

**A UW-RIVER FALLS, UW-EXTENSION, AND CENTER FOR DAIRY
PROFITABILITY REPORT**

**Producer Perceptions: Diverse Workforce Acceptance on
Wisconsin Dairy Farms and Farming Communities
- Outagamie County –**

By

Nathan Wilber¹, Gregg Hadley² and Zen Miller³



¹ Nathan Wilber is a UW-River Falls Agribusiness Management student and a recipient of a 2005 UW-River Falls Research, Scholarly and Creative Activity (RSCA) Grant. He is also an employee of the UW-River Falls Survey Research Center. This research was conducted in association with his RSCA award.

² Gregg Hadley is an Assistant Professor and Farm Management Specialist with the UW-River Falls Department of Agricultural Economics, UW-Extension, and Center for Dairy Profitability.

³ Zen Miller is an Associate Professor with UW-Extension and serves as the Dairy and Livestock Extension Agent for Outagamie County.

Section I. Introduction

Agricultural workforce diversity acceptance in Wisconsin is an important issue. In the 2002 Current Population Survey, an estimated forty two percent of the U.S. agricultural labor force classified themselves as “Hispanic,” roughly 6 percent classified themselves as “Black and Other Non-Hispanic,” and the remaining 52 percent classified themselves as “White.” Almost thirty-four percent of the agricultural laborers surveyed were foreign-born (Economic Research Service, 2005). Many Wisconsin dairy farms employ immigrant laborers.⁴ In an unofficial December 2002 survey of University of Wisconsin-Extension agricultural agents, there were at least 417 dairy farms in forty one counties that employed Hispanic labor (Duley, 2005). The number of Wisconsin farms that employ a culturally diverse workforce is likely to increase. One researcher indicated that Wisconsin is a popular location for undocumented immigrants to find work. This is due in part to poor working conditions in the traditional migration regions like California (Valentine, 2005). Roughly fifty-three percent of 53 undocumented workers interviewed by Valentine indicated that they immigrated to the U.S. to ultimately find employment in Wisconsin (2005). Because the Wisconsin agricultural workforce is likely to become more diverse, it is important for farm managers, their employees and their communities to understand diverse workforce acceptance issues.

This report describes the results of a case study of eleven Outagamie County dairy producers who employ immigrant laborers. There were three goals associated with this research. The first goal was to determine the level of diverse workforce acceptance on Outagamie County dairy farms and in Outagamie County dairy farming communities.

⁴ In this report, the term “immigrant laborer” refers to employees who have permanently moved to the United States and to those who have temporarily moved to the United States to seek employment.

Understanding acceptance permits the diagnosis of problems between employer and employees, between employees, and between the employees (and indirectly, the employer) and the community in which the dairy farm is located. Having a better understanding of immigrant labor acceptance allows the achievement of the second research goal, identifying potential program types – such as producer, employee and/or community education programs – to help increase the acceptance level. Third, this case study serves as a pilot for a larger proposed diverse workforce acceptance study of several select Wisconsin counties.

II. Methods

In August 2005 interviews were conducted in Outagamie County with eleven dairy farm managers who employ immigrant laborers. The producers were chosen by Zen Miller, UW-Extension Dairy and Livestock Agent for Outagamie County, based on his knowledge of these dairy producers employing immigrant labor, their availability and willingness to participate. The original project goal was to interview two types of managers; those who hire immigrant labor and those who do not. In Outagamie County, however, Miller indicated that farms with an appreciable labor force utilized at least some immigrant labor.

Questions were asked using a prepared document which was developed with the assistance of Zen Miller and the UW-River Falls Survey Research Center. The producers were asked questions concerning (among others) farm size, production performance, wages and benefits offered, hours worked, communication issues, employee interrelationships and community relationships. The interview form can be seen in Appendix 1. Each question was asked on every interview. Nevertheless, using the more

flexible case study approach, the interviewers were allowed to ask additional questions so that they may pursue additional points of interest concerning diverse workforce acceptance if an appropriate opportunity presented itself (Yin, 2005).

The farm manager interview responses were placed in a diversity acceptance framework. The diversity acceptance framework used in this study was the Diversity Acceptance Continuum described by Duster (1997). This continuum ranges from intolerance to tolerance to acceptance to appreciation to mutual enhancement (Table 1).

