

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

**Producer Perceptions: Diverse Workforce Acceptance on  
Wisconsin Dairy Farms and Farming Communities  
- Shawano and Waupaca Counties –**

By

Nathan Wilber<sup>1</sup>, Gregg Hadley<sup>2</sup>, Greg Blonde<sup>3</sup> and Tom Anderson<sup>4</sup>



---

<sup>1</sup> 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.

<sup>2</sup> 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.

<sup>3</sup> Greg Blonde is a Professor with UW-Extension and serves as the Agriculture Agent for Waupaca County.

<sup>4</sup> Tom Anderson is an Associate Professor with UW-Extension and serves as the Dairy and Livestock Agent for Shawano County

## **Section I. Introduction**

Agricultural workforce diversity acceptance in Wisconsin is an important issue. In the 2002 Current Population Survey, an estimated 42 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.<sup>5</sup> In an unofficial December 2002 survey of University of Wisconsin-Extension agricultural agents, there were at least 417 dairy farms in 41 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 Wisconsin’s 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 a combined fourteen Shawano and Waupaca 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 the dairy farms and in dairy farming communities.

---

<sup>5</sup> 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 one component of a larger proposed diverse workforce acceptance study of several select Wisconsin counties.

## **II. Methods**

In January 2006, interviews were conducted in Shawano and Waupaca County with 14 dairy farm managers who employ immigrant laborers. The producers were chosen by Greg Blonde in Waupaca County and Tom Anderson in Shawano County based on their knowledge of these dairy producers employing immigrant labor, producer availability and producer 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 Shawano and Waupaca County, however, Blonde and Anderson indicated that farms with an appreciable labor force utilized at least some immigrant labor.

Questions were asked using a prepared document (Appendix 1) which was developed with the assistance of Zen Miller (UW-Extension Dairy and Livestock Agent – Outagamie County) 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. Each question was asked on every

interview. Nevertheless, using the more flexible case study approach, the interviewers were allowed to ask additional questions in order to 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**

<b>Diversity Acceptance Continuum Stage</b>	<b>Stage Characteristics</b>
<b>Intolerance</b>	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"> <li>• verbal harassment;</li> <li>• fear;</li> <li>• bodily injury or harm; and,</li> <li>• economic or social injustice.</li> </ul>
<b>Tolerance</b>	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.
<b>Acceptance</b>	Party A accepts that Party B’s differences are real and will not change and need not change. Social interaction occurs.
<b>Appreciation</b>	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.
<b>Mutual Enhancement</b>	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 14 Shawano and Waupaca County producers interviewed. All farmers interviewed employed both U.S. national and immigrant employees. All 14 farm managers indicated that they employed immigrant employees who were originally from Mexico. Four of the managers also said they have employees from Central America, and one manager had an immigrant European employee.

#### 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 Shawano and Waupaca County dairy producers was approximately 1,020 acres. Of these acres, 390 were owned by the producer and 630 acres were rented. There was an average milking and dry cow herd size of 590 cows. There was an average youngstock inventory of 90 heifers and 30 calves.

**Table 2. Farm Demographic Information**

	<b>Average</b>	<b>Range</b>	<b>Standard Deviation</b>
<b>Acres Owned</b>	390	40 - 800	224
<b>Acres Rented</b>	630	140 - 2500	610
<b>Number of Milking and Dry Cows</b>	590	200 - 1670	500
<b>Number of Heifers</b>	90	0 - 450	144
<b>Number of Calves</b>	30	0 - 160	44

When asked questions regarding 2004 milk production per cow and milk quality estimates, eighty-six percent reported that their average milk per cow was over 24,000

pounds a year (Table 3). Of the fourteen producers, twelve estimated that their average somatic cell count was below 250,000.

**Table 3. Milk Production and Milk Quality Frequency Distributions**

<b>Estimated Average Milk Production Per Cow Per Year</b>	<b>Number of Farms Responding</b>	<b>Estimated Average Somatic Cell Count</b>	<b>Number of Farms Responding</b>
<b>0 to 18,000 pounds</b>	0	<b>Less than 150,000</b>	4
<b>18,001 to 21,000 pounds</b>	0	<b>150,001 to 250,000</b>	8
<b>21,001 to 24,000 pounds</b>	2	<b>250,001 to 350,000</b>	1
<b>24,001 or more pounds</b>	12	<b>350,001 or more</b>	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 compared.

