In 1983, personal interviews with 38 adult, Mexican American, migrant farmworker, male heads of households working tomato crops in Indiana, Ohio, and Michigan revealed living and working conditions and views and involvement regarding labor rights and the farmworker movement among the estimated 65,000 Midwestern migrant farmworkers. Interview data were organized into 10 sets of findings: general farmwork experience, health, life well-being and stress, locus of control, social supports, experience in the Midwest, living and working conditions, views on farmworker labor rights, views about the farmworker movement, and demographic background. Most farmworkers were from Texas (63%) and Florida (34%) and were American citizens (89%). Average age was 36 years, family size - 5.6 persons, education level - 6.8 years, 1982 income - $6,447, time worked in farm labor - 18.9 years, and annual employment in farmwork in the Midwest - 3.4 months. Although 42% experienced above average health problems, a doctor had not been seen in an average of 26.3 months. While farmworkers had little meaningful interaction with people outside work settings, they perceived that they generally experienced worse housing, sanitation, and education than other Midwesterners. Over 20% belonged to United Farm Workers; 99% endorsed farmworker labor rights; and 32% had actively supported the movement and participated in movement events. References are listed and survey results are presented. (NEC)
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Background

About 65,000 farmworkers come into the central Midwest every growing season to plant and harvest tomatoes, cucumbers, beets, strawberries, cherries, apples, and other vegetable and fruit crops. Most of these people are Mexican Americans who originate from lower Texas. Some farmworkers have moved their base to Florida where they can work fruit during the winter season, and some have settled in Midwestern communities and work local crops on a seasonal basis.

Farmworkers are a hard-working people, and they make a significant contribution to the agricultural economy in the areas where they work. But these people experience among the most deprived socioeconomic conditions of any group of American workers. They are involved in strenuous and deforming stoop labor, experience child labor and chronic underemployment, have an annual income far below the poverty level, live in crowded one-room labor camp cabins, are provided poor sanitation facilities in the camps and none in the fields, experience high disease and mortality rates, and are subjected to discrimination and unscrupulous labor practices. Farmworkers are specifically excluded from key labor laws, and where they are covered standards are reduced and laws are not enforced. These conditions have been documented for well over half a century, but the same basic problems persist generation after generation.
Few alternative solutions have effectively addressed farmworkers' poor conditions. Historically, the initiative of the agricultural businesses who benefit the most from their labor, legislation, and social service programs have never effectively improved farmworker conditions. The only solution that has historically proven to be effective has been the farmworker movement, in the case of the United Farm Workers (UFW). Where UFW has labor contracts, there is no longer child labor, parents earn enough to support their families, and farmworkers enjoy health insurance and other fringe benefits assumed as the norm for most other American workers.

In the Midwest, a sister farmworker organization to the UFW has emerged, the Farm Labor Organizing Committee (FLOC). FLOC is currently leading a major social movement that draws upon ethnic and labor ideology. FLOC has organized over 2,000 tomato workers in the central Midwest, and has tried to negotiate three-way contracts with large agricultural corporations and growers. After attempts to negotiate failed, FLOC farmworkers went on strike against all Campbell Soup and Libby tomato fields in the Midwest, and have called for a citizens' boycott of all Campbell's and Libby's products in support of Midwestern farmworkers. A recent public opinion survey conducted by Indiana University at Indianapolis reveals overwhelming popular endorsement of farmworker labor rights and of the farmworker movement in the Midwest. But while the position of the leaders of the farmworker movement is clear, the views of Midwestern farmworkers themselves have not been documented.

Purposes of the Survey Project

From August through October 1983, an initial scientific survey of Midwestern farmworkers was conducted, with two purposes in mind. First, almost all of the information about farmworkers has been based on the nonrepresentative records of government migrant agencies; so one purpose of the survey project was to provide representative, population-based data to more clearly identify patterns and variations among farmworkers, particularly experiences and views regarding work histories, health and general well-being, living and working in the Midwest, and other socioeconomic conditions.

A second purpose was to document population-based experiences and views regarding labor rights and the farmworker movement in the Midwest. While FLOC claims to represent Midwestern farmworkers in general, as well as its own membership, this claim has been regularly challenged. A valid scientific survey should be able to establish how much FLOC actually does represent Midwestern farmworkers in its labor organizing and collective bargaining goals.

