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Abstract

Horticulture work in many high-income economies is increasingly performed by temporary migrant workers from low-wage economies. In Australia, such work is now performed predominantly by international backpackers – young well-educated workers with mostly sound English language skills. These workers are drawn to harvesting work by a government scheme that provides an incentive for completing a specified number of days work in horticulture. This paper examines the health and safety experience of these workers, through focus groups, interviews and an online survey. Notwithstanding their distinctive backgrounds, the harvesting experience of these temporary migrant workers is similar to that of low-skilled migrants working in other high-income countries. Health and safety risks associated with work organisation and payment systems, and a lack of compliance with occupational safety and health legal requirements, are commonplace, but potentially compounded by a sense of invincibility among these young travellers. Furthermore, a growing pool of undocumented workers is placing downward pressures on their employment conditions. The vulnerability associated with work and earnings uncertainty, and the harsh environment in which harvesting work occurs, remains a constant, notwithstanding the background of these workers.
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Introduction

Standing recently characterised the ‘precariat’ as a global phenomenon produced since the 1970s by the neoliberal search for labour market flexibility.¹ As a new layer in the labour market positioned beneath the level of the traditional working class, the precariat is defined by lack of security. Among the several dimensions of insecurity listed by Standish is ‘employment insecurity’ involving unregulated hiring and inadequate protection against arbitrary dismissal. Most often associated with casual employment which has grown rapidly since the 1970s, this dimension of insecurity also extends to temporary migrant workers. According to one recent estimate, over 100 million workers, or 3 per cent of the global workforce, cross national boundaries to obtain jobs.² Such estimates include primarily documented workers admitted legally for the purpose of temporary employment rather than undocumented (illegal) workers who are hard to count. Demand changes affect this flow. Following the global financial crisis between 2008 and 2009, temporary migration in OECD countries fell by 16.5 per cent.³

Horticulture (growing fruit and vegetables) is an industry where large numbers of temporary, unskilled workers are employed for harvesting. High-wage economies with an insufficient supply of domestic harvest workers fill these jobs with temporary migrants from low-wage countries.
They do so in two ways. First, farmers hire undocumented workers – a resource often employed covertly in countries with restrictive migration laws. Thus Martin reports that since the mid-1990s, over half of US crop workers have been undocumented (mainly Mexican). Second, farmers recruit through formal temporary migrant worker programmes that offer short-term working visas to harvest workers. Germany and Canada took this approach recruiting harvest workers from Eastern European and Latin American nations respectively, with which they had agreements. The Australian approach is similar in the sense that temporary harvest workers are given formal work visas. However, Australia differs from Germany and Canada, where these visas are issued specifically for horticulture. Rather, Australia offers incentives so that part of the much larger pool of international working holiday makers (WHMs, also known as backpackers) will choose farm work. The incentive is a second year extension of the initial 12-month working visa.

Australia is also distinctive in having a highly regulated labour market in which minimum wage, unfair dismissal, and occupational safety and health (OSH) protection apply equally to native and temporary migrant workers. However, a growing body of research suggests that temporary migrant workers, whether documented or undocumented, are often denied full equality. They encounter systematic employment disadvantages, unable to claim normal legal rights, and have higher exposure to certain job hazards.

This paper seeks to explore how the precarious nature of temporary migrant work in Australian horticulture affects OSH conditions. International studies of temporary migrant workers in horticulture have identified the importance of contingent and informal work arrangements, language difficulties, economic dependence and an absence of formal protections as contributing to the higher level of injuries and poorer health evidenced among migrant horticulture workers. The Australian WHM worker faces a different context. These workers are young, tertiary educated and, for the majority, English is their mother tongue. Their employment is formally regulated through employment and health and safety legislation. Do these factors result in less exposure to hazardous work arrangements than commonly experienced by temporary migrant workers? This paper examines their experience, focusing particularly on hazards associated with work organisation and payment systems.