Table 1. Duster’s Diversity Acceptance Continuum Framework

Diversity Acceptance Continuum Stage	Stage Characteristics
Intolerance	Party A tries to have Party B removed from society because of Party B’s background. Examples of removal attempts may include (among others) inflicting: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • verbal harassment; • fear; • bodily injury or harm; and, • economic or social injustice.
Tolerance	Party A does not necessarily accept Party B’s differences, but Party A does nothing and will do nothing to have Party B removed from society.
Acceptance	Party A accepts that Party B’s differences are real and will not change and need not change. Social interaction occurs.
Appreciation	Party A recognizes, enjoys and appreciates aspects of Party’s B diverse culture. This may include (among others) enjoying Party B’s cuisine, music, etc.
Mutual Enhancement	Party A and Party B recognize the benefits of each other’s cultures and begins to integrate them into each other’s culture.

III. Results

The following subsections contain the diverse workforce acceptance case study results for the eleven Outagamie County producers interviewed. All farmers interviewed

employed both U.S. national and immigrant employees. Also, ten of the eleven farm managers indicated that their immigrant employees were originally from Mexico. The other manager chose not to disclose his employees' nationalities.

III-a. Farm Demographic and Production Information Results

The first part of the interview concerned farm demographic information (Table 2). The average number of acres operated by the Outagamie County dairy producers was approximately 1,420 acres. Of these acres, 428 were owned by the producer and 989 acres were rented. There was an average milking and dry cow herd size of 769 cows. There was an average youngstock inventory of 222 heifers and 60 calves.

Table 2. Farm Demographic Information

	Average	Standard Deviation
Acres Owned	428	260
Acres Rented	989	639
Number of Milking and Dry Cows	769	577
Number of Heifers	222	104
Number of Calves	60	53

When asked questions regarding 2004 milk production per cow and milk quality estimates, 73 percent reported that their average milk per cow was over 24,000 pounds a year (Table 3). Of the eleven producers, seven estimated that their average somatic cell count was between 150,000 and 250,000.

Table 3. Milk Production and Milk Quality Frequency Distributions

Estimated Average Milk Production Per Cow Per Year	Number Responding	Estimated Average Somatic Cell Count	Number Responding
0 to 18,000 pounds	0	Less than 150,000	0
18,001 to 21,000 pounds	1	150,001 to 250,000	7
21,001 to 24,000 pounds	2	250,001 to 350,000	3
24,001 or more pounds	8	350,001 or more	1

III-b. Results for Average Wages, Hours Worked, and Benefits Received

The differences between U.S. national and immigrant employees' hourly pay, hours worked per week, and benefits received were compared. Table 4 shows how trained immigrant and U.S. national employees' hourly pay rate and hours worked per week compares.

Table 4. Average Pay and Average Hours Worked for U.S and Immigrant Employees

Average Pay Range (per hour)	Number Responding		Average Hours Worked Range (per week)	Number Responding	
	Immigrant Employee	U.S. Employee		Immigrant Employee	U.S. Employee
\$4.25 to 8.24	1	0	35 to 40	0	2
\$8.25 to 12.24	9	5	41 to 55	6	4
\$12.25 to 16.24	1	4	56 to 60	3	3
\$16.25 or more	0	1	61 or more	2	1

The most common wage range for immigrant employees was \$8.25 to \$12.24 per hour. The most common pay range for U.S. employees was also \$8.25 to 12.24, but there were five farms paying U.S. employees more than \$12.25 per hour. Only one farm paid their immigrant employees more than \$12.25 per hour. It should be noted however, that most farm managers indicated that their U.S. employees generally held positions with at least some management responsibility. No farms indicated that they had immigrant employees who held management responsibilities.

The pay range for immigrant employees of the eleven Outagamie County farms does seem comparable to what farm employees working with livestock get paid in the Great Lakes Region.⁵ According to the National Agricultural Statistics Service (NASS-

⁵ The Great Lakes Region is the name for the USDA region consisting of Wisconsin, Michigan and Minnesota.

USDA) Farm Labor survey conducted from July 10 to July 16, 2005 – farm workers employed in primarily livestock-oriented positions earned on average \$9.52 per hour in the Great Lakes Region (National Agriculture Statistics Service, Agricultural Statistics Board, 2005). In comparison to another dairy state’s immigrant employees, the hourly wage range of \$8.25 to \$12.24 per hour that the Outagamie County immigrant employees receive exceeds the average wage rate found by researchers in New York. Grusenmeyer and Maloney determined that the average wage for trained immigrant employees on 102 New York dairies was \$7.51 (2005). The previously mentioned NASS-USDA Farm Labor survey indicated that the average wage paid for livestock employees in the Northeast 1 Region, which includes New York, was \$9.55 per hour (2005).