Research Methodology

The main method of the project was a cross-sectional study of Midwestern farmworkers. The study population is defined as the estimated 15,000 farmworkers involved in the 1983 tomato harvest in Indiana, Ohio, and Michigan. In order to control for confounding sociocultural factors, the study population is further defined as those estimated 3,000 Mexican American migrant farmworkers who are adult male heads of household. The research design consists of stratified sampling on the basis of state (Indiana, Ohio, Michigan), labor camp, and residential cabin.
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During August, September, and October of 1983, 42 personal interviews were conducted by the investigators and by Mexican American interviewers with farmworker backgrounds. The interviews averaged one and a quarter hours. Six sampled individuals declined to be interviewed, giving a response rate of 87.5%. Four of those interviewed were not included in the analysis because they did not fit the defined study population (married, Mexican Americans).

Given a significance level of 0.10, the maximum confidence interval is 0.13; that is, there is a 90% probability that the responses reported here do not vary from those of the total study population by more than 13% at the most (and by 0% at the least). Where more than 10% of the sample did not respond to or were not asked about a particular item, this is indicated. Student's t tests indicates that there are no statistically significant differences in the responses of those interviewed by different interviewers, in those working in Indiana, Ohio, and Michigan, and in those based in Texas and Florida; these tests indicate that these factors have not influenced results.

Survey Results

The attached Survey Results indicate the average or percentage of responses and the frequency of several scales constructed from the responses. In general, there are ten sets of findings:

(1) General Farmwork Experience: Farm labor as an occupation presents a unique set of challenges, with both advantages and disadvantages. Married males tend to have been involved for most of their adult lives, having been raised in a farmworker family. Most feel that they are not skilled for other work, without really recognizing the special abilities that they do possess (such as planning within a mobile life style to maximize annual earnings). Many have held other jobs from time to time, but most experience over two months unemployment a year, with farm labor in the Midwest being a major part of their annual employment. The majority feel threatened by displacement from agricultural mechanization, and a substantial proportion have actually been displaced by machines. Though they recognize both good and bad sides to farmwork, most generally focus on the more positive aspects of their occupation.

(2) Health: A nationally standardized set of questions regarding health conditions (HANES) was used to assess signs and symptoms. A large proportion of farmworkers report not feeling healthy, with upper respiratory, dental, and back and neck problems being the most common complaints. When it is felt that an illness warrants medical attention, migrant or other public clinics are the most utilized for health care, but even these are not used much. One serious occupational hazard is exposure to dangerous pesticides, and farmworkers report being exposed on an average of about seven times a year. It is estimated that almost half of Midwestern farmworkers are in need of medical attention, and most others are in need of some health care.

(3) Life Well-Being and Stress: While most farmworkers report feeling generally positive about their lives, they are not necessarily very hopeful, and a majority indicate some tenseness. Responses to a standardized set of questions indicates that about a 25% are experiencing some degree of distress. This might be due in part to the fact that the interviews were
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conducted during a period when people were working hard for long hours earning a significant proportion of their annual income.

(4) Locus of Control: Almost half of the farmworkers exhibit a sense of personal control in their lives; that is, they feel they can exert some influence in life events. Such a sense of control can be one psychological resource in meeting life challenges. In addition, most feel that collective action is the best way to influence such events.

(5) Social Support: The feeling of emotional, conceptual, and practical supportiveness from others is an important psychological resource in meeting life challenges. Not unlike other people, farmworkers indicate that they feel such social supports mostly from their families and other close relations. Other kinds of relationships provide less support. Overall, most farmworkers exhibit adequate feelings of social supports.

(6) Experience in the Midwest: While working in the Midwest, farmworkers interact mostly with others in and around the labor camps in which they are located. They have little meaningful interaction with people outside their immediate work setting. Since the majority experience societal isolation while in the Midwest, it is not surprising that they have few serious complaints about the few meaningful relations that they may have.

(7) Living and Working Conditions: Farmworkers feel that they generally experience worse conditions than people living in the Midwest. When this is considered along with chronic underemployment and poverty-level income, almost all migrants who come to the Midwest experience severely deprived socioeconomic conditions.