The paper is organised into six sections. First, we provide a brief account of the methodology used to collect the empirical data on which our analysis is based. Second, we examine the temporary migrant workforce in horticulture, looking at the numbers of workers and their different migration status. Third, the paper examines the itinerant nature of horticultural work and job search and hiring practices in the industry, noting how a two-tier labour market has emerged. The fourth section looks at OSH in horticulture, focusing on legal regulation, the nature of risks, and the role of training in incident prevention. The fifth section draws on focus group and survey data to report horticultural workers’ perceptions of risks, training and factors adversely impacting on their health and safety. In section six, we summarise our findings and compare these with the experience of temporary migrant horticulture workers in other high-income economies. We conclude that, notwithstanding exposure to similar tasks and hazards, the very transitory nature of WHMs’ involvement in harvesting may mitigate against some of the poorer outcomes observed overseas.

Methodology
The paper is based on empirical fieldwork collected in two stages during 2013 and 2014. First, an extensive interview programme was conducted at three regional locations in Victoria (Bendigo – apple and cherry orchards, Maffra – salad vegetables, and Mildura – grapes, citrus,
and mixed vegetables); Tasmania (Cignet and Huonville – apples, cherries and strawberries); and the Northern Territory (mangoes). Most interviewees were harvest workers, although data were also collected from farmers and contractors, employment agency staff, migrant hostel operators, union officials, OSH authority staff, and ethnic community organisers. Harvest workers were interviewed through nine focus groups with a total of 64 participants from the following countries: England (15), France (8), Burundi (7), Ireland (7), Germany (5), Hong Kong (5), Italy (3), Afghanistan (3), Taiwan (3), Malaysia (3), Scotland (2), Estonia (1), South Korea (1) and Japan (1).

Drawing on the focus group findings, a questionnaire was designed for administration online and presented in both English and Chinese. Respondents were recruited initially in all Australian states by placing invitation cards at hostels used by harvest workers. Following this, a further round of invitations was issued through a website used by WHMs seeking harvest work. A total of 417 initial responses were received; 303 valid responses remained after data cleaning. Data were analysed using SPSS 21. The national origin of respondents is shown in Table 1.

Of these respondents, at the time of completing the survey, 69 per cent were paid by farmers, 27 per cent by contractors, and most of the remaining 4 per cent were unpaid volunteers. Undocumented workers could not be readily accessed through the survey delivery method, and could not be identified through the survey.

The global reserve army: temporary migrants in Australian horticulture

The observation that a reserve army of labour is used to meet demand fluctuations is not new.21 Only recently, however, has the use by high-income economies of a global pool of surplus workers been observed.22 Australian horticulture had little need to tap into this global pool until recently, since Australian working class families traditionally provided the peak harvest workforce, often leaving the cities to harvest fruit and vegetables during their holidays. Until 1993 (when the railway closed), the Dried Fruits Association hired four or five trains a year to take Melbourne working class families to Mildura (a remote regional centre 600 kilometres away) to pick grapes during their holidays. As recently as 1999, Victorian fruit growers reported that 80 per cent of harvest workers in the rich Goulburn valley stone-fruit (apricots and peaches) district were local Australians.23 To some extent, Australians, including ‘grey nomads’ (itinerant retirees), still work in horticulture, often performing skilled jobs such as pruning, or driving tractors and forklifts, which horticulturists are reluctant to assign to unskilled migrants.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>% of responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Australia and New Zealand (14.5% Australia)</td>
<td>15.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Europe (21.8% UK and Ireland; 16.8% Germany; 6.9% France)</td>
<td>55.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asia (12.9% Taiwan)</td>
<td>23.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Americas (5% Canada)</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1
National origin of survey respondents
(n = 303)
Horticulturalists prefer WHMs for harvest work, finding them more motivated, hard working, honest and flexible than comparable Australians. They also prefer undocumented workers, who receive lower rates of pay and are typically supplied by contractors, removing administrative burdens from horticulturalists. A large share of unskilled horticultural work is thus now done by temporary migrant workers. There are estimated to be 30,000 horticulturalists and 130,000 employees in the industry. While the number of temporary migrant workers cannot be accurately measured, it is likely they account for the majority of seasonal peak employment. Three other groups participate in harvesting work but are not numerically significant. These include student visa holders, those employed under the Seasonal Worker Program (drawn from Pacific Islands) and Willing Workers on Organic Farms (WWOOFERS). The two main sources of temporary migrant harvest workers are working holiday makers and undocumented workers.