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

<b>Average Pay Range (per hour)</b>	<b>Number of Farms Responding</b>		<b>Average Hours Worked Range (per week)</b>	<b>Number of Farms Responding</b>	
	<b>Immigrant Employee</b>	<b>U.S. Employee</b>		<b>Immigrant Employee</b>	<b>U.S. Employee</b>
<b>\$4.25 to 8.24</b>	3	1	<b>35 to 40</b>	0	0
<b>\$8.25 to 12.24</b>	10	7	<b>41 to 55</b>	3	10
<b>\$12.25 to 16.24</b>	0	1	<b>56 to 60</b>	4	0
<b>\$16.25 or more</b>	0	0	<b>61 or more</b>	7	2

The most common wage range for immigrant employees was \$8.25 to \$12.24 per hour. There were three farms that paid \$4.25 to \$8.24. The three farms that did pay in that lower pay range did pay over \$8.00, however. In comparison with another Eastern

Wisconsin county, Outagamie County, only one Outagamie producer indicated that he paid his immigrant employees less than \$8.24 (Wilber, Hadley and Miller – 2005).

The most common pay range for U.S. employees was also \$8.25 to 12.24, and there was one farm paying U.S. 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 manager indicated that they had immigrant employees who held management responsibilities.

With the exception of the three lower paying farms, the pay range for immigrant employees of the 14 Shawano and Waupaca County farms does seem comparable to what farm employees working with livestock get paid in the Great Lakes Region.<sup>6</sup> According to the National Agricultural Statistics Service (NASS-USDA) Farm Labor survey conducted from July 10 to July 16, 2005 – Great Lakes Region farm workers employed in primarily livestock-oriented positions earned on average \$9.52 per hour (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 Shawano and Waupaca 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).

Many of the farm managers indicated that the immigrant employees seemed more willing than the U.S. employees to work additional hours when needed. The most

---

<sup>6</sup> The Great Lakes Region is the name for the USDA region consisting of Wisconsin, Michigan and Minnesota.

common range for hours worked by immigrant employees was between 61 hours or more. The most common range for U.S. employees was 41 to 55 hours.

**Table 5. A Comparison of Benefits Received**

<b>Benefit</b>	<b>Number of Responses</b>	
	<b>Immigrant Employees</b>	<b>U.S. National Employee</b>
<b>Housing</b>	5	0
<b>Transportation</b>	0	1
<b>Health Insurance</b>	4	5
<b>Meat</b>	2	1
<b>Milk</b>	0	0
<b>One Week of Paid Vacation</b>	3	4
<b>Two or More Weeks of Paid Vacation</b>	0	1
<b>Other</b>	6	3

Table 5 shows there are some differences between what benefits are offered to the two different groups of employees. The largest difference was that five of the fourteen producers offered their immigrant employees housing while no housing benefits were offered to the U.S. national employees. The one farm which offered their U.S. employee transportation did so because the U.S. employee held a position with management responsibility. The ‘other’ category difference was mainly due to the immigrant employees who were offered housing also received free utilities. The amount of vacation time varied on how long the employee had been working for a farm; the maximum usually being two weeks. Some producers also offered milk, meat, uniforms, lending and milk quality incentives as additional benefits.

In comparison to earlier research in Outagamie County – Shawano and Waupaca producers offered less in regards to health insurance, paid vacation and milk but offered more housing to the immigrant employees. The difference in the benefits offered by

Outagamie County producers may be caused by the fact that Outagamie County producers have to compete with more dairy farms that utilize immigrant employees. The difference may also be due to the proximity of the Outagamie County farms to larger cities, such as Appleton, where there is more competition for these employees from other businesses. The more competitive Outagamie County labor market may have also caused wage discrepancies in the higher wage brackets. Outagamie County had six farms where employees received more than \$12.25 per hour. In comparison, Shawano and Waupaca County had one farm where employees received more than \$12.25 per hour.

In summary, there were some differences in hours worked, wages paid and benefits offered between U.S. and immigrant employees on the Shawano and Waupaca County 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 on the majority of the Shawano and Waupaca County farms was equivalent to the average wage range offered to livestock employees in the Great Lakes Region; and,
- with the exception of housing benefits, there was little difference in benefits offered to immigrant and U.S. employees.

it appears that these Shawano and Waupaca 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 one area for improvement with regard to immigrant employee compensation issues. No farm indicated that they had immigrant employees with management responsibility. This may mean that management training programs for interested immigrant employees are needed.

