income?

	Yes		No	
	Frequency	%	Frequency	%
Turkish	13	25,0	39	75,0
Syrian	7	17,5	33	82,5
Total	20	21,7	72	78,3

Chart 31 shows if children’s households have side income. 21,7% of the children declared their household had side income.

In a study on socio-economic profile, attitudes and expectations of the families of children working on the street, Alacahan (2010) found that 90% of these families (44

families) did not have side income but 40% received aid from welfare institutions. In our study, the questions on welfare assistance received by children and families were left unanswered. However, during qualitative interviews, it was observed that families emphasized the need for welfare aid quantity of such aid. One of the interviewees said:

“Yes. The State gives 250 TL to the child to help cover school expenses. We don’t know if it is every month or every two months. For example, we were given 100-150 lira when the child started school. If you gave us another 750 lira, it would be enough for us to make to ends meet.”

Chart 32. Age When Children Were First Sent to Work on the Street

	Number (N)	Average
Turkish	52	9,61
Syrian	40	11,10
General	92	10,26

The average age when the children were first sent to work on the street was found to be 10,26 as indicated in the Chart 33. We observed that Turkish children started to work earlier than Syrian children.

The children started to work at an age that ranged from 4 to 16.

In a study on social perception about children working on the street in Mersin province, Yetim and Çağlayandereli (2007) found that the first age of starting to work on the street ranged from 11 to 14.

During in-depth interviews, parents were asked at what age an individual should start working. One of the parents expressed awareness of the age limit “A child should start working not younger than 18-19 years old. If you send a small child to work, he will either go missing or be kidnapped.” However, when asked whether the type of work done by his child was too heavy for him, the same parent made a statement

that normalized the child labour despite his awareness:

“Not heavy at all. As you see, it is just paper or plastic that we collect. I take the child with me. We collect wastes from markets. There are some markets where they know us. We go there to collect waste most of the time. We go there with this waste collection cart and wait. They take out their waste paper, plastic whatever. We put it on the cart and take it here.”

As understood from these statements, parents have awareness of the issue on one hand, but normalize the child labour on the other hand. When we make an overall assessment together with the other findings of the study, we think this dual approach is related to poverty and parental helplessness. Another statement in the same line is:

“You don’t inquire about the adults’ problems. Yu just inquire about the children’s problems. Who brought these children into the world? Of course, their mother and father. Who looks after the children? Of course, their mother and father. If it were not for the labour of parents, how would these children have something to eat?”

Chart 33. Type of Work Done by Children

	Turkish		Syrian		Total	
	Frequ ency	%	Frequ ency	%	Frequ ency	%
Collecting waste	24	46,2	22	55,0	46	50,0
Selling paper handkerchief	18	34,6	7	17,5	25	27,2
Carrying water at the cemetery	5	9,6	0	0,0	5	5,4
Wiping car glasses	2	3,8	2	5,0	4	4,3
Weighing with a scale	2	3,8	0	0,0	2	2,2
Shoe-shining	1	1,9	1	2,5	2	2,2
Begging	0	0,0	4	10,0	4	4,3
Selling water	0	0,0	1	2,5	1	1,1
Selling food on the street	0	0,0	3	7,5	3	3,3
Total	52	56,5	40	43,5	92	100,0

Chart 33 shows the types of work done by children. Collecting waste and selling paper handkerchief are the most common works.

A study conducted in 2009 identified the works done by children: shoe-shining, selling simit (Turkish bagel), paper handkerchief and chewing gums (Yeşil, 2009). Other work done by children include weighing, selling wafers/chocolate and collecting garbage. The results of that study are compatible with ours but differ in terms of the quality (like collecting paper).

Although there were less girls than boys in the study, we observed that waste paper collection was mostly done by boys while girls did physically less challenging works such as selling paper handkerchiefs. This is of course not independent from gender context. A mother begging to earn her livelihood displays a similar gender perception in relation to her daughter's future *"I tell my daughter not to be like me. I actually tell her that it is not very good to work at crossroads. I tell her to study so that she would not depend on her husband and earn her own money. She can marry when she wants, but if she does not study, then she would probably marry through an arranged marriage..."*

Chart 34. Types of Works Previously Done by the Children on the Street

	Turkish		Syrian		Total	
	Freq uenc y	%	Freq uenc y	%	Freq uenc y	%
Selling Handkerchief	25	48,1	7	17,5	32	34,8
Collecting Waste	22	42,3	9	22,5	31	33,7
Wiping Car Glass	9	17,3	4	10,0	13	14,1
Shoe-Shining	8	15,4	1	2,5	9	9,8
Weighing	7	13,5	0	0,0	7	7,6
Selling Water	6	11,5	5	12,5	11	12,0
Selling Roses	3	5,8	0	0,0	3	3,3
Selling Simit	2	3,8	0	0,0	2	2,2
Begging	2	3,8	6	15,0	8	8,7
Other*	5	9,6	11	27,5	16	17,4

*Two children declared working as seasonal agricultural workers and two children working in the carpet-rug weaving workshop and one child declared doing the following works: carrying coals,

tomato paste making, selling pencils, watering tombs at the cemetery, sewing-embroidery, working in a shoe workshop, welding, painting furniture, selling local foods on the street.

Chart 34 shows a list of works previously done by the children. The percentages given in the Chart show “yes” answers given by the children to the relevant category.

It seems that 33,7% of the children interviewed previously collected wastes, while 34,8% sold paper handkerchief. Selling waste and selling paper handkerchief seem to be very common among both Turkish and Syrian children

In his study, Şişman (2006) found that 51,5% of the children working on the street did not previously work, and those who previously worked did similar works in the past.

Waste paper collection seems to be common in our study, but children do a variety of works as understood from this declaration *“For example, I carry coals, sell paper handkerchief with my sister. Sometimes I work as porter.”*

Chart 35. How Children Perceive Their Family’s Economic Situation

	Very poor		Poor		Middle income		Good Income		Total	
	Frequen cy	%	Frequen cy	%	Frequen cy	%	Frequen cy	%	Frequen cy	%
Turkis h	10	19,2	31	59,6	11	21,2	0	0,0	52	57,8
Syrian	9	23,7	14	36,8	14	36,8	1	2,6	38	42,2
Total	19	21,1	45	50,0	25	27,8	1	1,1	90	100,0

Chart 35 shows how children perceive their family’s economic situation. 50% of all the children find their family’s economic situation poor. Except for one Syrian child, none of the children found their family’s economic situation good. The percentage of children who find their family’s economic situation poor is higher among Turkish children (59,6%) than Syrian children (36,8).

Kızmaz and Bilgili (2010) asked the children working/living on the street how they found their families’ economic situation. Most of the children (93,3%) categorized

their families as “poor”. There were only two children who found their situation “middle income”.

The children’s perception of their families’ poverty cause them to feel an obligation to work as understood in this statement:

“We want money. That means we have to work. We have the pay the rent ...”

Not only children but also their parents have a similar perception of poverty. We observed that some Turkish parents thought that provision of welfare aid to Syrians refugees caused Turkish people like themselves to lose their rights. A parent, linking poverty to the child’s labour and mentioning this link in the context of welfare aid, said:

“...if the authorities did not cut the welfare aid, if they gave it in time, if they did not give the welfare aid to Syrians, if they cared out their own homeland and people (Turkish people), my children would not have to go and beg.”

In the above statement, the parent attributes the problem of child work to the lack of welfare aid. Another parent said *“...They say we should not beg. I have no other option but to go begging. That one receives aid, so I do not take him to beg. M... hardly receives any aid, maybe once a year.”* These statements show that the problem of children working on the street cannot solely be solved by welfare aid. It means policies on poverty need to be developed in a more holistic manner.

The parent says that they don’t send the child who receives welfare to work, but the other child who does not receive aid is sent to work. He makes the following proposal for solution:

“If my two children were regularly given 1,000 TL of aid instead of 550 TL, I would not send my children to work. Because I spend 500 for my children and the other 500 goes to rent, electricity, water bills. I would never send my children then.”

It is clear that providing only economic aid is not enough to solve the problem.

Migration Experiences of the Children Working on the Street

Chart 36. Children's and Their Parents' Migration Situation

	Mother's Migration History				Father's Migration History				Child's Migration History			
	Migrated		Born in Ankara		Migrated		Born in Ankara		Migrated		Born in Ankara	
	Frequ	%	Frequ	%	Frequ	%	Frequ	%	Frequ	%	Frequ	%
Turkish	40	76,9	12	23,1	38	76,0	12	24,0	36	69,2	16	30,8
Syrian	37	100,0	0	0,0	34	100,0	0	0,0	40	100,0	0	0,0
Total	77	86,5	12	13,5	72	85,7	12	14,3	76	82,6	16	17,4

Information on the children's and their parents' migration history are given in the Chart 37. According to the Chart, all of the Syrian children and parents have migrated to Turkey. 69,2% of Turkish children have migrated. Mothers and fathers of roughly more than three quarters of Turkish children have migrated to Ankara from other provinces.

This finding shows that children's working on the street is closely related to internal and external migration process. A similar result was found in Bilgin's study (2009), which showed that the families of the children working on the street (400 children) had recently migrated to the city (81,8%).

Chart 37. Causes of Migration of the Children and Their Parents

	Causes of Mother's Migration						Causes of Father's Migration						Causes of Child's Migration					
	Economic		War and security		Earthquake		Economic		War and security		Earthquake		Economic		War and security		Earthquake	
	Freque	%	Freque	%	Freque	%	Freque	%	Freque	%	Freque	%	Freque	%	Freque	%	Freque	%
Turkish	34	94,4	0	0,0	2	5,6	32	94,1	0	0,0	2	5,9	31	96,9	0	0,0	1	3,1
Syrian	0	0,0	36	100,0	0	0	0	0,0	33	100,0	0	0,0	0	0,0	39	100,0	0	0,0
Total	34	47,2	36	50,0	2	2,8	32	47,8	33	49,2	2	3,0	31	43,7	39	54,9	1	1,4

Chart 37 shows the causes of the children's and their parents' migration. It seems that most of the Turkish others migrated for economic reasons, while all of the Syrian mothers migrated because of war and security situation. The chart shows that reasons of migration are similar for fathers and mothers. 96,9% of the Turkish children had to migrate for economic reasons, while all of the Syrian children had to migrate because of war and security situation.

In his study, Bilgin (2009) found that 81% of the families of working children migrated and 42,8% of them indicated the reasons of "terrorism and security situation" for migrating.

A Turkish parent said they had to migrate to Ankara because the authorities banned waste paper collection "Oh my dear girl. I can't find something to eat in Antep. They banned scrap dealing there. Nothing to make money there. Here, at least, you can collect this and that. Plenty of bread and clothes. They bring food to eat...They get

meat or cook chicken. They earn a living somehow.” Another Turkish parent said to emphasize the economic and social reasons of migration:

“...Oh brother, we are seasonal workers. We were going from one place to the other. One day, I came across my aunt’s husband at work. He said they would migrate to Ankara. Then I told my man: Let’s go to Ankara and see what it is like. What sort of a city is Ankara, capital? I wonder. Then we hit the road and came here. We found living conditions better here. It is not as difficult as in our hometown. Then we decided to stay here”

In-depth interviews with the children provided us with some important insight to the migration process A Syrian child talked about the external migration as follows “...We were very happy in Syria, but when the war broke out, we had to migrate to Turkey to save ourselves.” These comments reflect the destructive effect of war and how migrating to Turkey saved them from vital problems. During an interview at the Ankara Provincial Police Directorate Juvenile Branch with two mothers who took their children to beg, we asked them what they missed most about Syria. One of the two mothers, who were sisters, started to weep before the translation was over and told in tears how they had to migrate because of war and lost everything and missed Syria too much. This showed the extent of trauma caused by the obligation to leave one’s homeland because of reasons like war.

Chart 38. How long the children and their parents have been living in Ankara

	Mother		Father		Child	
	Number(N)	Average	Number(N)	Average	Number (N)	Average
Turkish	28	6,28	26	6,96	33	6,39
Syrian	31	2,54	29	2,10	35	2,40
Overall	59	4,32	55	4,40	68	4,33

Chart 38 shows how long the children and their parents have been living in Ankara. Mothers who answered this question declared living in Ankara for 4,3 years, fathers for 4,4 years and the children for 4,3 years. These data show that the children and

parent interviewed have been living in Ankara for a relatively short period of time. The duration of stay in the city is known to play an important role in integration and adaptation of the migrant families to big cities.