The first group – working holiday makers (subclass 417 visa holders) – make up perhaps a third of the harvest workforce. This visa scheme commenced in 1975, catering initially for British, Irish and Canadian backpackers, and now extends to 19 countries with which Australia has reciprocal arrangements (centred predominantly on work entitlements). Eligibility for the scheme is confined to single people without dependants aged between 18 and 30 years old. In 2012/13, a total of 249,231 WHM visas were granted. Two-thirds of these visa holders came from five countries – the UK, Germany, Taiwan, France and South Korea.

To attract WHMs into horticulture, the subclass 417 visa program was amended in 2005, allowing an extension for a further 12 months to applicants who have completed 88 days of work in three specified industries (mining, construction and agriculture) in regional Australia. In 2013/14, second year visa extensions were granted to 45,950 applicants. Over 90 per cent of second year visas are gained by taking horticultural jobs. Subclass 417 visa holders now form an important part of the horticultural workforce, with at least 40,000 a year seeking harvest jobs.

The second group are undocumented (illegal) workers – a growing and numerically significant part of the workforce. These are defined by the Department of Immigration and Border Protection (DIBP) as non-Australian citizens working in Australia without a visa (mostly 'over-stayers') or who are in Australia lawfully but working in breach of their visa conditions (mostly holders of visitor or tourist visas). Over-stayers (traditionally US or British, but increasingly Chinese) tend to be skilled, high-paid, city workers; those breaking their visitor’s visa conditions to work in horticulture mostly come from low-wage developing countries. In 1999, the Department recommended that tougher sanctions should be imposed on employers to curb the problem of illegal workers. This approach was opposed by horticulturalists, who argued ‘it was not always possible to attract sufficient legal workers during the harvest’. Because undocumented workers are deported for working illegally, they are elusive and difficult to count. In 2011, the Department estimated that between 40,000 and 93,000 illegal workers were working in all industries.

The DIBP conducts periodic checks to identify and deport illegal workers, locating 17,185 in 2013/14, although the number working in agriculture is unknown. This is likely to be the tip

---

* In 2007, the Department of Multicultural Affairs (DIMA) changed its name to the Department of Immigration and Citizenship (DIAC). The name changed again, in 2013, to the Department of Immigration and Border Protection (DIBP).
of a very large iceberg. Qualitative evidence suggests that undocumented workers are increasing rapidly in number. Qualitative evidence suggests that undocumented workers are increasing rapidly in number. While quantification is not possible, a recent report prepared for the World Bank found that 60 per cent of growers surveyed across Australia (n = 40) believed that undocumented workers were being used either to a moderate or large extent, with only 3 per cent believing they were not used at all.

To summarise, the horticultural workforce now is principally made up of three groups – a core of stable, generally skilled Australian workers; a large mobile population of WHMs, mostly taking harvest work to meet requirements for a visa extension; and a large and growing number of undocumented workers, mainly from low-wage, developing countries. For WHMs, their precarious status derives from their reliance on casual, short-term employment on which their access to a second year visa is dependent. They are vulnerable because of the need to work a minimum of 88 days in a volatile job market. Undocumented workers, on the other hand, are precarious because of the absence of a legal right to work. Their vulnerability extends beyond work rights to general citizenship rights. These varied sources and layers of vulnerability reflect characteristics identified by Sargeant & Tucker among migrant workers in the UK and Canada. The constraints on accessing undocumented workers, however, means that the data analysis that follows can only draw on data from documented workers.

Casual harvesting: a two-tier labour market

Harvesting jobs are short-term and unpredictable, governed by the vagaries of crop size and ripeness. Recruitment under these conditions is challenging since the right number of workers must be available, at the right time, and often in remote regions. These conditions dictate a dominant hiring model of casual work paid at piece rates – a model that is reflected in the employment conditions specified in the Horticulture Award. The Horticulture Award is determined by a national tribunal and sets legally binding minimum employment standards across the Australian horticultural industry. The award covers a range of employment conditions, such as standard working hours, leave entitlements and dispute resolution processes. With the exception of wage rates, however, most of these minimum standards are applicable only to permanent employees and not to casual employees, who predominate in harvesting work.