(8) Views on Farmworker Labor Rights: There is almost universal agreement among Midwestern farmworkers that they should receive basic labor rights, most of which are already enjoyed by other American workers.

(9) Views About the Farmworker Movement: Midwestern farmworkers also exhibit general endorsement of the farm labor movement. A majority have heard of the UFW and FLOC, and there is widespread approval of such organizations, of the rights to labor organizing and collective bargaining, of working under negotiated labor contracts, of going on strike if necessary to achieve better conditions, and of public boycotts in support of farmworkers. Many are informed about specific activities of the movement, and have even actively participated in some of the strikes and boycotts. Over one-fifth of Midwestern farmworkers claim to belong to the UFW and FLOC, and a majority of the rest indicate that they would be interested in belonging to such farm labor organizations. Almost half of the Midwestern farmworkers are knowledgeable about the farm labor movement, and an overwhelming majority approve of this movement's organizations, goals, and means. About a third of the Midwestern farmworkers have actively supported the movement and have actively participated in movement events and activities at one time or another.

(10) Demographic Background: Most Midwestern farmworkers in the study group are based in Texas or Florida, average 36 years old, and have over five members in their family. Though most young children are spared field work, there are still an estimated 3,000 children working in the tomato crops in the
central Midwest. Farmworkers average less than a 7th grade education, and most are able to communicate some in English. Average family income is about $6,500 a year, well below poverty standards, and over half of this is earned while working crops in the Midwest. Farmworkers spend about half of their Midwestern earnings locally, an estimated total of about $5 million for tomato workers alone (and almost $20 million for all Midwestern farmworkers). They thus make important economic contributions to local and regional economies where they work, in addition to their key involvement in agricultural production. Almost all farmworkers are Roman Catholic, and many exhibit regular religious faithfulness. Contrary to popular misconceptions, most farmworkers are American citizens, some of whom are active voters with a preference for the Democratic party.

Conclusions

At least four major conclusions can be drawn from the survey findings:

1. Existing information on farmworkers compiled from agency, employment, and case history records is sometimes incomplete and biased, and caution must be exercised in using non-representative information about farmworkers. The survey indicates that only 16% of the migrant farmworkers in the Midwest come in contact with service agencies, and only 3% indicate any extensive involvement with these agencies. The survey also shows that farmworkers are in the Midwest only about four months of the year. Furthermore, nowhere is it reported how much of an economic contribution farmworkers make in the Midwestern regions where they work. Not only do they make the basic contribution to economic production in the agricultural industries in which they work, but they currently collectively spend about $20 million dollars in local purchases while in the area.

2. The popular view that farmworkers experience deprived socioeconomic conditions is shared by Midwestern farmworkers themselves. In a 1982 survey of popular views about farmworkers (Barger and Haas 1983), an overwhelming proportion of the public believes that farmworkers have poor housing, poor education, poor health, child labor, and other disadvantage conditions. Farmworkers themselves also feel that they have substandard conditions, and such factors as poverty-level income and underemployment bear this out. Thus it is safe to conclude that farmworkers are one of the most disadvantaged groups of American workers.

3. Midwestern farmworkers almost universally endorse basic labor rights for themselves, particularly those currently sought by FLOC and enjoyed by most other American workers. Though they experience substandard conditions, almost all farmworkers actually hold much higher living and working standards for themselves and their families. This suggests that they are fully aware of the standard of living experienced by most other American workers. In addition, farmworkers feel some threat from agricultural mechanization for losing what little they do have. Such a discrepancy between aspirations and realities is thought to be a major factor that motivates social movements and change. According to the 1982 public survey (Barger and Haas 1983), this same discrepancy is held by the general population, and with both farmworkers and the public holding similar unachieved values it is possible that the general atmosphere is ripe for major socioeconomic changes in the agricultural system.
in which farmworkers are involved.