In a study conducted with 91 children, Hatiboğlu (2009) found that most of the families (47,3%) had been living in Ankara for 11-20 years. This was followed by the families living in Ankara for more than 20 years (27,5%).

Information on Life and Risks in the Street

Chart 39. Have You Ever Spent the Night in the Street?

	Yes		No		Total	
	Frequency	%	Frequency	%	Frequency	%
Turkish	7	13,5	45	86,5	52	56,5
Syrian	8	20,0	32	80,0	40	43,5
Total	15	16,3	77	83,7	92	100,0

Chart 39 gives information on whether the children have ever spent the night outside. 16,3% of the children declared having spent at least one night in the street. The chart shows this rate is 13,5% for Turkish children and 20,0% for Syrian children.

In a study conducted with 75 children, Karakuş (2010) found that 16% of the children had spent at least one night in the street.

A child who had to flee Syria due to the war and humanitarian crisis and migrated to Turkey and had lost most of the family members in the war said *“I could not find a house. I stayed in the street for two weeks.”* This shows the risks faced by him. Another child said the following about the same process: *“When we first migrated, there was no place to stay. We slept in the street by shift with my elder brother. We were afraid.”* Some of the children said they have to spend the night in the street because the work finished very late at night. One of them said *“Home is far away. When it is 10 p.m. I sleep there.”* Another child said *“There was a scrap yard at night. We waited the keeper to come, it was late and we could not return home.”* A Turkish child who had to spend the night in the street because of a domestic problem said *“I had a dispute with my father. He expelled me from home.”* As understood from these

testimonies, working on the street means living on the street. Street experience may pave the way for more risky behaviours like spending the whole day and night out in the street.

Chart 40. Time of the Child’s Returning Home and Time Spent on the Street During the Day

	Time of Returning Home		Time Spent on the Street (During the Day)	
	Number(N)	Average	Number (N)	Average
Turkish	45	19:51	49	5,91
Syrian	37	19:14	40	9,02
General	82	19:34	89	7,31

Chart 41 shows average time of children’s returning home and average time spent on the street during the day. The time of returning home ranges from 13:00 earliest and 02:00 latest. The average time of returning home for all the children was found to be 19:34. Yeşil (2009) had found in his study that the time of returning home for children working on the street ranged from 16:00 to 18:00 and from as late as 22:00 to 24:00 in summer. The average time of returning home in hour study was found to be 19:34, which is quite late given that we collected the research data in winter.

According to the chart, the average time spent by the children on the street during the day is 7,31 hours. The time spent by the children on the street ranged from 1 to 13 hours. The time spent on the street corresponds to the time spent at work. The times seem quite long for a child. Alptekin (2011) found a similar result in his study, which put the time spent working at a range of 5-12 hours.

One of the reasons that increased the average time spent on the street by the children was the fact that Syrian children living in particular in Önder Neighbourhood and collecting wastes have to wait until 22:00 o’clock to deliver wastes. This is a significant piece of information discovered by the researchers during the field study.

Chart 41. Means of Retuning Home for Children

	On Foot		Public transport		Hitch-hiking		My family collects me		Total	
	Frequency	%	Frequency	%	Frequency	%	Frequency	%	Frequency	%
Turkish	45	86,5	4	7,7	2	3,8	1	1,9	52	56,5
Syrian	37	92,5	3	7,5	0	0,0	0	0,0	40	43,5
Total	82	89,1	7	7,6	2	2,2	1	1,1	92	100,0

Chart 41 shows the children's answers to the question on how they return home. 89,1% of the children return home on foot. We also investigated the proximity of the children's working area to their house. 80,4% of the children declared that the area they work in was close to their house. Yeşil (2009) found in his study that almost all of the children interviewed went to work on foot and it took from 5 to 45 minutes to get to work.

An assessment of the Chart 33 and 41 together may provide a connection between the means used by the child to return home and the type of work done. For example, the children who collect wastes walk on foot by dragging their waste carts and usually work close to their house, which means that they don't take use any means of public transportation. This information is important in explaining the finding that 89,1% of the children return home on foot.

Chart 42. Do Children Sustain Physical Violence When Working on the Street

	Yes		No		Total	
	Frequency	%	Frequency	%	Frequency	%
Turkish	16	31,4	35	68,6	51	56,0
Syrian	21	52,5	19	47,5	40	44,0
Total	37	40,7	54	59,3	91	100,0

Chart 42 shows whether the children sustain physical violence when working on the street. 40,7% of the children declared sustaining physical violence when working. The rate is 31,4% for Turkish children and 52,5% for Syrian children.

The findings suggest that the children working on the street are commonly exposed to violence. Bilgin (2004) found in his study conducted in Diyarbakır that about 80% of the children living on the street were exposed to physical violence.

Chart 43. Who Uses Violence n the Children Working on the Street

	Turkish		Syrian		Total	
	Frequency	%	Frequency	%	Frequency	%
Other working children	7	43,8	6	28,6	13	35,1
Unknown persons	4	25,0	2	9,5	6	16,2
Shop keepers	2	12,5	3	14,3	5	13,5
Substance and alcohol users	1	6,3	4	19,0	5	13,5
Gang	0	0,0	3	14,3	3	8,1
Municipal police-police-security	2	12,5	0	0,0	2	5,4
Employer (owner of the waste paper collection cart)	0	0,0	2	9,5	2	5,4
Drivers in traffic	0	0,0	1	4,8	1	2,7
Total	16	43,2	21	56,8	37	100,0

Chart 43 shows who uses violence on the children working on the street. 35,1% of the children exposed to violence declared that the violence came from other working children. This is followed by unknown persons, shop keepers and substance-alcohol users.

The study by Çırak and Çivitci (2004) found that 41% of the children working on the street were exposed to violence from adults. We found in our study that the children working on the street were exposed to violence mostly from other working children, which means that the children are both perpetrators and victims of violence. The fact that the child is exposed to violence by other children may be attributed to the competition on the street. This being the case, it may be suggested that Turkish children enjoy a status superiority over Syrian children in connection with speaking

Turkish language. This situation may give rise to a hierarchical relation in street environment between Turkish children and Syrian children, both of whom are actually in need of protection.

A child working on the street talked about the violence from car drivers in traffic *“You know what happens...We pull our waste carts...The carts sometimes touch the cars and scratch them. Then the car owner beats us.”* When it is full, the waste collection carts are difficult to move. So, this waste cart, which causes a physical constraint for the child, may also be a cause of violence. Waste collection work is already difficult by itself. There are additional difficulties as declared by another child *“...We have been repeatedly beaten. To top it all, when we collect cardboards and plastics, a fight breaks out.”* Another child talked about the violence he was exposed to when working on the street *“Glue-sniffers took away my money.”* Another testified *“There is one municipal police officer, who pulls my ears. I dislike him.”*

Chart 44. Has the Child Ever Been Taken to the Police Station

	Yes		No		Total	
	Frequency	%	Frequency	%	Frequency	%
Turkish	19	36,5	33	63,5	52	56,5
Syrian	13	32,5	27	67,5	40	43,5
Total	32	34,8	60	65,2	92	100,0

Chart 45 shows the percentage of the children taken to the police station. Slightly more than one third of the children said “yes” to the question “Have you ever been taken to the police station when working/living on the street?” The results are similar for both groups.

Chart 45. Risks Involved in Working on the Street according to Children

	Turkish		Syrian		Total	
	Frequency	%	Frequency	%	Frequency	%
Verbal violence	20	40,0	15	37,5	35	38,9
Physical violence	14	28,0	13	30,5	27	30,0
Being harmed by extreme heat and cold	18	36,0	7	17,5	25	27,8
Being victim of a crime	8	16,0	11	27,5	19	21,1
Exhaustion and very heavy work	7	14,0	6	15,0	13	14,4
Fear of being harmed on the street	9	18,0	2	5,0	11	12,2
Car hit	5	10,0	4	10,0	9	10,0
Intervention of police or municipal police	3	6,0	6	15,0	9	10,0
Dog attack	2	4,0	5	12,5	7	7,8
Exclusion from social life	3	6,0	3	7,5	6	6,7
Conflict with other children working on the street	3	6,0	2	5,0	5	5,6
Accident risk	3	6,0	1	2,5	4	4,4
Health problems	4	8,0	0	0,0	4	4,4
Hunger	2	4,0	0	0,0	2	2,2
Not being paid for the product sold	2	4,0	0	0,0	2	2,2
Hygiene	1	2,0	0	0,0	1	1,1
Repercussions of working on academic success	1	2,0	0	0,0	1	1,1
Being scolded by the family when the amount of money earned is found small	1	2,0	0	0,0	1	1,1

Risks involved in working on the street were investigated. Answers given by the

children are given in the Chart 45. The percentages in the chart show “yes” answers given by the children under the relevant category. It is observed that 38,9% of the children referred to verbal violence as a risk. 30,0% of the children mentioned physical violence as a risk. 27,8% of the children mentioned being harmed by extreme heat and cold. Being a victim of a crime ranks fourth in the list of risks with 21,1%.

Çırak and Çivitci (2004) found in their study that 35% of the children found the street work unsafe. In another study conducted in Diyarbakır, Okumuş (2009) observed that children working on the street faced many risks such as upper respiratory tract infections, skin problems caused by dirt, pollution and air conditions; risk of consuming alcohol and using drugs, exposure to paint and chemicals and lifting heavy loads.

Children working on the street sometimes fight with and harm each other and also are exposed to physical and verbal violence of other people outside. A Syrian child talked about the violence he sustained when working on the street *“Sometimes, fights break out. Turks swear at us”*. Another child said *“Sometimes, some youngsters walking past me attack and beat us. They hit us because they drink. They think I look at the girls.”* A Turkish child said the following to talk about the risks of street work *“We risk getting our things stolen. There is also the risk of alcoholism. You may run all kinds of risks”*. Another child said how he became the victim of a crime *“Here there are a couple of Turkish guys like mafia. If they notice that we collected a lot of waste, carts loaded with waste, they certainly show up to get our money.”*

Adverse weather conditions that may affect the child’s health are among the most significant risks of working on the street for children. The following declaration reflects the child’s concerns on this issue:

“...I don’t know what to do, I worked in cold weather for some time, cardboard collection stuff. I wanted to do some work, then they gave none. The winter passed

like that. In snowy weather, we resisted water from head to toe. I wandered for some time to find a work, I found none other than cardboard stuff. We don't know what to do this winter."

A child said he had problems about getting warm both at home and at work "There is a stove, but no coal to burn. We go to cafes to get warm." Another child talked about the health effects of working on the street "Sometimes, we get our hands injured by tin, small injuries. But my wound has not yet healed."

The following comments made by a Syrian child working on the street sums up the dangers of the street work

"A covered van...he uncovered the vehicle loaded with waste cardboard, he told me to get out, hardly had I done so than 3 of them showed up, with a stab in their hand. They said they would cut my throat. They threatened me. They said I was Syrian. I said yes I knew. I did not understand why they made an issue out of my being Syrian...They did not ask for money. They beat me for about 1 hour and then left me...It was 3 youngsters at my age. They did not ask for money. They beat me for no reason. They talked a lot, but I did not understand what they said. I just understood them talking about my being Syrian."

On the other hand, it was observed that parents had a different view of risks on the street. For example, a parent talked about the risk of accident for the child "The problem is that, when it snows or rains, it becomes slippery on the slope. And card are passing fast I fear that the child would have an accident. That is our problem."

It was observed that parents usually mentioned kidnapping, organ mafia and car hit concerning the risks of the street. They did not place much emphasis on the children's health or developmental stage characteristics. The following quotations reflect this view:

"I fear they get hit by a car. I always keep an eye on them. If I don't go, I don't send

them to work. I fear they get kidnapped. You know, there are those organ mafia and prostitution rings. We watch such stuff on news. I may be a primary school graduate and grew up in a village. But we follow what happens around by watching TV news and looking at newspapers. These are what I fear, but I have no option other than taking them to work.”

“Someone may kidnap him and cut his limbs. You know, there are terrorists around. We are afraid. Of course, parents would be worried about their children. There are horrific things happening. We send children to work but we fear. When they are late, we go out to look for them.”