The most common range for hours worked by immigrant employees was between 41 and 55 hours. It was also the most common range for U.S. employees, but there was a greater dispersion of answers for U.S. employees. Once again, based upon further questioning by the interviewers, it was discovered that the management responsibilities of the U.S. employees was at least partly responsible for any difference in hours worked

Table 5. A Comparison of Benefits Received

Benefit	Number of Responses	
	Immigrant Employees	U.S. National Employee
Housing	2	1
Transportation	0	2
Health Insurance	9	8
Meat	1	1
Milk	1	2
One Week of Paid Vacation	6	3
Two or More Weeks of Paid Vacation	2	3
Other	1	3

between immigrant and U.S. employees. Furthermore, many of the farm managers indicated that the immigrant employees seemed more willing than the U.S. employees to work additional hours when needed.

With the exception of housing and transportation, all farms offered their immigrant and U.S. employees the same benefits (Table 5). The two farms who offered their U.S. employees transportation did so because the U.S. employees held positions with management responsibility. Eighty percent of the farms offered some form of health insurance to their employees. Even though most of the farms offered health insurance, the majority of the employees did not use the plan. The farm managers indicated that most of the U.S. national employees did not need health insurance because they were covered by a spouse's plan. It is unknown why the majority of immigrant employees declined health insurance. The majority of the producers (70%) offered paid vacation. The amount of vacation time varied on how long the employee had been working for them; the maximum usually being two weeks. Some producers also offered housing, milk, meat, milk quality incentives and 401K plans as additional benefits.

In summary, there were some differences in hours worked and wages paid between U.S. and immigrant employees on the Outagamie Bounty dairy farms studied. Nevertheless, when one considers that

- these difference can be explained at least in part to the differences in management-oriented responsibility between U.S. and immigrant employees,
- the greater willingness of the immigrant employees to work additional hours when needed,

- the immigrant employee wage range compares favorably to the average wage offered to livestock employees in the Great Lakes Region,
- and, with the exception of housing and transportation benefits, there was little difference in benefits offered to immigrant and U.S. employees

it appears that these Outagamie County farm managers are at least in the “*acceptance*” stage of the diversity acceptance continuum, as there didn’t appear to be an appreciable difference in compensation packages between U.S. and immigrant employees.

There does seem to be at least two areas for improvement with regard to immigrant employee compensation issues. First, no farm indicated that they had immigrant employees with management responsibility. This may indicate the need for programs aimed at increasing

- the knowledge/skill level of interested immigrant employees and/or programs designed,
- and the employer’s confidence level in those immigrant employees so that the immigrant employees can achieve higher paying positions with more management responsibility.

Second, educational programs designed to increase the immigrant employee’s understanding of health insurance may help immigrant employees make more informed decisions regarding their acceptance or denial of health insurance benefits.

III-c. Results for Communication-Related Issues

When employing immigrant laborers, a language barrier can be the largest obstacle to overcome. The eleven farmers were asked how they communicated with their employees. Ten of the eleven farmers said their employees spoke Spanish as their first

language. Only one of the eleven farmers spoke Spanish fluently (Table 6). For the ten who didn't speak Spanish well, most indicated that their immigrant employees knew enough English for communication to take place. The immigrant employees who could speak and understand English well were those who have lived in the U.S. for several years.

For immigrant employees with poor English language skills, communication between manager and employee was usually handled by having a bilingual immigrant employee do the translating and/or interpreting. In situations where this was not possible, communication was done with "point and show" demonstrations. When asked if any of the producers were making an effort to learn the language, three of the eleven indicated they were making an attempt to do so by either studying books, CDs or DVDs or from their immigrant workers.

Table 6 Language Adoption between the Farm Managers and Immigrant Employees

Language Adoption Effort	Number of Responses
No effort is being made to learn each other's language	1
Only the manager is making an effort to learn Spanish	0
Spanish-only speaking employees are making an effort to learn how to speak English to communicate with the manager	3
Both the manager and the Spanish-only speaking employees are making an effort to learn each other's language	3

While only a few farm managers were making an effort to learn Spanish, there was a difference in language adoption among the eleven farms' U.S. national employees and the immigrant employees (Table 7). Six farm managers indicated that their U.S.

employees were learning Spanish to speak with their Spanish speaking colleagues, and six farm managers indicated that their Spanish-only speaking employees were making an effort to learn English to speak with their English speaking colleagues .