(4) The Farm Labor Organizing Committee (FLOC) and the United Farm Workers do indeed represent farmworkers, as they claim. Midwestern farmworkers largely endorse the farm labor movement in general and in the Midwest, including farm labor organizations, their goals, and their methods. Most farmworkers see FLOC and UFW as viable means for achieving their unfulfilled standards, and many are actively involved with these movement organizations. In fact, about the only reservation is that the movement takes years to achieve its goals, during which farmworkers have to support their families and are threatened with losing their primary means of subsistence through agricultural mechanization. The 1982 public survey (Barger and Haas 1983) indicates that there is strong popular endorsement of the farmworker movement as well, and both the public and this survey jointly indicate that there is substantial internal and external potential for the success of the farmworker movement in the Midwest.

In summary, the current study is to our knowledge the only scientific, population-based investigations of the living and working conditions of Midwestern farmworkers and of the views and involvements of farmworkers themselves regarding the farmworker movement. This survey may be considered an initial study, and more research is needed with larger and more generalized samples which investigate cohort/longitudinal changes.
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SURVEY OF MIDWESTERN FARMWORKERS (1983)

W. K. Barger and Ernesto Reza

Survey population:
Adult, male heads of household, Mexican American migrant farmworkers working tomato crops in the central Midwest (Indiana, Ohio, and Michigan), an estimated 3,000 people.

Number of interviews:
Indiana random sample (3.5% of the estimated state migrants) 28 (74%)
Ohio random sample (0.2% of the estimated state migrants) 3 (8%)
Michigan random sample (3.5% of the estimated state migrants) 7 (18%)
TOTAL (1.3% of the total estimated study population) 38 (100%)

Confidence interval at .10 level of significance: 0.13
There is a 90% probability that the response patterns reported here do not vary from those of the study population by more than 13% at the most (and by 0% at the least).

Language in which the interviews were conducted:
English 8%
Spanish 92%
I. FARMWORK EXPERIENCE

1. Average time worked in farm labor.............. 18.9 years

2. Average generations worked in farm labor........ 2.1

3. How family got started in farmwork
   Other
   No other work available.................. 28%
   Not skilled/educated for other work........ 38%
   Life change/crisis...................... 21%

4.-6. Employment patterns
   AVERAGE ANNUAL EMPLOYMENT ..................... 9.0 months
   AVERAGE ANNUAL EMPLOYMENT IN NONFARMWORK JOBS........ 1.7 months
   AVERAGE ANNUAL EMPLOYMENT IN FARMWORK JOBS........ 7.3 months
   AVERAGE ANNUAL TIME OF FARMWORK IN THE MIDWEST ....... 3.4 months

7. Attitudes towards machines replacing farmworkers
   Negative......................................... 65%
   Neutral........................................ 19%
   Positive........................................ 16%

8. Have been displaced by agricultural mechanization........... 24%

9. What like the most about farmwork
   Nothing, do not like anything.................. 11%
   Other.............................................. 5%
   Provides a job/money.......................... 14%
   Travel.............................................. 11%
   Doing physical work.......................... 11%
   Working outside............................... 14%
   Set own work schedule/pace................... 16%
   Working for self/family........................ 8%
   Family together............................... 11%

10. What like the least about farmwork
    Other................................................ 8%
    Physical problems............................. 29%
    Underemployment, not steady work, no work between crops........ 8%
    Low pay......................................... 32%
    Hard work...................................... 8%
    Long hours..................................... 8%
    No control over weather and other conditions............ 3%
    Nothing, do not dislike anything............... 5%

11. How much like farmwork in general
    Not at all........................................ 3%
    Not much......................................... 16%
    Some............................................. 59%
    Very much....................................... 22%
II. HEALTH CONDITIONS (SELF-REPORTED SYMPTOMS)

Average blood pressure
- Systolic+ 134
- Diastolic+ 79
- Pulse rate+ 71

**HIGH BLOOD PRESSURE** (greater than 160 SBP and/or 90 DBP) 10.5%

12. Self-reported general health condition

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

13. Have current health problems that would like to see a doctor about

26%

14. Average months since last saw a doctor

26.3 months

In the past year or 12 months (Qs 15-50):