“For us, doing shit work is preferable to collecting wastes. But we have to do the waste collection work. Sometimes, we are scared to death. My daughter coming home at 9 in the evening, at 10 or 11. I get worried immediately. Has she been kidnapped, has something happened to her. We search in all directions here and there. I would like to give them mobile phones, but none of us has any phone.”

Chart 46. Do Children Find It Advantageous to Work on the Street

	Yes		No		Total	
	Frequency	%	Frequency	%	Frequency	%
Turkish	31	59,6	21	40,4	52	56,5
Syrian	30	75,0	10	25,0	40	43,5
Total	61	66,3	31	33,7	92	100,0

The children were asked if they found any advantage in working on the street. Answers are given in Chart 46. As seen, 66,3% of all the children declared it is advantageous to work on the street. Among Turkish children, the share of those who find it advantageous to work on the street and who don't is almost the same. As for the Syrian children, 75,0% of them find it advantageous on the street while 25,0% don't.

Çırak and Çivitci (2004) found that only 37% of the children working on the street enjoyed working on the street, while 63% did not enjoy it.

Chart 47. Advantages of Working on the Street according to Children

	Earning money		Making use of the free time		Sense of freedom		Learning how to work		Other*		Total	
	Freq.	%	Freq	%	Freq	%	Freq	%	Freq	%	Freq	%
Turkish	24	77,4	4	12,9	1	3,2	2	6,5	0	0,0	31	50,8
Syrian	25	83,3	3	10,0	1	3,3	0	0,0	1	3,3	30	49,2
Total	49	80,3	7	11,5	2	3,3	2	3,3	1	1,6	61	100,0

* One Syrian child who said “other” said the advantage was “to see the sun”.

The answers given to the question on the advantages of working on the street are given under 5 categories in the Chart 48. As seen in the chart, 80,3% of the children said the advantage of working on the street was to earn money. 3,3% said it was sense of freedom and 11,5% said it was making use of the free time. A Syrian child said the advantage of working on the street was “to see the sun”.

Çırak and Çivitci (2004) studied children who were happy with working on the street to understand why they were happy. They found that most common reasons were “earning pocket money”, “liking street work” and “contributing to the family”. The same study found that 75% of the children wanted to stop working on the street. 91% of the children said they wanted to attend school.

This being the case, a child said that he was obliged to work on the street “*There is no advantage in working on the street...We work because we have to.*” Another child considered working on the street as a leisure activity “*I don’t have a work to do, I don’t go to school. If I didn’t work on the street, I would sit at home all day and be bored.*” Parents were found to have a similar approach:

“No, that one does not come often to work. That boy is rebellious. You know how boys are, but the others say “we can give you pocket money”. Anyway, the children go to work to cover their own needs, to earn their own pocket money”.

Chart 48. From Whom Do Children Ask For Help When in Trouble

	From my friends		From my family		From law enforcement officers		From the people in the street		Others*	
	Frequen	%	Frequen	%	Frequen	%	Frequen	%	Frequen	%
Turkis	8	15,	33	63,	15	28,	6	11,	3	5,
Syrian	6	15,	19	47,	2	5,0	13	32,	3	7,
Total	14	15,	52	56,	17	18,	19	20,	6	6,

* Out of those children who declared asking for help from “others”, 2 asked for help from shop keepers and 1 child from other Syrian citizen and from the Municipality. 1 child said “I would leave it to God” and “I help myself”.

When asked from whom they asked for help when in trouble, 56,5% of all the children said they would ask for help from their family. This rate is 63,5% for Turkish children and 47,5% for Syrian children. The second most common answer for Turkish children is “asking for help from law enforcement officers” (28,5%), and “asking for help from other people on the street” for Syrian children (32,5%).

In his study, Karakuş (2010) asked children with whom they shared their problems when they had some. Out of the 70 children, 31 said “no one”, 17 said “friends” and 11 “family”. He found that out of the 70 children, 58 asked for help/support from the family, 10 from friends and 2 from school in cases of emergency.

A Syrian child said the following to explain how to ask for help from other people on the street when in trouble:

“If someone hit me, I would run away first. I would get into a shop or go near a Turkish person to ask for help to save me. There is not a police officer everywhere. That is what I would do.”

Chart 49. Type of Assistance Expected by Children When Working on the Street

	Turkish		Syrian		Total	
	Freq	%	Freq	%	Freq	%
Social assistance and protection	10	32,3	4	23,5	14	29,2
Help for physical hardships	5	16,1	6	35,3	11	22,9
Economic aid	8	25,8	0	0,0	8	16,7
Protection against verbal and physical violence (fears)	5	16,1	3	17,6	8	16,7
Security support	3	9,7	4	23,5	7	14,6
Total	31	64,6	17	35,4	48	100,0

Answers given by the children about the type of assistance expected to help them when working on the street are indicated in 5 categories in the Chart 49. The most common type of assistance expected by the Turkish children is social assistance and protection with 32,3%. The most common type of help expected by Syrian children, on the other hand, is help for physical hardships with 35,3%.

As seen above, children seem to have different interpretations of what assistance means. Some children view assistance as social and economic assistance while others understand it as physical for their work, like one of the children who said *“I wish someone helped me when I drag the waste cart”*.

Another child working on the street said *“Hüseyingazi police station is very far away from here. If there were a station near here, they could help more quickly”*. This statement shows the importance of institutional services in contacting children. Such institutional services are crucial in ensuring a faster and more effective access in order to prevent children from facing risks.

Chart 50. Do Children Face Undesirable Treatments When Working on the Street

	Yes		No		Total	
	Frequency	%	Frequency	%	Frequency	%
Turkish	25	48,1	27	51,9	52	56,5
Syrian	27	67,5	13	32,5	40	43,5
Total	52	56,5	40	43,5	92	100,0

Chart 50 shows if children working on the street face undesirable treatments. 56,5% of the children declared facing undesirable treatments in total. This rate is 67,5% for Syrian children and 48,1% for Turkish children.

More than half the children interviewed declared facing undesirable treatments, which shows once again that working on the street is not safe for children. Moreover, the rate of Syrian children reporting undesirable treatments is higher than that of Turkish children, which may be related to the status issue on the street and stigmatization.

Chart 51. Undesirable Treatments for Children

	Turkish		Syrian		Total	
	Freq	%	Freq	%	Freq	%
Yelling/threatening	9	36,0	10	37,0	19	36,5
Swear/insult	3	12,0	8	29,6	11	21,2
Violence by shop keepers	5	20,0	3	11,1	8	15,4
Violence by other working children	2	8,0	3	11,1	5	9,6
Theft	3	12,0	2	7,4	5	9,6
Reprobation	1	4,0	0	0,0	1	1,9
Violence by a substance user	1	4,0	0	0,0	1	1,9
Social adaptation	1	4,0	0	0,0	1	1,9
Dog attack/setting on a dog	0	0,0	1	3,7	1	1,9
Total	25	48,1	27	51,9	52	100,0

Chart 51 shows types of undesirable attitudes children face on the street according to their declaration. Answers are given under 9 categories. The most common

undesirable attitudes they face seem to be “yelling/threatening” with 36,5% and “swearing/insulting” with 21,2%. These two categories are followed by violence by shop keepers and violence by other working children. From a broad perspective, 90% of the children seem to fear being subject to violence.

Chart 46 had showed children’s perceived risks of working on the street. Treatments mentioned as risks by children in the Chart 46 seem to be similar to undesirable treatments in the Chart 51. A Syrian child expresses this as follows *“Between us Syrians, there has never been a fight...But we have a certain place of gathering...Sometimes other kids who get out of school come and attack us...Sometimes we fight...”*

Similarly, undesirable treatments mentioned by children include stealing and violence from shop keepers. A child carrying water at the cemetery for work said *“Once, the guys smoking at the first gate stole our money. As we earn a lot of money during religious holidays, they come them to steal our money. Sometimes, the other people working there do not let us work there too.”*

Chart 52. Children’s Reactions to Undesirable Treatments

	Turkish		Syrian		Total	
	Frequ	%	Frequ	%	Frequ	%
I do nothing/remain silent	5	20,8	12	48,0	17	34,7
I run away	3	12,5	11	44,0	14	28,6
I ask for help from the family and relatives	2	4,2	1	4,0	2	4,1
I ask for help from the friends	2	8,3	1	4,0	3	6,1
I ask for help from police officers	3	12,5	0	0,0	3	6,1
I object/quarrel	6	25,0	0	0,0	6	12,2
Reacts to oneself	4	16,7	0	0,0	4	8,2
Total	24	49,0	25	51,0	49	100,0

Chart 52 shows under 7 categories how children react to undesirable treatments. 34,7% of the children declare doing nothing and remaining silent, 28,6% running

way. 25% of the Turkish children declare objecting and arguing. Syrian children never do that. 92% of the Syrian children declare that, when faced with an undesirable treatment, they do nothing/just remain silent and run away. The fact that Syrian children do not oppose to undesirable treatments may be attributed to the migration they went through and trauma of the war and inability to speak Turkish.

Chart 53. Children's Having an Accident

	Yes		No		Total	
	Frequency	%	Frequency	%	Frequency	%
Turkish	25	48,1	27	51,9	52	56,5
Syrian	22	55,0	18	45,0	40	43,5
Total	47	51,1	45	48,9	92	100,0

Chart 53 shows the risk of accident children run when working on the street. 48,1% of the Turkish children and 55% of the Syrian children declared having run the risk of accident. In total, 51,1% of the children working on the street declared having run the risk of accident.

In his study conducted with 400 children in Diyarbakır, Bilgin (2004) found that 40% of the children were exposed to accidents related to the work.

Chart 54. Types of Accidents Children Had

	Car Hit		Hand-Foot Injury		Fall		Total	
	Frequen	%	Frequen	Frequen	Frequen	%	Frequen	%
Turkis	5	41,	5	41,7	2	16,	12	42,9
Syria	10	62,	6	37,5	0	0,0	16	57,1
Total	15	53,	11	39,3	2	7,1	28	100,

The children who declared having run the risk of having an accident were asked what type of an accident they had. The answers are given in 3 categories in the Chart 55. This question was answered by 28 children. 53,6% of these children said they were hit by a car, followed by hand-foot injury (39,3%) and fall (7,1%).

Bilgin (2012) found out that children working on the street got harmed by various causes such as slipping, fall and car hit. Since children usually work in places with heavy traffic, they are more frequently exposed to traffic accidents.

A parent interviewed talked about the accidents that their children had: *“My older daughter, Y...aged 12. A car hit and dragged her on the ground. But thanks God, the man did not run away, he took my daughter to the hospital...My other daughter was also hit by a car, but nothing happened. Both are fine.”*

Chart 55. How Children Protect Themselves from Excessive Heat or Cold

	Turkish		Syrian		Total	
	Frequency	%	Frequency	%	Frequency	%
Wearing warm clothes	26	56,5	19	57,6	45	57,0
Burning a fire	5	10,9	4	12,1	9	11,4
Not going out to work	8	17,4	1	3,0	9	11,4
Getting warm in a closed space or shop	3	6,5	4	12,1	7	8,9
Cannot protect oneself	3	6,5	1	3,0	4	5,1
I get back home to warm up	0	0,0	4	12,1	4	5,1
I like cold weather	1	2,2	0	0,0	1	1,3
Total	46	58,2	33	41,8	79	100,0

The study tried to find out how the children protected themselves from adverse weather conditions that could affect health. Answers are given in the Chart 55 in 7 sub-categories. The most common form of protection for the children is “wearing warm clothes” with 57%. This is the most common method for both groups.

The answers given by the children to the question about protection from adverse weather conditions that could affect health address ways of protection from very cold weather. Children did not address how they protected from very hot weather, because the study was conducted in winter.

Yeşil (2009) found in his study that children working on the street continued to work under very cold weather conditions in winter and in very hot summer weather above 40 degree.

Children’s Proposals for Solutions Concerning Street Work

Chart 56. What kind of a change in your life would make you give up working on the street?