The award sets an hourly wage and includes a 25 per cent loading to be paid to casual employees. It also specifies that piece work rates must enable the average competent employee to earn at least 15 per cent more per hour than the minimum hourly rate (Clause 15.2). Nevertheless, it does not create a floor to piece rate earnings, stating that ‘nothing in this award guarantees an employee on a piece work rate will earn at least the minimum ordinary time wage… as the employee’s earnings are contingent on their productivity’ (Clause 15.9). This absence of a floor leaves harvesting workers engaged on piece rates open to low hourly rates of pay and, as will be shown in the data analysis, a willingness to take risks to increase their earnings.

The casual hiring model is primarily geared to the needs of horticulturalists – not harvest workers, who have no guarantees of work, job duration or earnings. Few can afford to travel to remote regional locations only to find there is little or no work. In this labour market, the effective circulation of accurate and timely job information is important to both horticulturalists (so they can recruit sufficient labour) and temporary migrants (so they can find enough work as they travel).

Two different hiring methods are common in horticulture. The first is direct hire by farmers, who are responsible for the normal duties of an employer to observe legal employment,
workplace safety and health conditions and collect income tax, superannuation and workers' compensation contributions. The second is employment through contractors, who are paid an 'all-in rate' to relieve the horticulturalists not only of the challenge of finding labour, but also the responsibility for remuneration and meeting legal employment obligations (other than OSH duties, which are shared). Where direct employment prevails, both horticulturalists and workers (mainly Australians and WHMs) depend on a number of mechanisms to circulate information about job availability.

First, consistent with its promotion of harvesting work to international backpackers, the federal government funds a National Harvest Labour Information Service (NHLIS). The NHLIS provides a National harvest guide, which sets out the harvest periods for different crops in various locations; a free-call telephone job information service; and in larger regional centres, local job agencies are paid by the government for each job placement. The 'harvest trail' encourages temporary harvest workers to chase the harvest around the continent, since Australia's climatic range and variety of crops mean that some harvest work is almost always available somewhere. Publicity material also promotes the idea that job seekers from overseas can 'find a great way to maintain a fit and healthy lifestyle... to meet people from around the world... and to travel and see Australia at their own pace while working and making money'. Focus group and survey evidence indicate that the NHLIS is well known, but is rarely relied on by job seekers because of the lack of timely and accurate vacancy information.

Second, informal networks of WHMs rely on social media, word of mouth and working hostels for sources of job information. Four out of five survey respondents had found their current job using one of these three methods. The widespread use of social media has resulted in multiple websites catering to WHMs by advertising social events, accommodation and jobs. These are popular since they bridge the geographical gulf between harvest workers and horticulturalists in real time. Informal electronic communication is also important. One group of about 30 female Taiwanese harvest workers scattered around Australia established an exclusive social media site to pool job information gathered from their dispersed work experiences. But most often, friends simply phone each other about job openings. Mobile phones and internet access are essential tools for WHMs on the harvest trail.

Most important for informal job information, however, are working hostels, which operate as information brokers between harvest workers and horticulturalists. Their websites promote accommodation and their ability to provide jobs for those who stay with them. The information they offer WHMs typically includes job vacancies, likely duration and wage rates. For farmers, they undertake to recruit sufficient labour and sometimes to vet for skill and aptitude. Hostels make a profit by filling beds (dormitory accommodation costs between A$120 and A$180 a week) and sometimes by charging a daily fee of A$5 to A$8 to transport WHMs to work. The imperative of filling beds causes some hostels to claim harvest work is available when it is not. Such hostels get a bad reputation. An English backpacker described how 'we were promised six to eight hours a day, and six to seven days a week. We only do two hours a day, four days a week' (Mildura focus group, 07 Feb 2013); others described how they could be kept 'waiting weeks for work' (Mildura focus group, 06 Feb 2013). With a limited budget, and the need to complete 88 full days of work to achieve a second year visa, such misleading information is resented among backpackers. They can wait for work to become available, or they can travel to another regional location with no greater certainty of fair treatment.