15. Have been in the hospital

5%

16. Had an accident or injury requiring medical treatment

16%

17. Deafness or ear trouble (other than temporary colds)

5%

18. Trouble seeing or eye problems (other than glasses)

13%

19. Ever lost any teeth

32%

20. Dental or gum problems

42%

21. Back injury

13%

22. Had neck/back pain for at least a month

32%

23. Had joints pain for at least a month

11%

24. Had a cold or flu

74%

25. Had persistent cough attacks

13%

26. Had increased cough and plegm for at least 3 weeks

13%

27. Had wheezing or whistling sounds in the chest

13%

28. Severe pain across the front of the chest for at least a half hour

5%

29. Had heart failure or "weak heart" with any severity

0%

30. Had infections of the kidneys or bladder

3%

31. Had loss of vision or blindness lasting from several minutes to several days

3%

32. Had difficulty in speaking or very slurred speech lasting from several minutes to several days

3%

33. Had prolonged weakness or paralysis lasting up to several months

0%

34. Had loss of sensation or numbness or tingling sensations lasting from several minutes to several days

13%

35. Had any reason to suspect may have diabetes

8%

36. Had a goiter or other thyroid trouble

3%

37. Had an illness which cut down the appetite

11%

38. Had difficulty swallowing for at least 3 days (other than sore throat from a cold)

5%

39. Had yellow jaundice, which made the skin or eyes turn yellow

0%

40. Had an abdominal operation

0%

**AVERAGE NUMBER OF HEALTH PROBLEMS** (scale = 0-26)

3.4

**PROPORTION EXPERIENCING ABOVE AVERAGE HEALTH PROBLEMS**

42%

+ No data = 16%.
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Average presentations for health care in the past year (Qs 41-47):

41. Average presentations at a migrant or other public clinic 1.7
42. Average presentations at private doctor's office 0.6
43. Average presentations at a doctor's or group clinic 0.1
44. Average presentations at a company or industry clinic 0.0
45. Average presentations at a hospital outpatient clinic or emergency room 0.1
46. Average presentations to a curandero 0.2
47. Average times treated self by home treatment 1.6

AVERAGE ANNUAL PRESENTATIONS FOR HEALTH CARE 5.4
PROPORTION WITH ABOVE AVERAGE PRESENTATIONS 79%

48. Been told by a doctor or nurse in the past year that had a disease or health problem 24%
48a. Of those reporting YES, seriousness of health problem
   Seriously incapacitating or life threatening 0%
   Somewhat incapacitating 78%
   A mild health problem 22%

49. Other family members been told by a doctor or nurse in the past year that they had a disease or health problem 29%
49a. Of those reporting YES, average number of family members involved 1.1
49b. Seriousness of health problem of first person described
   Seriously incapacitating or life threatening 20%
   Somewhat incapacitating 40%
   A mild health problem 40%

50. Average number of times was sprayed by or otherwise exposed to pesticides (range from 0 to 40 times, with 21% reporting having been sprayed ten times or more) 6.6

AVERAGE HEALTH STATUS (scale = 1-3) 2.0

AVERAGE OR BELOW HEALTH STATUS (estimated to be in need of immediate medical attention. Only one person in the sample revealed consistently healthy conditions) 97%

+ No data = 11%.
III. GENERAL LIFE WELL-BEING

51. General feelings of being happy 84%

52. Feelings about things five years ago
   Happier 11%
   About the same 74%
   Not as happy 16%

53. Feelings about things five years from now
   Not as happy 22%
   About the same 43%
   Happier 35%

GENERAL FEELINGS OF OPTIMISM (scale = 0-3) 0%

54. Feelings of strain, stress, or pressure during the past month 45%

55. Feelings of tenseness (vs. relaxed) during the past month 54%

GENERAL FEELINGS OF TENSION (scale = 0-2) 57%

PSYCHOSOMATIC DISTRESS

56. I was bothered by things that usually don't bother me 16%
57. I did not feel like eating; my appetite was poor 5%
58. I felt that I could not shake off the blues even with the help of my family or friends 8%
59. I (HAVE NOT) felt that I was as good as other people 53%
60. I had trouble keeping my mind on what I was doing 16%
61. I felt depressed 16%
62. I felt that everything I did was an effort 24%
63. I (HAVE NOT) felt hopeful about the future 8%
64. I thought my life had been a failure 11%
65. I felt fearful 8%
66. My sleep was restless 22%
67. I was (NOT) happy 5%
68. I talked less than usual 11%
69. I felt lonely 8%
70. People were unfriendly 11%
71. I (HAVE NOT) enjoyed life 32%
72. I had crying spells 5%
73. I felt sad 16%
74. I felt that people disliked me 8%
75. I could not get "going" 16%