Table 7 Language Adoption between U.S. National Employees and Immigrant Employees

Language Adoption Effort	Number of Responses
No effort is being made to learn each other’s language	2
English-only speaking employees are making an effort to learn Spanish	6
Spanish-only speaking employees are making an effort to learn how to speak English	6

Overall, there appears to be little effort by the majority of the managers interviewed to learn Spanish. This may indicate that the managers are in the “*tolerance*” stage of the diversity acceptance continuum with regard to language (Table 1). By not learning Spanish, the employer is forced to rely on bilingual employees, translators and/or interpreters, and “point and show” techniques. Unfortunately, these techniques used to communicate to non-English speaking employees may not be as effective as having the manager learn Spanish. A reliance on bilingual employees assumes that the bilingual employee fully understands the message you are asking him or her to convey and that the employee will convey the intended message. Translators and interpreters can be very effective, especially at employee meetings or when developing employee handbooks. Unfortunately, translators and interpreters generally cannot be at a single farm all the time. “Point and show” techniques give the employer and employee little opportunity to clarify and confirm that the intended message is being adequately understood. It also doesn’t allow the manager to inform the employee about why things

need to be done in the manner described. Thus, the lack of farm managers with Spanish language skills offers the opportunity for less-than-optimal farm performance. If the need for Spanish language training can be impressed on the farm managers, there may be an increased demand for producer-oriented Spanish language programs.

While the number of managers learning Spanish language was disappointing, there did seem to be more Spanish language adoption by their U.S. employees. This may be due to the likelihood that the U.S. employees' management responsibilities have them working more closely with the immigrant employee than the farm manager. Regardless of the reason, it does show a migration up the diversity acceptance continuum, at least to the "*acceptance*" stage if not beyond (Table 1).

III-d. Results for the Adoption of Different Cultural Practices between Managers and Immigrant Employees

Sometimes, adopting different cultural perspectives can enhance one's personal wellbeing and professional life. The eleven case study managers did seem willing to adapt their business protocols because of their employees' cultural differences. Ten of the eleven producers said they allow their immigrant laborers to assist them in the hiring process on their farm (Table 8). For example, the milking crews on the majority of farms were very instrumental in recruiting, hiring and training new crew members. Some managers indicated that a departing worker would even stay on to make sure that their replacement was trained properly.

Allowing the immigrant employees to assist in the recruiting, hiring and training processes enhances workplace performance in at least three ways. First, it allows the immigrant employees to work with people that they are comfortable with. Second, the immigrant employees tend to closely monitor the new immigrant employee in order to

make sure that the new immigrant employee’s productivity is as good as their and their colleagues’ productivity (Valentine, 2005). Third, once this employee recruiting, hiring and training network develops, the employer of the immigrants soon finds that they have a very dependable supply of potential employees (Valentine, 2005).

Two other examples of changing business protocols to accommodate for the immigrant employees’ cultures were also mentioned. Three farms indicated that their training was modified to be conducted in the immigrant employee’s native language. Five farm managers adjusted their employee work schedule to accommodate their employees’ needs for religious and Mexican holiday observations.

Table 8. Examples of Adapting Different Cultural Perspectives in the Workplace

Adaptation Made in the Workplace	Number of Responses
Farm managers allowing the employees to be involved in the recruiting, hiring and training processes	10
Farm managers offering training in the employee’s native language	3
Farm managers adjusting the work schedule to accommodate the immigrant employee’s need for religious and Mexican holiday observations	5
Immigrant employees adjusting their perspective of time, deadlines, and schedules to the U.S. business perspective	5
Immigrant employees being more professional with regard to job applications	1
Immigrant employees utilizing banking services to facilitate payroll procedures	1

The Outagamie producers were not the only ones adopting different cultural perspectives. Many employees were adopting some of their employer’s cultural perspectives. Five farm managers stated that their immigrant employees had made a

considerable effort to adjust to the U.S. cultural perspective of time and its reliance on schedules. One farm manager noted that he has seen an improvement in the professionalism of job applications made by immigrant employees. A third noted that the immigrant employees on his farm were beginning to use U.S. banking services.

Fewer examples of cultural adoption were noted concerning the personal lives of the immigrant employees and their employers. Two farm managers indicated that they have incorporated their employee's native cuisines into their diet. Five employers noted that their immigrant employees enjoyed U.S. cuisine and U.S. television programming.