Other hostels, however, take their job intermediary role more seriously, including vetting WHMs for suitability (Interview, 24 January 2013), and restricting alcohol to ensure WHMs are fit for
early morning work (Interview, 11 November 2013). However good a hostel may be, its success depends on farmers seeking labour. Many hostels are finding demand for labour (and beds) is falling because farmers are recruiting undocumented workers whose contractor provides private housing. One example – a caravan park in the Goulburn Valley – contracted its operations from two sites to one, and was considering closing after being squeezed out by ‘dodgy contractors who cram 25 illegal workers in a house, if they are nice give them a mattress, and charge each one A$85 to A$125 a week rent’ (Interview, 15 January 2014).

Where contractor employment prevails, workers may be employed through contractors or labour hire agencies, both of which offer administrative advantages to farmers but were viewed unfavourably by focus group participants and survey respondents. Contractors paid harvest workers lower wages than farmers, and had a reputation for unreliable payment of wages, including non-payment. At the extreme of the spectrum are illegal contractors, who:38

... work with agents/facilitators overseas to recruit workers... and farmers are very willing to abrogate responsibility to these labour hire contractors including with regard to the extent to which they employ illegal workers.

Subcontracting arrangements and intra-ethnic exploitation are not unique to horticulture, particularly where they involve exploitation of recently arrived immigrants, or those with poor English language skills. They have been historically prevalent in the clothing and textile industry39 and have emerged more recently in the service sector as visa approval processes have become less rigorous.40

Information on illegal contractors is difficult to obtain. However, reports from government inquiries and other sources agree on how illegal contracting works. The most authoritative account comes from the Howells Report, which had access to closed files on illegal workers held by the Department of Immigration.33 Howells’ account of offshore recruitment observed:33

There are many people who come to Australia on a tourist visa... but who work to support their stay. This method... has proved reasonably successful and so it becomes attractive for organisers to arrange for tourist visas and passage and then to arrange work and some accommodation. A person then meets them on arrival and takes them to a workplace... They may not actually meet the employer. Rather they are ‘paid’ by the intermediary... and may move from one workplace to another.

This system is attractive to horticulturalists because it relieves them of the burden of employment paperwork and the need to discipline or communicate with workers, many of whom are Asian and cannot speak English. It can also yield lower labour costs and higher productivity because, as one hostel operator claimed, ‘Asians are disciplined and hard working and take care to get the job right’ (Interview, 24 January 2013).

The Howells Report criticised a growing reliance on this source of labour, saying the presence of these workers:33

... is very often organised by intermediaries who abuse and exploit these workers... these intermediaries are very often involved in tax and welfare fraud and breaches of industrial, health and safety and other laws.
The business of contracting is so lucrative and unregulated that abuses appear to be rife, with criminality often linked to the exploitation of members of closed ethnic communities by labour hire contractors.38 Labour contracting systems in Australia are unregulated beyond standard employer obligations. Illegal contractors are labelled as such because of their reliance on undocumented workers. Farmers, on the other hand, have until recent times been able to draw on such contractors with impunity. In 2013, migration laws were amended so that businesses could no longer claim a defence that they were unaware undocumented workers were employed.41 More recent changes have allowed farmers to rely on their contractor’s advice regarding the legal status of their workers, provided that their written contract specifies that they will only accept documented workers.42 The effectiveness of these amendments has not been yet been assessed; anecdotal evidence suggests the number of undocumented workers has continued to grow unabated.

There are important points of contrast between the experiences of WHM’s and undocumented workers in the labour market. First, most WHM’s are hired directly by farmers and need good job search data to locate vacancies. Experienced WHM’s are great consumers of labour market information from both formal and informal sources, aided by being generally well educated with adequate English.24 In contrast, undocumented workers generally depend on contractors to find them work. As a result, they are starved of labour market information, although their employers (the contractors) are not. They cannot find their own jobs, are unaware of health and safety entitlements, have poor English to access formal information sources, and may be too vulnerable to bullying or deportation to utilise labour market information. In effect, the labour market has become fractured into two tiers, the one operating primarily through direct hire by farmers with well-informed participants, while the other is run by illegal contractors who control a workforce with little access to job information and no freedom to act independently.