	Turkish		Syrian		Total	
	Frequency	%	Frequency	%	Frequency	%
If we were rich	30	60,0	8	20,0	38	42,2
If I could attend school	5	10,0	10	25,0	15	16,7
If we were given financial assistance	10	20,0	4	10,0	14	15,6
If there were appropriate works for children	2	4,0	8	20,0	10	11,1
If the war ended and we returned to Syria	0	0,0	7	17,5	7	7,8
If our parents found a work	3	6,0	3	7,5	6	6,7
Total	50	55,6	40	44,4	90	100,0

The children were asked the questions “What kind of a change in your life would make you give up working on the street?” and “What would you like to do for children working on the street?” Answers to these questions are given as children’s own proposals for solutions in categories in the Chart 57. Most of the children (42,2%) referred to getting richer. In their answers, 60% of Turkish children and 38% of Syrian children talked about getting richer.

This finding shows, from children’s perspective, the connection of the street work of children with economic variables. In chart 36, most of the children had defined their families’ economic situation as “poor”. So, it is significant that these children emphasize getting richer as an alternative to working on the street.

In a study, Yeşil (2009) asked children what they wanted to be when they grew up. It was found that the children selling simit (Turkish bagel) wanted to run a simit

bakery and shoe-shiners wanted to run a shoe shop or manufacturing workshop.

The problem of the children working on the street involved diverse variables. The solution of this problem also requires understanding the perspective of those who live these problems. The proposals given under this heading are those voiced by the children, subjects of the problem. These proposals are important in functionalizing the right to participation of the child as the subject of the problem, and this is valuable to enable decision-makers to see the problem of children working on the street from the child's perspective.

A child working on the street underlined the underlying economic cause of the problem *"I would give them money, victuals, food"*. Another child thinks the problem can be addressed by having a work with regular income and housing in better conditions: *"If only we had our own slum house and worked like normal"*. Another child also raised the health dimension of the problem: *"I wish we had our own house, some food. I wish we could go to the hospital free of charge. That is all I wish. Then I would be comfortable and live without problem. If you are not in good health, money is of no good."*

According to our observations, children attribute great importance to solving the problem of children's working on the street. A Syrian child mentioned the obligation to work as an obstacle to school attendance *"If I could, I would go to school, but I need to work"*. Another child referred to the need for education of the children working on the street *"I would provide for their needs for education. I would for example ask the school principal to enrol the children in his school"*. Another child underlined the importance of education more strongly *"First of all, I would compel all these working children to go to school whether they wished it or not. I would also provide them with what is necessary for a comfortable life. I would force them to go to school and also give them money"*.

Another child raised the multi-variable aspect of the issue *"First of all, I would buy a house and provide food for people in a situation like ours. I would open a school give*

them financial assistance, then they would not have to work and they would go to school”.

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Conclusion

The issue of children working on the street is a phenomenon with specific dynamics and is too complicated to be explained with one single variable. Intersectionality¹ is a helpful guide in understanding this complicated phenomenon with multiple variables. Intersectionality conceptualization refers to the diversity of risks faced by children working on the street and intersection of these risks to further compound these risks. Being sent to work on the street is a risk, per se. Some other variables based on ethnic, linguistic, socio-cultural, economic and social factors were found to further diversify the risks faced by the children.

Syrians who were forced to migrate to Turkey because of the war in Syria and resulting humanitarian crisis created significant effect on Turkey's demographic, social, cultural, economic and political life, which also led to a change in the profile of children working on the street. Before Syrians migrated to Turkey, one could not claim that speaking Turkish was an advantage or disadvantage for children working on the streets of Ankara. However, with the arrival of Syrian children who started to work on the streets of Ankara, this structure changed and certain new patterns of relationships emerged. As understood from the declaration by the children interviewed, speaking Turkish has now become an advantage when working on the streets of Ankara. This means that there are increased risks for Syrian children who do not speak Turkish. The language issue is also related to ethnic origin.

Gender seems to have come into focus in terms of types of work done by children interviewed. For instance, it has been observed that scavenger children are mostly boys, while scavenger girls usually go to collect wastes together with their parents or siblings.

¹ Usually used by feminist theorists, the concept of intersectionality emphasizes in our context that combination of the disadvantaged characteristics of the children causes an increase in their risks.

The risks mentioned up to this point are related to children's unchangeable traits (being Syrian, being a girl). There are also additional risks faced by children on the street that intersect and harm the child. For instance, one of the children interviewed said: *"Sometimes, it gets cold. What makes it harder is that when we collect too much waste, we cannot push the cart. We cannot give the right of way to automobiles. Then, many drivers swear at us, yell at us."* This declaration refers to meteorological conditions that have a negative effect on health, physical constraints and verbal abuse sustained.

Similarly, a parent said *"Our children tell us they get hungry and cold. They tell that their teacher got angry and asked why there is no toast in their meal kit. They see other children at school who have dozens of different food in their lunch kit. Our children cannot find a bun to eat. In truth, we see them in that situation, we feel like crying, but to no avail...Do you know what we can do to save ourselves, I know. We can put all our children home and kill ourselves...What is the point in living in that misery?"*. In these remarks, she refers to poverty, exclusion and helplessness.

As a result, intersectionality shows in a more holistic perspective the fact that the children working on the street are threatened not only due to their unchangeable traits but also due to the risks on the street. When addressing risks face by children, it is necessary to take into account how these risks affect children and to develop proposals for solutions in this context.

The results of the study are given under two headings. The first one gives the results of qualitative and quantitative interviews conducted with children and families. The second heading gives the results of focus group meetings and in-depth interviews with representatives of relevant institutions and non-governmental organizations, experts, mukhtars and police officers.

Results of Interviews with Children and Families

Even though most of the children interviewed as part of the study live in Altındağ district, they live actually in almost all parts of Ankara. However, since most are found working in Ankara's Altındağ, Yenimahalle and Çankaya Districts, the study was conducted in these areas.

Most of the children interviewed are boys. Children usually collect wastes. This is done mostly by boys. Girls, on the other hand, sell paper handkerchiefs. Gender effect is visible in types of works done by children. Money generated by the work and hardship of the work define who will do a particular work. No doubt, this is not independent from gender. Average age of the children is 13. 80% of the children were born in Ankara and experienced migration.

Children do not have regular and adequate nutrition. They live in unfavourable conditions. As a result, they have a poor health condition. One fifth of the children have a chronic disease. And yet, their access to health services and rate of taking medication are low. The general impression is that the children interviewed usually are less developed than their peers in terms of height and weight, which is visible by naked eye. In average, Children sleep 9 hours and have two meals a day. Most of the children get their food outside when working on the street. Children declared they did not use substance themselves but knew people around them who used substance. A small number of children smoke.

None of the Syrian children interviewed attend school. Most of the Turkish children attend primary or junior secondary school. All of the Syrian children dropped out of school because of war and migration, while some of the Turkish children dropped out of school because of migration and unfavourable conditions they faced at school environment. Street work is a physically tiring activity. Children get tired and do not have enough time for doing homework, which results in their alienation from school.

From the perspective of the children and parents interviewed, education means money spent. One of the reasons is that when the child does not go to school, s/he contributes to the family budget. That is why, going to school is perceived as a cost in terms of expenditure and also a disadvantage as the additional income earned by family members is decreased. On one hand, the child works to meet school expenses, which may sometimes result in the child's alienation from the school. Gradually, children's working to cover school expenditures and bringing home money may turn into a habit which eliminates the responsibility of the parents.

The children interviewed live in crowded nuclear families where mother and father usually live together. Approximately, one fourth of the children declared that their father used violence on their mother; and half of them declared their father used violence on them and their siblings.

Most of the children interviewed declared that there were other children in their neighbourhood who are sent to work on the street. Most of the children live in slum houses. In average, there are 3 rooms in the housings. There being one room per three persons, one may suggest children do not have private living space.

The type of housing was observed to be very important for some works. For instance, for waste paper collectors, the availability of a large space in the slum house is an advantage for the work done. Although an advantage in terms of providing space for the work, slum houses create unfavourable effects on the health situation of children in particular and other family members.

Fathers of most of the Turkish children work, while those of most of the Syrian children do not work. In both groups, most of the mothers do not work. The average income of the households is 1250 TL, which is below the threshold of poverty. The average age when the children interviewed were first sent to work on the street is 10.

As for the types of works done by the child, waste collection is very common. This is

followed secondly by selling paper handkerchief. The children did similar works in the past. Most of the children define the economic situation of their families as “poor”.

Parents have a certain awareness of the age when the child started to work on one hand, and normalize the child’s labour on the other hand. We think the parents normalize the child’s labour because of the poverty of the families and parents’ helplessness.

All of the Syrian children and most of the Turkish children experienced migration. The reason of migration for the Syrian children is war and security while it is economic for Turkish children.

Few children spend the night on the street, relatively. The average time of returning home from the street is 8 p.m. In average, children stay on the street for 7,5 hours a day. Waste paper collecting children usually work in areas close to home and therefore return home on foot. Waste paper collecting children have to return home on foot with the waste collection cart. Similarly, children sent to work further away from home also returned home on foot.

About one third of the children are exposed to physical violence on the street. That is why, street work brings about a cycle of violence for the children. The children sustain violence by the other children working on the street in most cases. Violence from unknown persons and shop keepers is also significant.

Children declared that the biggest risk of working on the street was verbal and physical violence. Other risks according to their declaration include adverse weather conditions affecting the health and being a victim of crime. More than half of the children define working on the street as an advantage. Most of these advantages are attributed to earning money, making use of the free time and sense of freedom.

When children get into trouble, they usually ask for help from their families. This shows that the children opt for informal assistance instead of institutional support.

Children working on the street usually expect to receive social assistance, protection and assistance against physical hardships.

More than half of the children are exposed to undesirable treatments on the street, most commonly being yelled at/threatened and being insulted/sworn. When faced with such undesirable treatments, Syrian children usually remain silent and prefer to run away. Turkish children, on the other hand, react more differently (asking for help from the family, relatives, friends and security staff or resisting). This shows that Syrian children feel less secure than Turkish children.

More than half of the children run the risk of having an accident. Car crashes are the most common type of accident. The children work in places with heavy traffic, which increases the risk of traffic accident and likelihood of the child to be exposed to violence. Children put on warm clothes to protect against adverse weather conditions.

Children's idea of getting out of poverty and related deprivation is by way of getting rich. Children's perception is that reaching a good income level would put an end to poverty. Additionally, Syrian children think that the ending of the war and getting back to Syria would solve the problems they have in Turkey.

Conclusions Drawn From Meetings with Relevant Institutions and Non-Governmental Organizations, Experts, Mukhtars and Police Officers

We have consulted actors working in the field of children working on the street. An analysis has been carried out on the data obtained from focus group meetings with representatives of institutions and non-governmental organizations that took place on 1-2 October 2015 as well as from in-depth interviews with Mukhtars and police officers that were done in the course of the study.

As a result, the following conclusions have been drawn from focus group meetings and in-depth interviews conducted with representatives working within institutions or voluntarily with Turkish and Syrian children working on the street:

- Economic assistance without psycho-social support and counselling to children working, living and begging on the street has limited and inadequate effect.
- Certain assumptions internalized by families play an important role in children's working on the street.
- In addition to assumptions internalized by families, traditional assumptions of the society also create a normalizing effect on children's working on the street.
- Sub-culture of poverty and begging is another factor normalizing children's working on the street.
- Public opinion is decisive in the perception of the problem of children's working on the street.
- Working on the street in the case of Syrian children in particular is related to children's school attendance, parents' education level and income level.
- In the schooling rate of Syrian children in particular, the age limit of 12 seems to be a decisive factor. If children have not been schooled before the age of 12, it is harder to school them after that age.
- Parents' informal employment and unfair remuneration are important factors in Syrian children's working on the street.
- After migration experience, elder boys in the family are deprived of education in order to work to meet the needs of the family and of younger siblings.
- Delinquent tendencies seem to be lower among Syrian children as compared to Turkish children
- Security-based propaganda used by municipal police and security forces toward the phenomenon of juvenile delinquency makes it harder to communicate with children and to relate children to resources.