Overall, there does seem to be evidence of adopting each others' cultural perspectives for the mutual enhancement of the workplace. Both the farm managers and the immigrant employees seem to be in the "*mutual enhancement*" phase of the diversity acceptance continuum with regard to the workplace environment because the two parties are adjusting their perspectives for the betterment of the farm (Table 1). Programming efforts to further improve cultural adaptation should concentrate on helping the manager and the immigrant employee identify other areas of the business where cultural adaptation may enhance the workplace environment.

In terms of their personal life, some of the employers and their immigrant employees appear to be in the "*appreciation*" phase of the diversity acceptance continuum – as both parties appreciate each others cuisine and the immigrant employees enjoy U.S. television programming (Table 1). To help stimulate further migration up the diversity acceptance continuum concerning the personal adaptation of different cultural perspectives in the personal lives of the farm managers and immigrant employees,

programming efforts should emphasize expanding the farm managers’ and immigrant employees’ awareness and understanding of and the appreciation for each others’ culture.

III-e. Results for the Availability of Culturally Appropriate Products and Services to Immigrant Employees

In order to enhance the immigrant employees’ personal lives, immigrant employees need to have culturally appropriate services and products made available to them by the communities in which they live. If immigrants are able to go about their life with the same if not better services than they had in their native country, it will make their stay in the United States more pleasant and will probably make them more efficient in the workplace.

Table 9. How Farm Managers Rate the Culturally Appropriate Product and Service Availability to Immigrant Employees

Product and Service Type	Number of Responses
Ability to purchase native foods rated as being good to excellent	6
Ability to purchase native foods rated as some to moderate	5
Access to products or services other than food (good to excellent)	7
Access to products or services other than food (some to moderate)	3
Access to the availability of communication to the immigrants family in their native country	11

The first service addressed was the ability for the immigrants to purchase their native foods in their community (Table 9). Six of the eleven farm managers rated that their employees had “*good to excellent access*” to their native food products. The remaining five farm managers indicated that their employees had “*some to moderate access*” to their native foods.

The producers were also questioned about their immigrant employees' access to products and services other than food in their community. Sixty four percent said that local businesses are offering “*good to excellent access*” to culturally appropriate products or services other than food. All eleven managers indicated that the immigrant employees' availability to communicate with their families in their native country is very good.

Based on the eleven producers' perceptions, the businesses and communities of Outagamie County appear to have done at least a satisfactory job of providing culturally appropriate products and services to their immigrant employee population. This indicates that the communities are at least in the “*acceptance*” stage of the diversity continuum if not beyond (Table 1). Programming efforts in this area may include increasing the business managers' awareness of additional products and services desired by the immigrant employees.

III-f. Results for the Community Acceptance of Immigrant Labor

When the producers were asked to describe the community's acceptance of the immigrant employees, seven out of the eleven producers (63%) stated that their community appreciates the immigrant employees' contribution to the community (Table 10). Thus, these communities are apparently in the “*appreciation*” stage of the diversity acceptance continuum (Table 1). No producer indicated that the communities feel that the immigrant employees are unwelcome. Four managers indicated that their communities accept the immigrant employees' presence but ignore the fact that they are here. While the former would indicate that these communities are in the “*acceptance*” stage of the

diversity acceptance continuum, the latter indicates that these communities are at the lower “*tolerance*” stage of the diversity continuum (Table 1).

Table 10. How Producers Rated the Community Acceptance of Immigrant Employees

Rating	Number of Responses
Unwelcome	0
Mildly Irritated	0
Ignore their presence	4
Accept them	4
Appreciate what the immigrant employees contribute to the community	7

For the Outagamie communities that are in both the “*appreciation*” and “*tolerance*” stage of the diversity awareness continuum, diversity awareness programs would help both to continue their migration up the diversity acceptance continuum. Nevertheless, program offerings to each would take different forms. For the communities in the “*appreciation*” stage of the diversity acceptance continuum, diversity programs should aim at expanding the community’s already high level of Mexican cultural awareness and their awareness of the immigrant employees’ contributions to the community. This will allow the community members to have an even deeper knowledge of and greater appreciation for aspects of the immigrant population’s culture. For the communities in the “*tolerance*” stage of the diversity continuum, the diversity awareness programs need to be more basic. Such programs may concentrate on educating the community members on the cultural differences and why those differences may actually strengthen the community as a whole.