OSH in horticulture: regulation and risk

The exchange of job information covers more than just work availability and wage rates. It includes OSH regulations and risks. While OSH information may seem unimportant to farmers and workers during the hiring process, this changes after employment has commenced. The case of Jessica Pera – an inexperienced 24-year-old German backpacker – illustrates the point. Jessica died in December 2009 on her second day picking tomatoes on a farm near Childers in Queensland. Her employer, Barbera Farms, was fined A$25,000 for failing to supply drinking water to minimise the effects of dehydration.43

Workplace health and safety standards throughout Australian horticulture are regulated by state-based Workplace Health and Safety Acts (the Acts) that mostly apply the federal ‘model Act’. Two exceptions exist – the states of Victoria and Western Australia. These states have not adopted the national model of workplace health and safety laws, although their laws specify similar obligations, thereby creating the same practical obligations on employers, contractors (including labour hire) and workers.

This legislation imposes uniform obligations on ‘persons conducting a business or undertaking’ (the expression which replaced ‘employers’ when the federal ‘model Act’ came into effect in 2012). Such persons are obliged to ensure the health and safety of workers while working in the business or undertaking, ‘so far as is reasonably practicable’. This obligation extends beyond the persons’ employees to workers employed by contractors and labour hire agencies, including a requirement to consult with all workers, notwithstanding their employment by another party. In horticulture, both farmers, and contractors providing workers to farms, have to ensure the health and safety of the workforce. When farmers hire contractors, both parties are obliged to
co-ordinate activities to ensure that either the farmer or the contractor is taking the necessary steps to eliminate risks and protect workers. They may, for example, agree on which party will provide OSH training to avoid duplication of the others' activities. Australian legislation is comprehensive, with coverage applying to all farm workplaces and to all workers, whether hired directly or through contractors.

The Acts also set out a comprehensive list of duties towards workers. Of particular relevance here are obligations with respect to:

- providing and maintaining a risk-free work environment
- a safe system of work
- adequate facilities for the welfare of workers
- the provision of information, training, instruction and supervision
- the safe handling and storage of substances
- safe plant and structures.

Employers are expected to eliminate risks to health and safety, and where this is not reasonably practicable, to minimise the risks. Workers also have obligations under the Acts. These include an obligation to take 'reasonable care' with respect to their own health and safety; that their conduct does not adversely affect the health and safety of others; and that they comply and co-operate with health and safety policies and instructions.

The importance of regulating farm OSH is underlined by the industry's poor record. Farm work is not safe. In 2007/8, the incidence of workers' compensation claims in agriculture, forestry and fishing (24 per 1,000 workers) exceeded Australia's two other most dangerous industries – construction (22 per 1,000) and mining (18 per 1,000). Fatalities were lower than in construction, but still averaged 16.5 per 1,000 workers between 2008/9 and 2010/11, or seven times the national fatality rate.

The causes of severe OSH incidents reflect the high level of mechanisation in Australian agriculture. On average, one person a year now dies falling from a horse, while 33 are killed by vehicles and machinery, including aircraft, tractors, quad bikes and motorcycles. OSH authorities are correspondingly 'vehicle and machinery' focused, although they also seek to promote awareness of a wider range of risks. For example, WorkSafe Victoria produces a 'Horticulture safety guide', which provides advice on how to minimise the risks associated with a comprehensive list of hazards, including:

- working with and around machinery (tractors, quad bikes, elevated work platforms)
- environmental hazards (heat stress, sunburn and cold)
- isolation in remote locations
- pruning (including the use of hand-held secateurs, saws and chainsaws)
- chemicals
- manual handling
- fruit-picking ladders and working at heights.