- It was declared that, as far as the Syrian children are concerned, international legislation on the rights of the child was not applied and there were some gaps in national legislation on this issue.
- Language barrier for Syrian children makes it harder for them to access to public services, city and new social possibilities
- Substance use seems not to be common among Syrian and Turkish working children.
- It was underlined that adults' drinking and using substance in the working environment create an incentive effect for the children.
- The major problem in working with Syrian children is language and communication.
- Experts stated that there was a lack of resources for solving the language issue.
- Language barrier means children are excluded from education system.
- Economic assistance provided to families is not enough in solving the problem of child work on the street.
- Participants underlined the lack of institutional infrastructure and of social policies required for ensuring Syrian children's school attendance.
- There is need for an in-depth needs assessment of the problems of Syrian children and their families
- Professional competence of experts working with the children working on the street as well as their suitability for team work matter. Systematic and theoretical works also matter, according to comments.

Proposals

Following proposals have been developed on the basis of the findings and outcomes of this study:

- There is need for intensified protective, therapeutical and rehabilitative actions for children currently living on the street. As in many other areas, the issue of street children concerns diverse sectors, professions and disciplines. Therefore, inter-sectoral cooperation and coordination are important. It is also imperative that relevant professions and disciplines work together with a team spirit.
- Launching a public debate on social and cultural views on children working and begging on the street would make a significant contribution to the solution of the problem. Printed and visual media should be actively used in making this debate and comprehensively assessing the issue.
- It is important to address sanctions against making children work on the street on the basis of reparative justice. In this context, punishment-based sanctions against children working on the street and their families should be replaced with professional interventions that address the roots of the problem.
- One of the key points in working with children is to discover their semantic universe related to experiences of working on the street. Knowledge of these experiences would strengthen the practise when working with children. That is why continuity is important in working together with universities and relevant organizations to carry out researches.
- When providing social assistance and services, it is important to take into account the socio-cultural characteristics and expectations of service recipient children and families.
- Actions to be taken for the children working on the street should be structured in a way to address their different development needs and characteristics.

- Children's working spaces seem to be concentrated in certain areas. Therefore, before provision of service to children working on the street, risk-mapping is important in increasing the service effectiveness.
- Those planning the services for children working on the street should attach importance to the children's involvement.
- It is important to set up units that can directly contact children in areas to be identified through risk-mapping. The actions to be taken by these units also need to involve role model children to be selected from among the children working on the street. Such an action would not only empower role model children but also make it easier to access other children. This would also allow for children's own representativeness so that they could directly communicate their needs and demands.
- There is need for developing effective monitoring and early warning systems for timely intervention in health problems affecting children working on the street. To this end, it is important to develop practises and mechanisms for checking and recording the health situation of children, whether going to school or not.
- Given that there are people using substance around children working on the street, actions need to be taken to protect children from the influence of friends that would make them start using substance. These actions need to be carried out in coordination with institutions and organizations that implement preventive and protective actions on substance use. Common recording and identification systems should be used. This would enable the development of protective and preventive actions for children in areas where substance use is identified as an issue. Intervention may be planned against the likelihood of relapse into addiction.
- Awareness of management of schools should be increased. Schools should be held responsible.

- Infrastructure development works required for enabling Syrian children to access education should be sped up and barriers to Syrian children's education should be eliminated.
- Social work should be started with the child and the family as soon as it is identified that children are working on the street, which is important to solve the problem before it becomes chronic. School system provides the fastest way of identification and intervention about the child being pushed to the street. This means that school social work should be launched immediately.
- Generalization of school social work and recruitment of professionals in the field would allow for capturing the child's problems in school environment and working to solve them.
- When working with the parents who send their children to work on the street, it is important to take into account assumptions on child labour internalized by parents.
- The families of children working on the street also face various problems. It is not realistic to leave the family alone with their problems and to expect the problem to be solved at the same time. It is important to develop the family's problem-solving skills. This being the case, it is necessary to empower families and to raise their awareness on various issues such as the child's needs and characteristics at each relevant developmental phase, risks of the street and negative impacts of street work on the child's education and future. "Family counselling" to be provided by relevant institutions would make a very important contribution in this area.
- Parents' unemployment is one of the most important reasons of sending children to work on the street. This being the case, it is important to contribute to the parents' finding a work. Disseminating job-oriented vocational trainings and development courses may contribute to solving this problem.

- New employment possibilities should be developed for Syrian adults particularly in order to prevent parental unemployment from causing children to be sent to work on the street.
- Similarly, legal barriers to Syrian parents' employment in Turkey should be eliminated. Training programmes should be developed to solve the issue of disadvantage caused by low skills of Syrian adults in the labour market.
- Enrolling children in school and providing families with assistance are fundamental in eradicating the problem of children's working on the street. Social dimension of the social and economic assistance service provided for this purpose by the Ministry of Family and Social Policies should be strengthened.
- Social services and assistance provided by the Ministry of Family and Social Policies should be restructured in a family-oriented manner, with a particular focus on protective, preventive and constructive actions towards children under risk.
- Children working on the street and their families should be given not only economic assistance but also psycho-social support and counselling services. In this framework, psycho-social counselling centres and related establishments should be put in place and activated.
- Services should be devised to prevent children of families migrating within Turkey (such as seasonal workers) from being deprived of education and to eliminate potential risks leading children to be sent to work on the street.
- Juvenile police should be developed as an institution.
- Social services should be strengthened to solve the problem within the family.
- Therapies and rehabilitative actions for addicted children should be disseminated.

- When planning services for children working on the street, it is necessary to address the needs and problems of children currently working on the street and at the same time to develop preventive actions for children under the risk of working - living on the street in the long term and their families.
- The primary objective is to save children from the street. All actions to be carried out with these children and their families should focus on getting children back from the street and enrolling them at school and protecting the child from the unfavourable conditions of the street.
- The fundamental approach in addressing the issue of children working and living on the street is to prevent children from working and settling in the street in the first place. To this end, actions should focus on prevention and protection. A more effective protection should be developed for children working and living on the street through the involvement of central government, local administration and non-governmental organizations. Cooperation and coordination of institutions and organizations working in this field should be developed.
- In order to put an end to child labour, it is necessary to eradicate factors that encourage and thus legitimize child labour. Goal of education for all is the most important instrument in preventing child labour. This goal may be achieved by providing basic education free of charge, creating a healthy (adequate healthcare, water and sanitation etc.) and safe education space, eliminating gender inequality in education and ensuring girls' enrolment.
- In cases where it is not possible to immediately achieve the above-mentioned goals, it is important to set up centres that can directly contact these children and to ensure that these centres be accessible from areas where the children work and live. These centres should recruit professionals (social worker, psychologist etc.) who are particularly equipped with specific knowledge and skills related to working with children working and living on the street and

begging on the street and their families, who know the context in which children are working and can engage in a proper and effective communication with them. Mobile teams composed of such professionals should follow the children in their working environment.

- Effective functioning of these centres is important in following Syrian children on the street.
- In setting up these centres, the experiences drawn from Child and Youth Centres (ÇOGEM) that had been set up by the Ministry of Family and Social Policies (Social Services and Child Protection Agency) and had provided effective services should be used.
- Gradually and under certain influences, children working on the street run the risk of living permanently in the street (becoming a child of the street). Institutions and staff members should raise awareness of this risk and immediately after the first experience of living in the street, should prevent the child from fully settling in the street.
- Law enforcement officers and municipal police officers who are in direct contact with children working on the street should be given trainings on topics such as children's developmental stage characteristics and effective communication with children. It is important that these trainings be delivered by a multi-disciplinary team under the leadership of the Ministry of Family and Social Policies.
- In addition;
- The lack of legislation and organization including recycling policies and practises in Turkey indirectly contributes to the problem of children working on the street. That is why there is need for a comprehensive recycling policy, legislation and waste collection organization.
- Given that most of the children working on the street fear or experience car hit,

it is important to provide a traffic culture training that will get car drivers to acquire more humane attitudes towards children or living creatures in a broad sense.

REFERENCES

- Acar, Hakan. "Cumhuriyetin Çocuk Refahı Politikasını Yapılandıran Bir Sivil Toplum Örgütü: Türkiye Çocuk Esirgeme Kurumu (1921-1981)." [A Civil Society Organization Structuring the Republican Policy of Child Welfare: Child Protection Agency of Turkey] Çalışma Ortamı Dergisi. 73 (2004): 18-21.
- Acar, H, et al. "A Research on Self-esteem Level of Street Children in Istanbul." Research Journal of International Studies 4. (2006): 71-82.
- Acar, Hakan. "Sokakta Yaşayan ve/veya Çalıştırılan Çocuklara Yönelik Hizmet Modelinin Ve İl Eylem Planlarının Değerlendirilmesi Raporu." [Assessment Report on Service Model for Children Living and/or Working on the Street and Provincial Action Plans] 1.Edition. Ankara: SHÇEK D.G.- UNICEF, 2010.
- Acar, Hakan. "Children Working in the Streets and in the Service Sector in Turkey. A Comparative Study." International Journal of Human Sciences 7. 1 (2010): 1009-1019.
- Ajanshaber. "Suriyeli Çocuklar Atık Toplayarak Yaşamını Geçiriyor." [Syrian Children Making a Living Collecting Wastes] 2015.
<http://www.ajanshaber.com/suriyeli-cocuklar-atik-toplayarak-gecimini-sagliyor-haberi/171908>
- Akşit, Bahattin, Nuray Karancı, and Ayşe Gündüz-Hoşgör. "Working Street Children in Three Metropolitan Cities: A Rapid Assessment." No. 7. International Labour Organization, International Programme on the Elimination of Child Labour (IPEC), 2001.
- Aljazeera Turk. "Suriyeli Çocukların Büyük Yükü." [Big Burden of Syrian Children] 2014. <http://www.aljazeera.com.tr/al-jazeera-ozel/suriyeli-cocuklarin-buyuk-yuku>

Alptekin, Kamil. "Sokakta Çalışan Çocuklar ve Aileleri: Düzce Örneği." [Children Working on the Street and Their Families: Düzce Case] *Toplum ve Sosyal Hizmet* 22. 1 (2011): 25-48.

Altıntaş, Betül. "Mendile, Simite, Boyaya, Çöpe... Ankara Sokaklarında Çalışan Çocuklar." [Selling Paper Handkerchief, Simit, Shoe-Shining, Garbage Collecting] İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 2003.

Alacahan, Osman. "Çocuğunu Sokakta Çalıştıran Ailelerin Sosyo-Ekonomik Profili, Tutum ve Beklentileri." [Socio-Economic Profile, Attitudes and Expectations of Families Sending Their Children to Work] *Sosyal Siyaset Konferansları Dergisi* 59. (2010): 133-147.

Alparslan, Özgür and Bahattin Karaoğlan. "Sokakta Çalışan Çocukların Yaşam Koşulları." [Living Conditions of Children Working on the Street] *Journal of Anatolia Nursing and Health Sciences* 15. 4 (2012):268-274.

Constitution (1982). *T. C. Resmi Gazete*, 2709,7 Kasım 1982

Atasü-Topcuoğlu, Reyhan. "Türkiye'de Göçmen Çocukların Profili: Sosyal Politika ve Sosyal Hizmet Önerileri. Bir Hızlı Değerlendirme Araştırması." [Profile of Migrant Children in Turkey: Social Policy and Social Service Recommendations] International Organization of Migration (IOM). Ankara, 2012.

Atauz, Sevil. "Ankara ve Şanlıurfa'da Sokak Çocukları." [Street Children in Ankara and Şanlıurfa] Ankara: UNICEF Yayınları, 1990.

Atauz, Sevil. "Diyarbakır Sokak Çocukları Araştırması." [Research on Street Children in Diyarbakır] Ankara: UNICEF Yayınları, 1997.

Baybuğa, Media and Gülümser Kubilay. "Sokakta Yaşayan/Çalışan Çocukların Aile ve Yaşadıkları Konutun Özellikleri." [Characteristics of the Family and Housing of

Children Living/Working on the Street] Hemşirelikte Araştırma Geliştirme Dergisi 2. (2003): 34-46.

Baymur, Feriha. "*Genel Psikoloji.*" [General Psychology] İstanbul: İnkılap ve Aka Basımevi, 1978.

BBC. "*Suriyeli Mülteciler Dosyası: Eğitimde Kayıp Nesil Riski.*" [Syrian Refugees: Risk of Lost Generation in Education] 2015.

http://www.bbc.com/turkce/haberler/2015/10/151006_suriye_selin

Bilgin, Rifat. "*Diyarbakır'da Sokakta Çalışan Çocuklar Üzerine Sosyolojik Bir Araştırma.*" [A Sociological Research on Children Working on the Street in Diyarbakır] Elektronik Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi 8. 27 (2009): 232-244.