III-g. Results for Incidences of Prejudice

The producers were also asked to rank the amount and degree of immigrant employee reported prejudice expressed against them by the community (Table 11) and their U.S. employees (Table 12). Although prejudice of all forms is inappropriate, the farm managers were asked whether the immigrant employees had reported no prejudicial acts, “*moderate*” prejudicial acts, or “*severe*” prejudicial acts. For this case study, a “*moderate*” designation of prejudice referred to written or verbal prejudicial remarks. A “*severe*” designation referred to acts or threats of personal injury or property damage. Six managers indicated that their immigrant employees had reported no incidences of prejudice expressed by the community to them. Nevertheless, some managers indicated that they could not be sure whether the immigrant employees would report such incidences. Four producers said that their immigrant employees had experienced incidences of prejudice, but they said these incidences were “*moderate and infrequent.*” No farm manager knew of an instance of a prejudicial threat to cause injury or property damage.

Table 11. Prejudice Expressed by Community Members Towards Immigrant Employees

Degree of Prejudice	Number of Responses
No Acts of Prejudice Reported	6
Moderate and Infrequent	4
Moderate and Frequent	0
Severe and Infrequent	0
Severe and Frequent	0

Most of the managers indicated that their immigrant employees had not reported any incidences of prejudice expressed by the their U.S. employee colleagues. Two farm

managers reported that their had been “*moderate and infrequent*” incidences. There were no reports of expressions of prejudice that warranted the “*severe*” designation.

Table 12. Prejudice Expressed by U.S. Employees Towards Immigrant Employees

Degree of Prejudice	Number of Responses
No Acts of Prejudice Reported	8
Moderate and Infrequent	2
Moderate and Frequent	0
Severe and Infrequent	0
Severe and Frequent	0

As no amount of expressions of prejudice is appropriate, programs are always needed to combat prejudice. For the Outagamie dairy farming communities, basic cultural diversity awareness and sensitivity programs should help. Such programs would also be beneficial for the U.S. employees who have made insensitive remarks concerning the immigrant employees’ culture. Another type of program that may help combat prejudice in the workforce is to incorporate teambuilding exercises into the training programs of Outagamie County dairy farms.

IV. Summary

Overall, the Outagamie County dairy producers and its dairy farming communities appear to have a high degree of diversity acceptance. The employers seem to compensate their immigrant employees appropriately, and both the farm managers and the immigrant employees have adapted aspects of each others’ cultural perspectives to make the workplace a more productive environment. The dairy farming community, at least from the majority of the farm managers perspectives, appreciates what the immigrant employees contribute to the community. A summary of the results and program recommendations can be seen in Table 13.

Table 13. Summary of Results and Recommendations for Outagamie County

Diverse Workforce Acceptance Issue	Diversity Acceptance Continuum Stage	Program Recommendations
Wages	“Acceptance” or higher	NA
Benefits	“Acceptance” or higher	Programs aimed at increasing the immigrant employee’s understanding of health insurance
Upward Job Mobility	“Tolerance”	Programs aimed at increasing the management capability of the immigrant employees and the employer’s confidence in these employees
Language Adoption by the Farm Manager	“Tolerance”	Programs aimed at improving the employer’s Spanish language skills
Language Adoption by the Immigrant Employee	“Acceptance” or higher	Programs aimed at further improving the immigrant employee’s English language skills
Language Adoption by the U.S. Employee	“Acceptance” or higher	Programs aimed at further improving the U.S. employee’s Spanish language skills
Workplace Cultural Adaptation by the Farm Manager	“Mutual Enhancement”	Programs aimed at helping the manager identify other areas of the business where cultural adaptation may enhance the workplace environment
Workplace Cultural Adaptation by the Immigrant Employee	“Mutual Enhancement”	Programs aimed at helping the employee identify other areas of the business where cultural adaptation may enhance the workplace environment
Personal Cultural Adaptation by the Farm Manager	“Appreciation”	Programs aimed at further expanding the farm manager’s awareness and understanding of and the appreciation for the immigrant employees’ culture
Personal Cultural Adaptation by the Immigrant Employee	“Appreciation”	Programs aimed at further expanding the immigrant employee’s awareness and understanding of and the appreciation for U.S. culture
Culturally Appropriate Products and Services Availability	“Acceptance” or higher	Programs designed to make business managers aware of additional products and services desired by the immigrant employees
Community Acceptance of the Immigrant Employees	“Tolerance” to “Appreciation” depending on the particular community	* For communities in the “tolerance” stage, programs should concentrate on basic cultural diversity awareness issues * For communities in the appreciation stage, program should concentrate on expanding the community’s knowledge about the immigrant employees and their culture
Combating Prejudice	Any prejudice incident is a sign of “intolerance” on the part of the offending party	* For communities, programs should concentrate on basic cultural awareness and sensitivity training * For employees, programs should concentrate on basic cultural awareness, sensitivity training and team building exercises

References

Duley, Carl. October 2005. University of Wisconsin-Extension Agriculture Agent – Buffalo County. Personal Communication.