### **III-c. Results for Communication-Related Issues**

When employing immigrant laborers, a language barrier can be the largest obstacle to overcome. The fourteen managers were asked how they communicated with their employees. All fourteen farmers said they have employees who spoke Spanish as their first language. No producer spoke Spanish fluently. Nine managers said that they knew enough Spanish or were in the process of learning to speak Spanish to effectively communicate with their immigrant employees about the milking process (Table 6). Most indicated that their immigrant employees knew enough English for communication to take place. The immigrant employees who could speak and understand English 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, nine of the fourteen producers indicated they were making an attempt to do so by either studying books, CDs or DVDs or through on the job communication with their immigrant workers.

**Table 6 Language Adoption between the Farm Managers and Immigrant Employees**

<b>Language Adoption Effort</b>	<b>Number of Responses</b>
<b>No effort is being made to learn each other's language</b>	1
<b>Only the manager is making an effort to learn Spanish</b>	0
<b>Spanish-only speaking employees are making an effort to learn how to speak English to communicate with the manager</b>	2
<b>Both the manager and the Spanish-only speaking employees are making an effort to learn each other's language</b>	9

While the majority of the farm managers were making an effort to learn Spanish, there was a difference in language adoption among the fourteen farms' U.S. national employees and the immigrant employees (Table 7). Five managers indicated that there English-only speaking colleagues were learning Spanish. Six managers stated that their Spanish-only speaking employees were making an effort to learn English.

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

<b>Language Adoption Effort</b>	<b>Number of Responses</b>
<b>No effort is being made to learn each other's language</b>	2
<b>English-only speaking employees are making an effort to learn Spanish to communicate with their Spanish-speaking colleagues</b>	5
<b>Spanish-only speaking employees are making an effort to learn how to speak English to communicate with their English speaking colleagues</b>	6

Overall, language adoption seems to be occurring on the Shawano and Waupaca County dairy farms. A majority of the managers were trying to learn Spanish, indicating that these farms are in the “*appreciation*” stage of the diversity acceptance continuum with regard to language (Table 1). Less than half of the farm managers indicated that their U.S. and immigrant employees were learning each others’ languages. On forty-three percent of the farms, English-only speaking employees were learning Spanish, and, on thirty-six percent of the farms, Spanish-only speaking employees were learning English. This indicates that the Shawano and Waupaca county dairy farm employees are at least in the “*acceptance*” stage of the diversity continuum with regard to language.

Despite this, due to overall language fluency, there is still a reliance on other methods of communicating with the immigrant employees. Using bilingual employees to translate assumes that the bilingual employee fully understands the message you are trying 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 fluent Spanish language skills and immigrant employees with fluent English language skills offers the opportunity for less-than-optimal farm performance. If the need for language training can be impressed on the farm managers, farm performance may be enhanced.

### **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, professional life, and farm performance. The fourteen case study managers did seem willing to adapt their business protocols because of their employees' cultural differences.

Sixty-four percent of the producers said they allow their immigrant laborers to assist them in the hiring process on their farm (Table 8). On a majority of the farms, the milking crews were very instrumental in recruiting, hiring and training new crew members. In many cases, departing employees assist in finding and training their replacement. In many cases, immigrant employees brought in their family members or extended family members to work for the farm.

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. Five farms indicated that their training was modified to be conducted in the immigrant employee's native language.

Only three farm managers adjusted their employee work schedule to accommodate their employees' needs for religious and Mexican holiday observations, but this was due in part to the fact that the majority of the immigrant employees managed their own work schedule.

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

<b>Adaptation Made in the Workplace</b>	<b>Number of Responses</b>
<b>Farm managers allowing the employees to be involved in the recruiting, hiring and training processes</b>	9
<b>Farm managers offering training in the employee's native language</b>	5
<b>Farm managers adjusting the work schedule to accommodate the immigrant employee's need for religious and Mexican holiday observations</b>	3
<b>Immigrant employees adjusting their perspective of time, deadlines, and schedules to the U.S. business perspective</b>	6
<b>Immigrant employees being more professional with regard to job applications</b>	1

The Shawano and Waupaca County producers were not the only ones adopting different cultural perspectives in the workplace. Many employees were adopting some of their employer's cultural perspectives. Six 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 the farm were beginning to accept women in the workforce.

Some cultural adoption also occurred in the managers' and employees' personal lives. Eight farm managers indicated that they have incorporated their employee's native cuisines into their diet. Nine 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**

<b>Product and Service Type</b>	<b>Number of Responses</b>
<b>Ability to purchase native foods rated as being good to excellent</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>Ability to purchase native foods rated as some to moderate</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Access to products or services other than food (good to excellent)</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>Access to products or services other than food (some to moderate)</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>Access to products or services other than food (none)</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>Access to the availability of communication to the immigrants family in their native country</b>	<b>13</b>

The first service addressed was the ability for the immigrants to purchase their native foods in their community (Table 9). Eleven of the fourteen farm managers rated that their employees had “*good to excellent access*” to their native food products. The remaining three 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 non-food products and services. Thirty-six percent said that local businesses are offering “*good to excellent access*” to culturally appropriate products or services other than food. All but one of the managers indicated that the immigrant employees' availability to communicate with their families in their native country is very good.