Bilgin, Rifat. "*Sokakta Çalışan Çocukları Bekleyen Risk ve Tehlikeler: Diyarbakır Örneği.*" [Risks and Dangers Threatening Children Working on the Street: Diyarbakır Case] Uluslararası Yönetim İktisat ve İşletme Dergisi 8. 15 (2012): 79-96.

General Assembly of the United Nations. "*Convention on the Rights of the Child.*" 20.11.1989

Bromley, Daniel W. ve Peter K. Mackie. "*Child Experiences As Street Traders İn Peru: Contributing to A Reappraisal For Working Children.*" Children's Geographies 7. 2 (2009): 141-158.

Bumin, Kürşat. "*Batı' da Devlet ve Çocuk.*" [State and Child in the West] 2.Baskı. İstanbul: Patika Yayınları, 1998.

Can Beritan, Saim. "*Sokağın Yoksul Çocukları: İstanbul Örneği.*" [Poor Children of the Street: İstanbul Case] Yoksulluk Sempozyumunda Sunulan Bildiri: 31 Mayıs- 1 Haziran 2003, İstanbul. İstanbul: Deniz Feneri Yayınları, (2003): 278-289.

Cangür, Şengül, et al. "*Düzce İlinde Sokakta Çalışan Çocukların Eğitime Bakış Açısı ve Beklentileri.*" [Perspective of Education of Children Working on the Street in the Province of Düzce and Expectations] *Düzce Üniversitesi Sağlık Bilimleri Enstitüsü Dergisi* 3. 2 (2013): 5-14.

Cheng, Fucai and Debbie Lam. "*How Is Street Life? An Examination of The Subjective Wellbeing Of Street Children In China.*" *International Social Work* 53. 3 (2010): 353–365.

Çeltikçi, Ebrize. "*Çocuk, Kadın ve Haklar Açısından Aile İçi Şiddete Bakış.*" [*Domestic Violence in terms of Children, Women and Rights*] *Aile ve Şiddet*. Ed. Adem Solak. Ankara: HEGEM Yayınları, 2010. 97-114.

Çırak, Yüksel and Nazmiye Çivitci. "*Malatya İlinde Sokakta Çalışan Çocuklar Üzerine Bir İnceleme.*" [*A Study on Children Working on the Street in Malatya*] *İnönü Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*. Malatya, 2004.

Child Protection Law. (2005). *T. C. Resmi Gazete*, 25876, 15 July 2005

Çolak, Ömer Faruk. "*Küreselleşme, Beşeri Sermaye ve Çocuk İşgücü.*" [*Globalization, Human Capital and Child Labour*] Ankara: Uluslararası Çalışma Örgütü ve Türkiye İşveren Sendikaları Konfederasyonu Yayını, 1998.

Danişoğlu, Emel. "*Kalkınma Planlarında Çocukla İlgili Devlet Politikaları.*" [*Child-Related State Policies in Development Plans*] 2.Ulusal Çocuk Kültürü Kongresi. Ed. Bekir Onur. Ankara: ÇOKAUM Yayınları, 1999.

Demirci, Gülhan. "*Suriyeli Çocuklar Ekmeklerini Çöpten Çıkartıyor.*" [*Syrian Children Retrieving Bread from the Garbage*] *Radikal Gazetesi*. 2015.
<http://www.radikal.com.tr/turkiye/suriyeli-cocuklar-ekmeklerini-copten-cikartiyor-1448409/>

DİSK-AR. 2012. <http://www.yenidenatilim.com/?/D%C4%B0SK-AR-:D%C3%BCnyada-%C3%A7al%C4%B1%C5%9Fan-%C3%A7ocuk-say%C4%B1s%C4%B1-306-milyon&Bid=1330473>

Ekspres. "*Endişelendiren Artış.*" [Worrying Increase] 2015.
<http://www.gazeteekspres.com/haber-endiselendiren-artis-30387.html>

Erdoğan, M. Murat and Can Ünver. "*Türk İş Dünyasının Türkiye'deki Suriyeliler Konusundaki Görüş Beklenti Ve Önerileri.*" [Opinions, Expectations and Recommendations of the Turkish Business Circles about Syrian Refugees] Ankara: Türkiye İşveren Sendikaları Konfederasyonu Yayın No: 353, 2015.

Erdoğan, M. Yüksel. "*Sokakta Çalışan Çocukların Depresif Belirti Düzeylerinin Taranması: Karşılaştırılmalı Çalışma.*" [Screening the Depressive Symptom Levels of Children Working on the Street] Selçuk Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi. 28 (2012): 77-87.

Ergun, Doğan. "*Kimlikler Kıskaçında Ulusal Kişilik.*" [National Personality within the Gripper of Identities] Ankara: İmge Kitabevi, 2000.

Erkan, Rüstem and M.Yüksel Erdoğan. "*Göç ve Çocuk Suçluluğu*" [Migration and Juvenile Delinquency] Aile ve Toplum Eğitim Kültür ve Araştırma Dergisi 3, 9 (2006).

Ertürk, Yakın and Meltem Dayıoğlu. "*Gender, Education and Child Labour in Turkey.*" International Labour Organization, 2004.

Ferguson, Kristin M. "*Responding To Children's Street Work with Alternative Income-Generation Strategies.*" International Social Work 49, 6 (2006): 705–717.

Fişek, A. Gürhan. "*Türkiye'de Çocuk Emegi Çalışmalarına Genel Bakış.*" [General Perspective into Child Labour Studies in Turkey] Fişek Enstitüsü.
<http://www.fisek.org.tr/calismalar/cocuk-emegi/cocuk-emegi-uzerine-yazilar/turkiyede-cocuk-emegi-calismalarina-genel-bakis/>

Göksoy, Süleyman. *"Türkiye ve Avrupa Birliği Ülkelerinde Zorunlu Eğitim Uygulamaları."* [Compulsory Education Practises in Turkey and European Union Countries] *Asya Öğretim Dergisi* 1. 1 (2013): 30-41.

Göktürk, Atilla and Sevilay Kaygalak. (2001). *"Göç ve kentleşme."* [Migration and Urbanization] *Sosyal Hizmet Sempozyumu 99: Bölgesel Kalkınma Sürecinde Sosyal Hizmet*. Ankara: Hacettepe Üniversitesi Sosyal Hizmetler Yüksekokulu Yayını No: 07, 1999

Gün, Servet. *"Yoksulluk Döngüsü Bağlamında Sokakta Çalışan Çocuklar."* [Children Working on the Street within the Context of Poverty Cycle] Yayınlanmamış doktora tezi, Ankara Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Çalışma Ekonomisi ve Endüstri İlişkileri Anabilim Dalı, Ankara,2010.

Güngör, Mehmet. *"Yoksulluk ve Sokakta Çalışan Çocuklar (Mersin Örneği)." [Poverty and Children Working on the Street (Mersin Case)]* Yoksulluk Sempozyumunda Sunulan Bildiri: 31 Mayıs- 1 Haziran 2003 İstanbul. İstanbul: Deniz Feneri Yayınları, (2003): 290-297.

Güngör, Mehmet. *"Evrensel Bir Sorun Olarak Çocuk Suçluluğu ve Sokakta Çalışan ve Yaşayan Çocuklar."* [Juvenile Delinquency and Children Working and Living on the Street as a Universal Problem] *Adıyaman Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi* 1. 1 (2008): 25-43.

Güngör, Mehmet. *"Risk Altındaki Çocukların Aile Yapıları Ve Suça Yönelimleri (Mersin İli Örneği)." [Family Structures and Delinquent Tendencies of Children under Risk (Mersin Case)]* *Mersin Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi* 9. 2 (2013): 421-434.

Günşen İçli, Tülin. *"Çocuk Suç ve Sokak: Sokakta Yaşayan, Suç İşleyen ve Suça Maruz Kalan Çocuklar: Ankara Ve İstanbul Örneği Çözümler ve Öneriler."* [Child, Delinquency and Street: Children Living on the Street, Committing Crimes and

Being the Victim of Crimes: Ankara and İstanbul Case, Solutions and Recommendations] Ankara: Dumat Ofset Matbaa, 2009.

Hatibođlu, Burcu. "Yoksul Ailelerle Sosyal Hizmet: Sokakta alıřan ocuklar rneđi." [Social Work with Poor Families: Case of Children Working on the Street] Published Master Thesis, Hacettepe University, Social Sciences Institute, Social Work Department, Ankara, 2009.

İlik, Blent, and Zeynep Trkmen. "*Sokakta alıřan ocuklar.*" [Children Working on the Street] Ankara: ILO/IPEC, 1994.

İmc Tv. "*CBS: Suriyeli ocuklar İstanbul'da alıřmaya Zorlanıyor.*" [CBS: Syrian Children Forced to Work in İstanbul] 2015. <http://www.imctv.com.tr/cbs-suriyeli-cocuklar-istanbulda-calismaya-zorlaniyor/>

İnan, Ali Naim. "ocuđun Korunması ve Polis." [Child Protection and Police] Ankara niversitesi Hukuk Fakltesi Dergisi 37. 1 (1980): 243-244.

International Labour Office (ILO). "*Child Labour.*" <http://www.ilo.org/ankara/areas-of-work/child-labour/lang--tr/index.htm>

International Labour Office (ILO). "*Children in Hazardous Work: What We Know, What We Need To Do.*" International Programme on the Elimination of Child Labour (IPEC) – Geneva, 2011.

International Labour Office (ILO). "*Marking Progress Against Child Labour - Global Estimates and Trends 2000-2012*" International Programme on the Elimination of Child Labour (IPEC) – Geneva, 2013.

İnsan Hakları İzleme rgt. "When I Picture My Future I See Nothing: Barriers to Education for Syrian Refugee Children in Turkey *Preventing Them from Being Lost Generation.*" 2015. <https://www.hrw.org/tr/news/2015/11/08/283225>.

İnan, Ali Naim. "Çocuğun Korunması ve Polis." [Child Protection and Police] Ankara Üniversitesi Hukuk Fakültesi Dergisi 37. 1 (1980): 243-244.

Labour Law. (2003). T. C. Resmi Gazete, 4857, 22 Mayıs 2003.

Kap, Derya. "Suriyeli Mülteciler: Türkiye'nin Müstakbel Vatandaşları." [Syrian Refugees: Turkey's Future Citizens] Akademik Perspektif 1. 2 (2014): 30-35.

Kara, Sultan Bilge Keskinlik and Temel Çalık. "Sokakta Çalışan Çocukların Eğitim İhtiyaçları." [Education Needs of Children Working on the Street] Gazi Üniversitesi Gazi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi 32. 3 (2012):673-695.

Karabulut, Özcan. "Ekonomik İstismar: Çocukların Çalıştırılması." [Economic Exploitation: Child Labour] 1. İstanbul Çocuk Kurultayı Bildiriler Kitabı: İstanbul. İstanbul Çocukları Vakfı Yayınları, 2000.

Karakuş, Mülazim. "Sokak Çocuklarının Sosyo-Kültürel Durumları ve Gelecek Beklentileri (Diyarbakır İli Örneği)." [Socio-Cultural Situation of Street Children and Their Expectations (Diyarbakır Case)] Unpublished Master Thesis. Abant İzzet Baysal University Social Sciences Institute Primary Education Department, Bolu, 2010.

Karataş, Kasım. "Çocuk İşgücü Sorunu: Nedenleri, Sonuçları ve Çözüm Önerileri" [Child Labour Problem: Reasons, Results and Proposals for Solution] Hacettepe Üniversitesi Sosyal Hizmetler Yüksekokulu Dergisi 11. 1-2-3 (1993): 85-102.

Karataş, Kasım "1920'den 2000'e Türkiye'de Çocuk Olmak" [Being a Child in Turkey from 1920 to 2000] Ufkun Ötesi Aylık Dergi 4. 16 (2000): 2-6.

Karataş, Kasım "Türk Toplumunda Temel Kişilik Özelliklerinin Oluşumuna Geleneksel Çocuk Yetiştirme Yöntemlerinin Etkisi", [Repercussions of Traditional Child Rearing Methods on Development of Basic Personality Characteristics] Prof.