Duster, T. 1997. “The Stratification of Cultures as the Barrier to Democratic Pluralism,” in Robert Orrill’s, *Executive Editor, Education and Democracy: Re-imagining Liberal Learning in America*. pp. 273-277. (New York: College Entrance Examination Board).

Economic Research Service – United States Department of Agriculture. October 28, 2005. <http://www.ers.usda.gov/briefing/FarmLabor/Demographics/>.

Grusenmeyer, D. and T. Maloney. October 25, 2005. “How New York Dairies Pay Their Hispanic Workers.” *Hoard Dairyman*. Volume 150, No. 18. p. 698.

National Agriculture Statistics Service, Agricultural Statistics Board, United States Department of Agriculture. August 19, 2005. “Farm Labor.” Sp Sy 8 (8-05). p. 5.

Valentine, B.E. September 2005. “Uniting Two Cultures: Latino Immigrants in the Wisconsin Dairy Industry.” Working Paper 121. The Center for Comparative Immigration Studies. University of California, San Diego. pp. 41-43.

Yin, R.K. 1994. *Case Study Research Design and Methods. Second Edition*. Sage Publications. Thousand Oaks, California. 1994. p. 56.

Appendix 1

Interview Guide for the Case Study:

Producer Perceptions of Diverse Workforce Acceptance on Wisconsin

Dairy Farms and Farming Communities

- Outagamie County –

Section 1: Farm Demographics

- 1) How many acres do you operate? _____ Own _____ Rent
- 2) How many cows are on your farm?
Cows _____
Heifers _____
Calves _____
- 3) Estimated average milk production per cow per year?
 - a. 0-18,000
 - b. 18,001-21,000
 - c. 21,001-24,000
 - d. 24,001 +
- 4) What was your estimated average somatic cell count for the year in 2004?
 - a. less than 150,000
 - b. 150,001-250,000
 - c. 250,001-350,000
 - d. 350,001 +

**Please fill out section two if you employ ONLY U.S. citizens.
Please fill out section three if you employ immigrant labor.**

Section 2: If Only U.S. National Employees Are Hired

- 1) On average how many full-time employees do you employ on your dairy farm? _____
- 2) On average how many full-time employees do you have to replace each year? _____
- 3) What is the estimated pay range you pay for a trained full-time farm laborer?
 - a) \$4.25 to 8.24 per hour
 - b) \$8.25 to 12.24 per hour
 - c) \$12.25 to 16.24 per hour
 - d) \$16.25 or more per hour
- 4) What is the estimated average hours worked per week for a hired full-time farm employee?
 - a) 35 hours to 40
 - b) 41 to 55 hours
 - c) 56 hours to 60 hours
 - d) 60 hours or more
- 5) What benefits do you offer your hired full-time farm employee (Circle all that apply)
 - a) Housing
 - b) Transportation
 - c) Health Insurance
 - d) Meat
 - e) Milk
 - f) One week paid vacation
 - g) Two or more weeks vacation
 - h) Other _____
- 6) Have you employed immigrant labor in the past?
Yes _____ No _____ (If not, go to question 10)
- 7) If so, what was their citizenship? (Check all that apply)
Mexico _____ Europe _____

Central America _____ Africa _____
South America _____ Asia _____

8) Did you or someone on your management team speak the immigrant's native language?

Yes _____

No _____ (If not, how did you communicate with them?)

9) If you did employ immigrant labor why did you cease employing immigrant labor?

10) Would you hire immigrant labor in the future?

Yes _____ No _____

11) Why would you hire immigrant labor?

12) Why wouldn't you hire immigrant labor?

13) Have there been any large scale (value greater than \$ _____) accidents on your farm due to communication problems between you or your management team and your U.S. national employees in the past year?

Yes _____ No _____

If so, please explain. _____

b. If yes, in an average year how many accidents above this value occur?