AVERAGE SYMPTOMS OF PSYCHOSOMATIC DISTRESS (scale = 0-20) 2.9
PROPORTION EXPERIENCING ABOVE AVERAGE PSYCHOSOMATIC DISTRESS 25%
IV. LOCUS OF CONTROL

76. When you make plans ahead, do you usually get to carry out things as expected? or Do things usually come out to make you change your plans? 63% 37%

77. Have you usually felt pretty sure your life would work out the way you want it to? or Have there been times when you haven't been sure about it? 55% 45%

78. Some people feel they can run their lives pretty much the way they want to; Others feel the problems of life are sometimes too big for them. How about you? 71% 29%

79. Do you think it's better to plan your life a good way ahead, or, would you say life is too much a matter of luck to plan far ahead? 47% 53%

Average internal locus of control (scale = 0-4) 2.4
PROPORTION WITH ABOVE AVERAGE INTERNAL LOCUS OF CONTROL 45%

INDIVIDUAL/GROUP IMPACT

80. The best way to improve farmworker conditions is For each individual to work hard and do the best he can for himself, or For people to work together for the good of the whole group. 38% 62%
### V. SOCIAL SUPPORTS

#### Feelings of emotional support

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Support Source</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Immediate family</td>
<td>92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other close relatives</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compadres and padrinos</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friends and relatives</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fellow workers</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bosses</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labor union staff and officials</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priests or clergymen</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curanderos</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical professionals</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social and other service workers</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average feelings of emotional supports (scale = 0-11) = 3.6

Proportion with above average feelings of emotional supports = 51%

#### Feelings of conceptual support

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Support Source</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Immediate family</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other close relatives</td>
<td>85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compadres and padrinos</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friends and neighbors</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fellow workers</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bosses</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labor union staff and officials</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priests or clergymen</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curanderos</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical professionals</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social and other service workers</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average feelings of conceptual supports = 3.6

Proportion with above average feelings of conceptual supports = 53%

#### Feelings of practical/material support

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Support Source</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Immediate family</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other close relatives</td>
<td>88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compadres and padrinos</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friends and neighbors</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fellow workers</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bosses</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labor union staff and officials</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priests or clergymen</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curanderos</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical professionals</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social and other service workers</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average feelings of practical supports (scale = 0-11) = 3.5

Proportion with above average feelings of practical supports = 41%

Average feelings of social supports (scale = 0-3) = 1.5

Proportion with above average feelings of social supports = 50%

---

*No data = 11%.*
VI. EXPERIENCE IN MIDWEST

Reported degree of some social interaction
114. Other farmworkers 89%
115. Crew leaders 71%
116. Farmers 32%
117. Local merchants and store clerks 26%
118. Social service agencies 16%
119. Local Latino residents 29%
120. Local Anglo residents 13%

AVERAGE NUMBER OF SOCIAL RELATIONS WHILE IN THE MIDWEST 2.8

PROPORTION EXPERIENCING SOCIETAL ISOLATION WHILE IN THE MIDWEST 66%
(Includes only one or no interaction with people outside the camp/field work setting.)

Reported social experience while in the Midwest
121. Good experiences with Midwestern Anglos 92%
122. Good experiences with Midwestern growers 92%
123. Good experiences with crew leaders while in the Midwest 87%

POSITIVE SOCIAL EXPERIENCES WHILE IN THE MIDWEST 92%

VII. ATTITUDES TOWARD LIVING AND WORKING CONDITIONS

Perceived problems of farmworkers in comparison with Midwesterners
124. Poorer housing and sanitation facilities 92%
125. More diseases and other health problems 84%
126. Poorer education 76%
127. Greater discrimination and prejudice 61%
128. More child labor 76%
129. Greater exposure to pesticides and hazardous chemicals 79%
129a. Have ever been promised a job only to find there was none when arrived in the Midwest 25%

FARMWORKERS EXPERIENCING SEVERELY DEPRIVED CONDITIONS 95%
(Includes perceived greater problems, low family income [less than $10,000], and un/underemployment [less than 8 months]. The other 5% also experience deprived conditions, but less severe.)