Dr. Vedia Emirođlu'na Armađan, Editör: Gönül Erkan ve Vedat Işıkhan. Ankara: Hacettepe Üniversitesi Sosyal Hizmetler Yüksekokulu Yayını 6. (2000): 40-50.

Karataş, Kasım "*Toplumsal Deđişme ve Aile*" [*Social Change and Family*] Toplum ve Sosyal Hizmet 12. 2 (2001): 87-96.

Karataş, Kasım, et al. "*Göç ve Kentsel Yaşama Uyum Sorunları.*" [*Migration and Problems of Integration with Urban Life*] 2001 Yılı Aile Raporu. Editor: İrfan Çayboylu. Turkish Prime Ministry Family Research Agency. Ankara: 2002.

Karataş, Kasım. "*Sokakta Çalıştırılan ve Yaşayan Çocuklar Sorununun Düşündürdükleri.*" [*Thought-Provoking Aspects of the Problem of Children Working and Living on the Street*] Sokak Çocuklarının İstismarı ve İhmali. Editor: Özkan Yıldız. Gaziantep: Gaziantep Üniversitesi Yayınları, (2009): 61-67.

Karatay, Abdullah. "*Cumhuriyet Dönemi Korunmaya Muhtaç Çocuklara İlişkin Politika Oluşum Süreci.*" [*Policy Making in Republican Era for Children in Need of Protection*] Unpublished Doctorate Thesis. Marmara University Social Sciences Institute, İstanbul, 2007.

Kesmen, Gökhan. "*Adana İl Merkezinde Sokakta Çalışan Çocukların Beslenme Alışkanlıkları Ve Beslenme Durumu.*" [*Nutritional Habits and Situation of Children Working on the Street in Downtown Adana*] Unpublished Master Thesis. Selçuk University Social Sciences Institute, Konya, 2007.

Kızmaz, Zahir and Rifat Bilgin. "*Sokakta Çalışan/Yaşayan Çocuklar ve Suç: Diyarbakır Örneđi.*" [*Children Working/Living on the Street and Delinquency: Diyarbakır Case*] Elektronik Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi 9. 32 (2010): 269-311.

Konanç, Esin, Sezen Zeytinođlu and Şeyda Kozcu. "*İstanbul ve İzmir'de Sokakta Yaşayan ve Çocuklar Üzerinde Araştırma.*" [*Study on Children Living on the Street in İstanbul and İzmir*] İstanbul: Friedrich Ebert Foundation, 1990.

Konanç, Esin. "*Korunmaya Muhtaç Kent Çocukları.*" [*Urban Children in Need of Protection*] İstanbul: Friedrich Ebert Foundation, 1992.

Koşar, Nesrin. "*Sosyal Hizmetlerde Aile ve Çocuk Refahı Alanı.*" [*Family and Child Welfare in Social Services*] 2.Edition. Ankara, 1992.

Kulca, Yusuf and Ümran Korkmazlar. "*Yoksulluk ve Sokak Çocukları.*" [*Poverty and Street Children*] Yoksulluk Sempozyumunda Sunulan Bildiri: 31 May- 1 June 2003, İstanbul. İstanbul: Deniz Feneri Derneği Yayınları, (2003): 272-277.

Vocational Education Law. (1986). *T. C. Resmi Gazete*, 19139, 19 June 1986.

Nalkur, Priya. G. "*When Life is "Difficult": A Comparison of Street Children's and Non-Street Children's Priorities.*" *Vulnerable Children and Youth Studies: An International Interdisciplinary Journal for Research, Policy and Care* 4. 4 (2009): 324–332.

Njord, Levi, et al. "*Drug Use Among Street Children And Non—Street Children in The Philippines.*" *Asia-Pacific Journal of Public Health* 22. 2 (2010): 203-211.

Okumuş, Ejder. "*Sokak Çocukları'nın Sosyolojisi-Diyarbakır Örneği.*" [*Sociology of Street Children-Diyarbakır Case*] *Din bilimleri Akademik Araştırma Dergisi* 9. 4 (2009): 9-37.

Onur, Bekir. "*Çocuk, Tarih ve Toplum.*" [*Child, History and Society*] İmge Kitabevi: Ankara, 2007.

Orhan, Serdar. "*Sokak Çocuklarının Sosyal Rehabilitasyonu.*" [*Social Rehabilitation of Street Children*] Sakarya University. Social Sciences Institute, Master Thesis, Sakarya, 2003.

Ögel, Kültegin, Alper Aksoy ve Olcay Liman. "*Sokakta ve Depresyonda: Sokakta Yaşayan Çocuk ve Ergenlerde Depresyon Görülme Sıklığı.*" [*On the Street and*

Depressed: Depression Prevalence in Children and Adolescents Living on the Street] İstanbul: Yeniden Sağlık ve Eğitim Derneği, 2005.

Ögel, Kültegin. and Harika Yücel. "Sokakta Yaşayan Ergenler ve Sağlık Durumu." *[Adolescents Living on the Street and Health Situation]* İstanbul: Yeniden Sağlık ve Eğitim Derneği, 2005.

Öntaş, Özlem. "Çocuk Adalet Sistemi ve Çocuk Polis İlişkisi." *[Juvenile Justice System and Child-Police Relation]* Toplum ve Sosyal Hizmet Dergisi 19. 2 (2008): 21-37.

Özbay, Ferhunde. "Turkish Female Child Labor in Domestic Work: Past and Present." Bosphorus University Print. Office, 1999.

Öztürk, A. Burcu. "Kentteki Çocuk Yoksulluğu: Keçiören Örneği." *[Child Poverty in the City: Keçiören Case]* Unpublished Master Thesis, Hacettepe University Social Sciences Institute Social Work Department. Ankara, 2008.

Permien, Hana and Gabiriela Zink. "Daily Life on the Street and Delinquency". (translated by Hakan Hakeri). *Çocuklar ve Suç-Ceza*. Ankara: Seçkin Yayıncılık, (2005): 201-205.

Polat, Oğuz. "Sokak Çocukları Gönüllülerine." *[For the Volunteers of Street Children]* İstanbul: Özgün Ofset, 2002.

Rosenblatt, Fernanda Fosenca. "A Youth Justice Approach to the Street Children Phenomenon In Brazil: A Critical Review." *Youth Justice* 12. 3 (2015): 229–244.

Salim, Muammer. "Geçmişten Günümüze Türkiye’de Çocuk Koruma Politikaları ve Sosyal Hizmetler ve Çocuk Esirgeme Kurumu." *[Child Protection Policies and Social Services and Child Protection Agency from past to Present in Turkey]* Unpublished Master Thesis, Süleyman Demirel University Social Sciences Institute Public Administration Department. Isparta, 2011.

Secretaria de Direitos Humanos da Presidência da República- (SDH). "*Primeira Pesquisa Censitária Nacional Sobre Crianças e Adolescentes em Situação de Rua.*" Brasília: SDH, 2011. Available at: www.direitosdacrainca.org.br

Şirin, Mustafa Ruhi. "*Dersimiz Çocuk.*" [Our Lesson: Child] İstanbul: İz Yayıncılık, 2006.

Şişman, Yener. "*Sokakta Çalışan Çocukların Yaşam Koşulları ve Gelecek Beklentileri.*" [Living Conditions of Children Working on the Street and Their Expectations] Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi 2. 2006: 251-276.

Tan, Mine. "*Çağlar Boyu Çocukluk.*" [Childhood Through Ages] Ankara Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Fakültesi Dergisi 23. 2 (1989): 71-88.

TGNA, Investigation Committee Report "*Çocukları Sokağa Düşüren Nedenlerle Sokak Çocuklarının Sorunlarının Araştırılarak Alınması Gereken Tedbirlerin Önlemlerin Belirlenmesi*" [Investigation of Reasons Pushing Children to the Street and Problems of Street Children, Measures to be Taken], 2005.

Tor, Hacer. "*Ankara Sokaklarında Çalışan Çocukların Çalışma Hayatına Katılma Nedenleri ve Karşılaştıkları Risklere İlişkin Görüşleri.*" [Reasons for Children's Working on the Streets of Ankara and Their Opinion on the Risks They Face] Suça Sürüklenen ve Mağdur Çocuklar Uluslararası Sempozyumunda Sunulan Bildiri: 27-28 May 2010, Diyarbakır, 2010

Turkish Statistical Institute (TurkSTAT). "*Çocuk İşgücü Anketi Sonuçları.*" [Results of the Child Labour Survey] 2012.

<http://www.tuik.gov.tr/PreHaberBultenleri.do?id=13659>.

Tunç, Güven. "*Sokaklar ve Çocukları.*" [Streets and Their Children] Birikim Dergisi 116. (1998): 80-85

Türkdogan, Orhan. "*Türk Toplumunda Yoksulluk Kültürü.*" [Poverty Culture in the Turkish Society] Yoksulluk Sempozyumunda Sunulan Bildiri: 31 May- 1 June 2003, İstanbul. İstanbul: Deniz Feneri Derneği Yayınları, (2003): 104-109.

Türkmen, Münevver, et al. "*A Descriptive Study on Street Children Living in A Southern City of Turkey.*" Turkish Journal of Paediatrics 46. 2 (2004): 131-136.

Uluğtekin, Sevda. "*Sokak Çocukları Eğiticilerin Eğitimi Programı.*" [Training of Trainers of Street Children] Ankara: Bizim Büro Basımevi, 1997.

International Labour Organization (ILO) and State Statistics Institute (DİE). "*Türkiye'de Çalışan Çocuklar.*" [Children Working in Turkey] Ankara: DİE Matbaası, 1999.

Public Health Law. (1930). *T. C. Resmi Gazete*, 1593, 24 April 1930.

UNICEF. "*Syrian Children in Turkey.*" 2015.

https://www.unicefturk.org/suriye/Suriyeli_Cocuklar_UNICEF_Bilgi_Dokumani10_0_9_2015%201835-TR.pdf

UNICEF. "*Exploitation of Working Children and Street Children.*" 1986.

Yavuzer, Haluk. "*Çocuk ve Suç.*" [Child and Delinquency] İstanbul: Remzi Kitabevi, 2006.

Yeşil, Mehmet Bülent. "*Sokakta Çalışan Çocukların Çalışma Şartları: Malatya Örneği.*" [Working Conditions of Children Working on the Street: Malatya Case] Unpublished Master Thesis, İnönü University Social Sciences Institute, Malatya, 2009.

Yetim, Nalan, and Mustafa Çağlayandereli. "*Toplumsal Algı Boyutuyla Sokakta Çalışan Çocuklar: Mersin Örneği.*" [Children Working on the Street and Social Perceptions] *Sosyoloji Dergisi* 3. 14 (2012): 31-55.

Zaman. "Mendil Satan Suriyeli Çocuklar Sürücülere Zor Anlar Yaşatıyor." [Syrian Refugee Children Selling Paper Handkerchief Giving a Hard Time to Drivers] 2015. http://www.zaman.com.tr/bolge-haberleri_mendil-satan-suriyeli-cocuklar-suruculere-zor-anlar-yasatiyor_2284196.html

ANNEXES

ANNEX-1. Child Quantitative Form

Interviewer:

Date of Interview:

Place of Interview:

DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS

1. Age.....
2. Sex Girl Boy
3. Number of siblings.....
4. What is your nationality? Turkey Other.....
5. Where were you born? Village District..... Province.....

HEALTH AND NUTRITION

6. How tall are you?.....
7. How much do you weigh?.....
8. Do you have any disease? Yes No
9. If yes, what is your disease?.....
10. Do you take any medication? Yes No
11. Is there a member in your family with chronic disease? Yes No
12. Do you have any disability condition? Yes No
13. If yes, what is it?

14. How many meals do you have a day?.....
15. How do you get food when working on the street?.....
16. What was the last meal you had, what did you eat?
 Morning.....

 Noon.....

 Evening.....

17. Do you smoke? () Yes () No
18. Do you use any other addictive substance other than cigarettes?
 () Yes () No
19. If yes, what is it?:

20. Are there people in your environment who drink, take drugs or volatile substances?
 () Yes () No
21. How many hours do you sleep a day?.....

EDUCATION

22. What is your education status?
 () Finished primary
 () Attending primary
 () Dropped out of primary
 () Finished junior secondary
 () Attending junior secondary
 () Dropped out of junior secondary
 () Finished high school
 () Attending high school
 () Dropped out of high school
 () Illiterate
23. If ever dropped out of any grade of school, what is the reason?.....