The challenge OSH agencies face has been to ensure farmers and contractors act on advice they are given about risks. It has been suggested that raising farmer awareness of OSH risks remains difficult because of identified cultural factors, including resistance to external interference, individualism, and intolerance for information that does not appear immediately relevant. Fragar et al. describe a range of ways that farmers can improve OSH, including design.
interventions (such as a roll-over protection system on tractors) and farm safety audits. However, horticulturists and contractors must go further than adopting safe design and complying with audits; they also have a duty to provide information, training, instruction and supervision on a range of matters, including safe work practices. This creates additional challenges. WHM harvest workers may be unreceptive to OSH information and training. They fall into identified 'at risk' groups because of the dangers of their industry, their youth, and short job tenure. There is evidence that questions the effectiveness of OSH training targeted at them. Thus, there are several points at which the flow of OSH information and training can be interrupted, causing it to fall short of achieving its intended purpose.

OSH risks and responses: the view from below
In this section we look at focus group and survey evidence to uncover harvest workers’ perceptions of, and responses to, OSH risk. We distinguish between hiring arrangements (hired by a farmer or contractor), and payment systems (hourly or output-based wages) where these are associated with different OSH risks. Both are well-documented sources of risk in other industries. Subcontracting, often characterised by economic pressures, disorganisation and regulatory failure, has been associated with increased OSH risks in industries such as clothing manufacturing, mining and advanced technological processes, such as aeronautics. Studies of piece rate payment systems reveal similar findings. Among garment workers, for example, musculoskeletal strain is more prevalent among piece workers, for whom the risks of performing highly repetitious work are compounded by the need to work quickly. Studies of truck drivers have similarly found that drivers paid by the trip are more likely to suffer fatigue, and have an increased risk of motor vehicle accidents. The findings here are consistent with those studies; the pressures to harvest quickly and continuously, including in extreme weather, contributed to health and safety considerations being foregone.

Focus groups quickly established three common opinions among young WHM harvest workers – that all farm work is safe, hazard avoidance is common sense, and incidents will not happen to them. However, focus group discussions also went on to reveal risks. The most common complaints concerned back pain (‘strawberries do your back in’); falls (stretching to reach apples); dehydration (followed by hosing down between the rows of grapes); blisters and skinned fingers (‘you have to work through the pain barrier picking peas’); and scratches (‘even when you wear gloves to pick oranges’). These low-level injuries were accepted as part of the experience of harvesting work: ‘everyone gets back pain; just suck it up’ (Mildura focus group, 06 March 2013). Farmers commonly affirmed this view: ‘everyone gets back pain’. As one worker put it:

They (the farmers) don’t care about you – just enough for you to come back tomorrow… we’re told if you are still sore by the time you return to the hostel, you may have a problem. (Mildura focus group, 07 March 2013)

These workers coped through a sense of camaraderie supported by lay solutions, such as one worker who took ‘endless painkillers’ while picking cauliflowers for 12 hours per day (Mildura focus group, 07 March 2013).

Survey respondents’ experiences were consistent with those reported in focus groups. They regularly experienced low-level injuries and near misses, irrespective of whether they were employed by farmers or contractors. Table 2 shows survey data on the relative incidence of injuries, minor incidents and near misses.
Half the respondents often or always experienced body stressing, indicated by sore backs, and sore arms, shoulders and/or hands. A substantial minority regularly experienced cuts, grazes and scratches, and one-third often or always developed blisters on their hands. Over-exposure to sun and heat were common and one in 10 reported frequent exposure to chemicals. In one extreme case, a worker was hospitalised following chemical exposure. Hazards with potentially severe consequences, such as near misses involving farm tractors or machinery and falls from ladders, were less common.

Respondents' exposure to hazards mostly reflects the physically demanding nature of their tasks and the harsh environment in which they are undertaken. Fruit and vegetable picking is not amenable to mechanisation, and harvesting work must be undertaken when the product is ready, usually in high summer. However, both farmers and contractors have a legal obligation to control or minimise these risks. To minimise muscular strains and sprains, for example, they are obliged to train workers in manual handling techniques, provide sufficient rest breaks, consider task rotation, and ensure tubs of products are not overfilled nor lifted over shoulder height. These simple and inexpensive administrative controls have been shown to reduce the prevalence of muscular strain when consistently applied, but were not evident in this study.