Section 3: Complete only if you currently have Immigrant Employees on your payroll

- 1) How many hired full-time employees do you employ on your dairy farm? _____
- 2) How many hired full-time employees do you have to replace each year? _____
- 3) What is the estimated pay range you pay for a full-time trained U.S. national farm laborer?
 - a) \$4.25 to 8.24 per hour
 - b) \$8.25 to 12.24 per hour
 - c) \$12.25 to 16.24 per hour
 - d) \$16.25 or more per hour
- 4) What is the estimated pay range you pay for a full-time trained immigrant farm laborer?
 - a) \$4.25 to 8.24 per hour
 - b) \$8.25 to 12.24 per hour
 - c) \$12.25 to 16.24 per hour
 - d) \$16.25 or more per hour
- 5) What is the estimated average hours worked per week for a hired full-time U.S. national farm employee?
 - a) 35 hours to 40
 - b) 41 to 55 hours
 - c) 56 hours to 60 hours
 - c) 60 hours or more
- 6) What is the estimated average hours worked per week for a hired full-time immigrant farm employee?
 - a) 35 hours to 40
 - b) 41 to 55 hours
 - c) 56 hours to 60 hours
 - c) 60 hours or more
- 7) What benefits do you offer your hired full-time U.S. national farm employee? (Circle all that apply)
 - a) Housing
 - b) Transportation
 - c) Health Insurance
 - d) Meat
 - e) Milk
 - f) One week paid vacation
 - g) Two or more weeks vacation
 - h) Other _____
- 8) What benefits do you offer your hired full-time immigrant farm employee? (Circle all that apply)
 - a) Housing
 - b) Transportation
 - c) Health Insurance
 - d) Meat
 - e) Milk
 - f) One week paid vacation
 - g) Two or more weeks vacation
 - h) Other _____
- 9) What are your immigrant employees' citizenship? (Check all that apply)

Mexico _____	Europe _____
Central America _____	Africa _____
South America _____	Asia _____

10) Do you speak their native language?

Yes _____ No _____ (If yes, please skip 11 and go to 12)
If not, how do you communicate with them?

11) Are you and your employees making an effort to learn one another's native language? (Check all that apply)

_____ I'm learning _____ They are learning
_____ Both learning _____ No effort is being made by either

B. How are you learning each others language?

_____ Classes _____ Books, CDs, DVDs, etc.
_____ From one another Other (Explain) _____

12) Have you changed your business in any way to adapt to your immigrant employees? (Check all that apply)

_____ Allow their assistance in the hiring process
_____ Training program in their native language
_____ Accommodate their religious beliefs and cultural holidays
Other (Explain) _____

13) Have you adopted any of your immigrant employees' culture in your private life?

_____ Enjoy their native cuisines _____ Celebrate their holidays
_____ Learning their language Other (Explain) _____

14) Have your immigrant employees adapted their work life or habits to the U.S. business culture?

15) Have your immigrant employees adopted U.S. culture in their private life? (Check all that apply)

_____ Eating American food _____ Watching American TV
_____ Learning English Other (Explain) _____
_____ Celebrate American holidays

16) How would you rate the access for immigrant workers to purchase their native foods in your geographical area?

1. No access
2. Some access
3. Moderate access
4. Good access
5. Excellent access

17) To what degree have local businesses and community services offered access to products (other than food) and services based upon your immigrant employees cultural needs?

1. No access
2. Some access
3. Moderate access
4. Good access
5. Excellent access

18) Are the immigrant workers able to communicate with their family at home?

Yes _____ No _____

If not, what is preventing them? _____

19) Has there been any large scale (value greater than \$_____) accidents on your farm due to communication problems between you or your management team and your immigrant employees in the past year?

Yes _____ No _____

If so, please explain. _____

b. If yes, in an average year how many accidents above this value occur?

20) Which of the following best describes how the community has accepted the immigrant employees?

1. Unwelcome
2. Mildly irritated
3. Ignore their presence
4. Accept them
5. Appreciate what they contribute to the community

21) Are the immigrant workers able to communicate or get together with people of the same culture?

_____ Yes _____ No

If not, please explain why. _____

22) If you also have full-time U.S. national employees, are your employees making an effort to learn each other's language and culture? (Circle all that apply)

- a. No effort is being made by either
- b. U.S. based citizens are making an effort
- c. Immigrant workers are making an effort
- d. Only hire immigrant labor

- 23) What is the degree of prejudice expressed by the U.S. based employees towards the immigrant employees? (Moderate being verbal harassment and severe being threats of causing injury, property damage or actual physical injury)
1. None
 2. Moderate and infrequent
 3. Moderate and frequent
 4. Severe and infrequent
 5. Severe and frequent
- 24) What is the degree of prejudice expressed by the community? (Moderate being verbal harassment and severe being threats of causing injury, property damage or actual physical injury)
1. None
 2. Moderate and infrequent
 3. Moderate and frequent
 4. Severe and infrequent
 5. Severe and frequent