24. For those currently attending school:
 () Formal education () Open education

25. How was your academic achievement affected by living/working on the street?
 Positive Negative No effect
26. Do any of your school mates work/live on the street? Yes No
27. Do any of your neighbourhood friends work/live on the street? Yes No
28. Are there any hardships caused by attending school and working at the same time? Yes No
29. If yes, what are these?.....

FAMILY DATA

30. Family structure:
 Nuclear family Extended family Broken family
31. How many people live in your household?.....
32. Which of the following describes your situation about mother and father?
 Mother and father living together
 Mother and father divorced, living separate
 Mother and father married, but living separate
 Both are dead
 Mother dead
 Father dead
33. Do your mother and father have civil marriage?
 Yes No I don't know
34. Does your father have a second spouse?
 Yes No
35. Does your father use violence on your mother? Yes No
36. Does your father use violence on you or your siblings? Yes No

HOUSING AND NEIGHBOURHOOD INFORMATION

37. Type of housing inhabited:
 Slum house
 Flat
 Janitor flat in an apartment building
 Building in construction
 Other.....
38. Number of rooms in the housing (including living room)?.....

39. Do your parents and children have separate bedrooms?
 Yes No
40. Which neighbourhood do you live in?.....

WORKING AND INCOME

41. Are there disabled individuals in your family who cannot work? Yes No
42. What is the average monthly income of your family?.....
43. Which family members work?
 Mother
 Father
 Grandfather-
 Grandmother
 Sibling/siblings (If more than one sibling works, how many!.....)
 Other relatives
44. Other than the income generated by work, are there other types of income earned by the family?
 Yes No
45. Since what age have you been working?.....
46. How many hours do you work a day?.....
47. What type of work are you doing currently?
 Selling simit
 Begging
 Wiping car glasses
 Selling roses
 Shoe-shining
 Selling water
 Waste collection
 Selling paper handkerchief
 Weigher
 Other.....
48. What types of work have you so far done on the street?
 Selling simit
 Begging
 Wiping car glasses
 Selling roses

- Shoe-shining
 - Selling water
 - Waste collection
 - Selling paper handkerchief
 - Weigher
 - Other.....
49. How would you define your family's economic situation?
- Very poor or (very bad)
 - Poor (Bad)
 - Middle income (intermediate)
 - High Income (good)
 - Very high income (very good)

QUESTIONS ON MIGRATION

50. Migration Experience

	Migrated	Born in Ankara	How long living in Ankara?	Reason for migrating?
Mother				
Father				
Child				

LIFE AND RISKS ON THE STREET

51. Do you usually work in a place close to your home? Yes No
52. How many hours do you stay on the street a day?.....
53. Have you ever spent the night on the street? Yes No
54. If yes, why?
55. If yes, how many times.....
56. What time do you get back home?.....
57. How do you get back home?
- On foot
 - Public transport
 - Hitch-hiking
 - Clandestine passenger on public transport
 - By taxi

58. Have you ever sustained physical violence while working on the street? ()
 Yes () No
59. If yes, who did it?
60. Have you ever been taken to police station when working on the street?
 () Yes () No
61. If yes, how many times?.....
62. Have you ever been arrested? () Yes () No
63. If yes, how many times?.....
64. Ave you ever been prosecuted?() Yes () No
65. If yes, how many times and on what matter?.....
66. What do you think the risks of working/living on the street are?

67. What do you think the advantages of working/living on the street?.....
68. When in trouble, from whom do you ask for help?.....
 () from friends
 () from the family
 () from the police/municipal police
 () other people on the street
 () Other.....
69. Would you like to be assisted by someone when working on the street?
 () Yes () No
70. If yes, what kind of assistance would you like to receive and from whom?.....
71. Are there people who treat you badly when working on the street?
 () Yes () No
72. If yes, what kind of treatments?.....
73. What do you do in such cases?.....
74. Do you ever run the risk of accident when working? () Yes () No
75. Have you ever been injured when working on the street? () Yes () No
76. How do you protect yourself from excessive heat or cold?.....
77. What kind of change in your life would make you give up working/living on the street?.....

ANNEX-2. Form for In-Depth Interview with Families

Interviewer:

Date:

Place:

FAMILY MEMBERS TABLE

Name Surname	Age	Education Situation	Profession (For Adults)	Working Situation (For Adults)
1.				
2.				
3.				
4.				
5.				
6.				
7.				
8.				
9.				
10.				

FAMILY'S MIGRATION HISTORY

1. Have you ever lived in another city or other cities before settling in Ankara? If yes, how long?
2. What are the reasons that you came to Ankara? Can you talk about reasons that compelled you to migrate?
3. Have you lost any family member?
4. Is there a family member in military service or prison?

HOUSING INFORMATION

5. What neighbourhood is your housing located in? Can you briefly tell us your neighbourhood? Why did you prefer to live there? Who are the people living in your neighbourhood? Is your neighbourhood close to your work place?

6. How big is your housing? Do you have any infrastructural problems? (Toilet, bathroom, sewerage)

7. Can you talk about the internal structure of your housing? (Number of rooms, whether there is a separate bedroom for parents, how many people stay in each bedroom, do children have their own rooms?)

HOW DID THE CHILD GET INTO THE STREET

8. Who works/work in the family?

9. How many children in the family work?

10. How long has your child been working on the street?

11. How long have your children been working on the street, what are the main reasons that they started to work on the street?

12. Do you think that your children face risks when working on the street? What kinds of risks?

13. What types of changes in the family would remove the need for your child's working on the street?

DELINQUENCY AND SUBSTANCE USE IN THE FAMILY

14. Are there any members in your family who have ever committed a crime and been punished for this reason or ever been imprisoned? Can you tell us why?

15. What do you think the crime means, what acts would amount to a crime for the child working on the street?

16. How would you feel, react if your child committed a crime? (Theft, pick-pocketing, extortion, bodily injury, murder etc.)

17. Is there a member in your family using any substance? How long?

18. How would you feel, react if you found out that your child used a substance?

UNEMPLOYMENT

19. At what age should a person start to contribute to the family budget and work outside?
20. Have you ever worked at a permanent job with a fixed income?
21. How many members of your family above 18 years old are unemployed, how long?
22. How many members of your family below 18 years old but at a working age are unemployed, how long?
23. Why do you think members of your family are unemployed?
24. If you had a regular income, would you still want your children to work on the street?

FOR SYRIAN FAMILIES

25. When did you arrive at Turkey?
26. Why did you leave Syria?
27. Which border gate did you enter Turkey from, where else in Turkey have you lived before coming here?
28. Have you stayed at a camp?
29. Are there any members of the family left behind?
30. Do you work?
31. When in Syria, what were the jobs done by those in charge of earning the livelihood?
32. What is your opinion of sending children to work on the street?

ANNEX-3. Form for Focus Group Meeting With Non-Governmental Organizations

Interviewer:

Date:

Place:

QUESTIONS ON STREET WORK

1. How do you think people perceive the issue of children sent to work/beg on the streets of Ankara?
2. What is your assessment of the issue?
3. How do you view the presence of Syrian children on the street?
4. What do you think the main reasons for sending children to work on the street are? What are your assessments? (Family, social background, political background, education system)

CHILDREN'S PROBLEMS AND EXPERIENCES

5. What are the similarities and differences between the two groups (Turkish and Syrian children) in terms of staying on the street, risks faced on the street, needs and problems?
6. Do you have direct contact with children and their families? Have you ever encountered interesting cases? Can you share these cases?
7. How long have you been working on this issue? What actions are taken and where? Have you ever had interesting cases?
8. Have you observed any change in the profile of the street children and in the causes of the problem? Do you think any progress has been achieved for the solution of the problem? If not, what do you think is the reason?

SERVICE AND NEEDS

9. What kinds of risks do you think children working on the street face? (Physical, development risks, biological...)
10. Do you think children working on the street need protection? What should be the measures, can they be implemented, what are the barriers to implementation?
11. What measures need to be taken to move these children back from the street into home and school?
12. What actions are taken by the municipalities/police about children sent to work and beg on the street? What actions do you take in particular in your capacity as the police/municipal police? Do you think these actions are effective? If not, what are the shortcomings?
13. What roles and responsibilities do you think the police and municipal police can assume in this field? (Policy making, advocacy, direct response etc.)
14. When working with these children, do you ever have disputes, rows and other similar physical contacts?
15. Do you have communication/language problems when working with the children and their families? How do you solve problems? What sorts of solutions should be devised?
16. Do you ever feel helpless? Why? Can you give any example? What needs to be done by institutions to solve the problem?

ANNEX-4. Form for Focus Group Meeting With Law Enforcement Officers

Interviewer:

Date:

Place:

QUESTIONS ON STREET WORK

1. How do you think people perceive the issue of children sent to work/beg on the streets of Ankara?
2. What is your assessment of the issue?

3. How do you view the presence of Syrian children on the street?
4. What do you think the main reasons for sending children to work on the street are? What are your assessments? (Family, social background, political background, education system)

CHILDREN'S PROBLEMS AND EXPERIENCES

5. What are the similarities and differences between the two groups (Turkish and Syrian children) in terms of staying on the street, risks faced on the street, needs and problems?
6. Do you have direct contact with children and their families? Have you ever encountered interesting cases? Can you share these cases?
7. How long have you been working on this issue? What actions are taken and where? Have you ever had interesting cases?
8. Have you observed any change in the profile of the street children and in the causes of the problem? Do you think any progress has been achieved for the solution of the problem? If not, what do you think is the reason?

SERVICE AND NEEDS

9. What kinds of risks do you think children working on the street face? (Physical, development risks, biological...)
10. Do you think children working on the street need protection? What should be the measures, can they be implemented, what are the barriers to implementation?
11. What measures need to be taken to move these children back from the street into home and school?
12. What actions are taken by the municipalities/police about children sent to work and beg on the street? What actions do you take in particular in your capacity as the police/municipal police? Do you think these actions are effective? If not, what are the shortcomings?
13. What roles and responsibilities do you think the police and municipal police can assume in this field? (Policy making, advocacy, direct response etc.)

14. When working with these children, do you ever have disputes, rows and other similar physical contacts?

15. Do you have communication/language problems when working with the children and their families? How do you solve problems? What sorts of solutions should be devised?

16. Do you ever feel helpless? Why? Can you give any example? What needs to be done by institutions to solve the problem?

Annex-5. Directives for In-Depth Interview with Children Working on the Street

CHILD DATA

1. Age.....
2. Sex
3. Number of siblings.....
4. Education status.....
5. Work done.....
6. Nationality
7. Height... weight...
8. Place of birth.....
9. Have you ever migrated?

() Yes () No

10. If yes, from where.....

WORKING SITUATION

11. Do you work?
12. What types of works have you so far done on the street, what are you doing now?
13. How many hours do you work a day in average?
14. Can you tell me how you spend a day working on the street? What time do you leave home and come back? How do you travel?
15. Where do you usually work, is it close to your home?
16. Since what age have you been working?
17. Who else in your family works other than you?
18. Have you ever been forced to work? Why do you work?

19. Are any of your class mates or neighbourhood friends working?

20. Does it affect your school?

RISKS

21. In your opinion, what are the hardships of working on the street?

22. While working on the street, are there things that frighten you, what do you do in such cases?

23. Who helps you in such cases?

24. Have you ever been to a police station? Ever been arrested? Can you tell me why?

25. Have you ever been prosecuted, have you ever been to a court?

26. What kind of an assistance would you like to receive about conditions you face on the street and frighten you?

27. Have you ever been subject to physical violence?

28. Are you happy?

HEALTH SITUATION

29. How many hours do you sleep a day?

30. Where do you live?

31. How did you spend a normal day in your home country?

32. Do you have any health problem?

33. How many meals do you have a day?

34. When was the last time you ate something, what did you eat?

35. Do you take any medication?

36. Do you use any addictive substance?

37. Is there someone around you smoking, drinking or using drugs?



International
Labour
Organization

ILO Office for Turkey

Ferit Recai Ertuğrul Caddesi No. 4

Oran 06450 Ankara

Phone: (312) 491 98 90

Fax: (312) 491 99 45

E-mail: ankara@ilo.org

www.ilo.org/ankara