+ No data = 37%.
VIII. VIEWS ON FARMWORKER LABOR RIGHTS

130. Believe farmworkers should have access to fresh drinking water while working in the fields 100%
131. Believe farmworkers should have access to restroom and hand washing facilities while working in the fields 100%
132. Believe farmworkers should receive earnings that average at least the minimum wage for time working in the fields 100%
133. Believe farmworkers should receive payment for travel expenses in coming to work crops in this area 100%
134. Believe farmworkers should receive full wages each payday, rather than having part withheld for an end-of-the-season "bonus" 97%
135. Believe farmworkers should receive workman's compensation for work-related injuries and disabilities 97%
136. Believe farmworkers should receive health insurance as a part of their working conditions 100%
137. Believe farmworkers should receive unemployment insurance benefits as a part of their working conditions 100%
138. Believe farmworkers should receive first choice of new jobs created when agricultural mechanization eliminates old jobs 100%
139. Believe farmworkers should receive retraining programs when displaced by agricultural mechanization 100%

AVERAGE ENDORSEMENT OF LABOR RIGHTS (Includes positive attitudes toward labor rights.) 99%
IX. VIEWS ABOUT THE FARM LABOR MOVEMENT

140. Have heard of the United Farm Workers (UFW) 61%
140a. For those who have heard, how they learned about UFW 18%
    Media
    Other farmworkers 9%
    Relatives or friends 5%
    Union organizers 68%
140b. For those who have heard, what they understand about UFW 4%
    Does not understand the purpose well 4%
    Works for better rights and conditions 18%
    Works for better rights and conditions through labor 72%
    organizing and collective bargaining

141. Have heard of the Farm Labor Organizing Committee (FLOC) 53%
141a. For those who have heard, how they learned about FLOC 6%
    Media
    Other farmworkers 44%
    Relatives or friends 13%
    Union organizers 38%
141b. For those who have heard, what they understand about FLOC 11%
    Does not understand the purpose well 11%
    Works for better rights and conditions 17%
    Works for better rights and conditions through labor 72%
    organizing and collective bargaining

142. What like the most about these kind of organizations+ 3%
    Nothing, do not like anything
    Other 28%
    Works for better conditions and rights 66%
    Unity of farmworkers 3%

143. What like the least about these kind of organizations+ 14%
    Other
    Takes too long to accomplish results 24%
    Nothing, do not dislike anything 62%

144. General attitude toward how much organizations like UFW and FLOC are good for farmworkers* 9%
    Disapproves
    Approves 91%

+ No data = 24%.
* No data = 13%.
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145. Think farmworkers should have the right to labor organizing and collective bargaining 97%

146. Think farmworker organizations like UFW and FLOC should negotiate contracts with those growers and agricultural businesses whose products involve farmworkers' labor 91%

147. Would prefer working at a job under contract to a farmworker organization rather than working under the personal arrangements of a crew leader. 92%

148. If necessary, think farmworkers should go on strike to achieve better working rights and conditions 84%

149. Aware of the FLOC strike against Campbell Soup and Libby tomatoes in this region 46%

150. Aware of the UFW grape and lettuce boycotts a few years ago 61%
150a. For those who were aware, participated in these boycotts (28% of the total sample) 52%

151. Aware of the current FLOC boycott of Campbell Soup products 32%
151a. For those who were aware, participated in this boycott (32% of the total sample) 92%

152. Approve of these kinds of public boycotts to help achieve better working rights and conditions for farmworkers 85%

153. Believe that these kinds of public boycotts help achieve better working rights and conditions for farmworkers 78%

154. Currently belong to a farm labor organization 22%
NOTE: 11% more indicated that they used to belong to the UFW, but had let their membership lapse.
154a. For those not belonging, would be interested in belonging to a farm labor organization like UFW or FLOC (43% of the total sample) 55%
154b. For those who do belong, membership: UFWBoth the UFW and FLOC 50% 50%

155. Main reason joined or would join a farm labor organization
Not interested in joining 17%
Other 14%
To get better conditions for self/family 46%
To get better conditions for farmworkers in general 9%
To work together with other farmworkers for better conditions 14%