Based on the fourteen producers' perceptions, the businesses and communities of Shawano and Waupaca 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, sixty-four percent of the producers stated that their community accepts the immigrant employees' (Table 10). Thus, these communities are apparently in at least the “*acceptance*” stage of the diversity acceptance continuum (Table 1). No producer indicated that the communities feel that the immigrant employees are unwelcome. Nevertheless, no manager indicated that the community appreciates what the immigrant employees contribute to the community, which shows that the community is far from the “*mutual enhancement*” stage of the diversity acceptance continuum.

There were three managers that indicated their communities accept the immigrant employees' presence but ignore the fact that they are here. This indicates that these three

Shawano and Waupaca county communities are at the lower “*tolerance*” stage of the diversity continuum (Table 1).

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

<b>Rating</b>	<b>Number of Responses</b>
<b>Unwelcome</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Mildly Irritated</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>Ignore their presence</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Accept them</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>Appreciate what the immigrant employees contribute to the community</b>	<b>0</b>

For the Shawano and Waupaca communities that are in both the “*acceptance*” 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 “*acceptance*” stage of the diversity acceptance continuum, diversity programs should aim at expanding the community’s awareness of Mexican culture and 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. Nine 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. Five 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**

<b>Degree of Prejudice</b>	<b>Number of Responses</b>
<b>No Acts of Prejudice Reported</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>Moderate and Infrequent</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>Moderate and Frequent</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Severe and Infrequent</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Severe and Frequent</b>	<b>0</b>

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

managers reported that there 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**

<b>Degree of Prejudice</b>	<b>Number of Responses</b>
<b>No Acts of Prejudice Reported</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>Moderate and Infrequent</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Moderate and Frequent</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Severe and Infrequent</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Severe and Frequent</b>	<b>0</b>

As no amount of prejudice is appropriate, programs are always needed to combat prejudice. For the Shawano and Waupaca dairy farming communities, basic cultural diversity awareness and sensitivity programs could 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 Shawano and Waupaca County dairy farms.

**IV. Summary**

Overall, the Shawano and Waupaca County dairy producers and their dairy farming communities appear to have a high degree of diversity acceptance. The employers, 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 manager’s 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 Shawano County and Waupaca County**

<b>Diverse Workforce Acceptance Issue</b>	<b>Diversity Acceptance Continuum Stage</b>	<b>Program Recommendations</b>
<b>Wages</b>	“Acceptance” or higher	NA
<b>Benefits</b>	“Acceptance” or higher	NA
<b>Upward Job Mobility</b>	“Tolerance”	Programs aimed at increasing the management capability of the immigrant employees and the employer’s confidence in these employees
<b>Language Adoption by the Farm Manager</b>	“Appreciation”	Programs aimed at improving the employer’s Spanish fluency
<b>Language Adoption by the Immigrant Employee</b>	“Acceptance” or higher	Programs aimed at improving the immigrant employee’s English language skills
<b>Language Adoption by the U.S. Employee</b>	“Acceptance” or higher	Programs aimed at improving the U.S. employee’s Spanish language skills
<b>Workplace Cultural Adaptation by the Farm Manager</b>	“Mutual Enhancement”	Programs aimed at helping the manager identify other areas of the business where cultural adaptation may enhance the workplace environment
<b>Workplace Cultural Adaptation by the Immigrant Employee</b>	“Mutual Enhancement”	Programs aimed at helping the employee identify other areas of the business where cultural adaptation may enhance the workplace environment
<b>Personal Cultural Adaptation by the Farm Manager</b>	“Appreciation”	Programs aimed at further expanding the farm manager’s awareness and understanding of and the appreciation for the immigrant employees’ culture
<b>Personal Cultural Adaptation by the Immigrant Employee</b>	“Appreciation”	Programs aimed at further expanding the immigrant employee’s awareness and understanding of and the appreciation for U.S. culture
<b>Culturally Appropriate Products and Services Availability</b>	“Acceptance” or higher	Programs designed to make business managers aware of additional products and services desired by the immigrant employees
<b>Community Acceptance of the Immigrant Employees</b>	“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
<b>Combating Prejudice</b>	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**

**- Shawano and Waupaca Counties –**

## 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
  - d) 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
  - d) 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