+ No data = 11%.
++ No data = 16%.
* A total of 65% therefore report either belonging to a farm labor organization or interest in belonging.
FOR THOSE WHO ARE MEMBERS OF A FARM LABOR ORGANIZATION

156a. How came to join
   Convinced by relatives/friends  14%
   Convinced by union organizers  86%

156b. How being a member has changed life
   Not much  43%
   Personal development  43%
   Social development  14%

156c. Ways are involved in the organization
   Regular contact and information  71%
   Participates in events and activities  14%
   Is involved in strikes, organizing, and other operations  14%

156d. Degree of involvement in the organization
   Not much  71%
   A lot  29%

KNOWLEDGEABLE ABOUT THE FARM LABOR MOVEMENT
   45%
   (Includes knowledge claimed about a majority of the following items: UFW and FLOC, the Campbell Soup strike, and the UFW and FLOC boycotts.)

POSITIVE ATTITUDES TOWARDS THE FARM LABOR MOVEMENT
   79%
   (Includes expressed positive attitudes toward a majority of the following items: farmworker organizations, collective bargaining, labor negotiations, contracts, and strikes, approval and effectiveness of boycotts, and a rating by the interviewer.)

ACTIVE SUPPORT OF THE FARM LABOR MOVEMENT
   32%
   (Includes a majority of the following items: participation in the UFW and FLOC boycotts, membership in a farmworker organization, and a rating by the interviewer on the degree of commitment to the farmworker movement.)
VIII. DEMOGRAPHIC BACKGROUND

157. Home base
   - Midwest: 3%
   - Florida: 34%
   - Texas: 63%

158. Place of birth
   - Mexico: 19%
   - Florida: 22%
   - Texas: 59%

159. Average age: 36.2 years

160. Males*: 100%

161. Mexican/Mexican-American ethnic heritage*: 100%

162. Married marital status*: 100%

163. Average family size: 5.6 people
163a. Number of workers in the family+: 3.6 people
163b. Number of adult (18+) workers in the family+: 2.6 people

AVERAGE CHILD LABOR PER FAMILY
ESTIMATED CHILDREN INVOLVED IN TOMATO CROPS IN CENTRAL MIDWEST
   - 3,000 children

164. Average educational level completed: 6.8 grade

165. Some ability to speak English: 71%
166. Some ability to read English: 61%
   - Basic ability to communicate in English: 58%

167. Farmworker occupation*: 100%

168. Average total 1982 household income before taxes: $6,447
169. Average total household earnings while in the Midwest (53% of annual income): $3,395
170. Average total household spending while in the Midwest (25% of annual income, 49% of Midwestern earnings): $1,650

TOTAL ESTIMATED SPENDING OF TOMATO WORKERS WHILE IN THE CENTRAL MIDWEST: $5 million

* No data = 29%.

The study population was defined as adult, male heads of household, Mexican-American migrant farmworkers involved with the tomato crops in the Central Midwest.
171. Church or religious affiliation
   "Evangelical" Protestant ........................................... 3%
   "Mainstream" Protestant ........................................... 0%
   Roman Catholic ...................................................... 97%

172. Degree of participation in religious activities
   Not at all ...................................................................... 5%
   Once a year or so ..................................................... 11%
   Once every few months .............................................. 26%
   Once every few weeks ............................................... 42%
   At least once a week .................................................. 16%

173. Reported degree of religiousness
   Not at all religious ...................................................... 3%
   Not very religious ...................................................... 22%
   Somewhat religious .................................................... 68%
   Very religious ................................................................ 8%

174. Membership in labor unions
   None ............................................................................ 79%
   Industrial or trade union ............................................. 0%
   Farm labor union ....................................................... 21%

175. Citizenship
   Mexico ........................................................................... 11%
   U.S. ............................................................................. 89%

176. Voted in last national elections ...................................... 13%

177. Political party preference
   None ............................................................................ 58%
   Republican .................................................................... 0%
   Other ........................................................................... 3%
   Democrat ....................................................................... 39%

177a. Registered voter + ...................................................... 13%

Average number of housing units in labor camp .................... 17
Average length of interviews ............................................ 77 min.

+ No data = 58%.