Farmers and contractors are also obliged to provide personal protective equipment to minimise the risk of injuries, such as scratches, grazes, blisters, and sunburn, as well as provide workers with cool, palatable drinking water. The responses in Table 2 suggest a low level of compliance with these obligations. Farmers appear responsive to high-hazard risks, such as separating workers from machinery and providing stable ladders, but leave workers to shoulder the responsibility for managing those risks which farmers regard as 'common sense' and 'part of the job' of harvesting work (Interview, 09 February 2013).

The extent to which workers received health and safety instructions, and were provided with personal protective equipment, reflects this approach. Survey respondents were asked whether, and when, they were informed about the need for protections against environment risks and received health and safety instructions. Table 3 provides their responses.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue (n = 275)</th>
<th>Frequency of exposure</th>
<th>Never/rarely (%)</th>
<th>Sometimes (%)</th>
<th>Often/Always (%)</th>
<th>Total (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sore backs</td>
<td></td>
<td>19.3</td>
<td>29.1</td>
<td>51.6</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sore arms, shoulders and/or hands</td>
<td></td>
<td>19.6</td>
<td>30.2</td>
<td>50.2</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cuts, scratches, grazes to arms, legs or face</td>
<td></td>
<td>20.7</td>
<td>36.4</td>
<td>44.9</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blisters on hands</td>
<td></td>
<td>33.5</td>
<td>32.7</td>
<td>33.8</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunburn</td>
<td></td>
<td>36.0</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>26.5</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dehydration</td>
<td></td>
<td>47.6</td>
<td>34.5</td>
<td>17.8</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Almost being hit by tractor/farm machinery</td>
<td></td>
<td>82.9</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Almost falling off a ladder</td>
<td></td>
<td>78.5</td>
<td>14.9</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exposure to chemicals and/or pesticides</td>
<td></td>
<td>65.5</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Arriving at a farm with adequate protection – such as a long-sleeved shirt, sun hat, UV sun blockout and sufficient drinking water – is an important preventative measure, but almost one-third of respondents were not advised to do so before commencing their job. Notwithstanding statutory obligations, workers could not depend on farmers or contractors to provide these protections (40 per cent of respondents said the farmer or contractor never or rarely provided UV blockout for sun protection).

Turning to safety training, all but 14 per cent of survey respondents received some form of safety instructions. While instructions of more than 5 minutes duration were most common, the quality of the instruction is questionable and appears to have been limited to immediate work tasks, with half of all respondents reporting that they were not informed about the risks they may encounter. Although government OSH agencies advise employers to treat harvest workers as ‘new, inexperienced workers’ because their seasonal employment is associated with a lack of familiarity with the workplace and associated risks, one in five farm employees and 36 per cent of contractor employees believed their training was not sufficient to perform work safely. A further 18 per cent of farm employees and 31 per cent of contract employees were ambivalent about its effectiveness (p < .01). Examples provided by survey respondents illustrate the brevity of information provided: ‘told to keep clear of machinery and to avoid putting hands/arms into moving conveyor belts and so on. Not very much information really’; and ‘only that I may get incredibly hot and would always need to keep rehydrated from my own supply’. There were some exceptions. A Tasmanian orchardist, for example, gave a 30-minute safety talk before the start of each working day; and a hostel showed pickers an industry-developed safety training DVD before commencing work. These were rare instances.

Focus group participants reported a strong reliance on word-of-mouth communication about clothing, water and sun protection. But such informal communication is not systematic, comprehensive, or necessarily accurate. If workers are unaware of the need for protections before commencing a new job, and the farmer does not provide those protections, they are immediately at risk. To illustrate, in one case a backpacker who had arrived from England only three days earlier was told by fellow hostel stayers that he needed to take enough drinking water

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Information provided</th>
<th>When information was provided</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Before starting at farm (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>On first day at farm (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not told at all (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need to wear protective clothing</td>
<td>56.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>302</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need for sun protection</td>
<td>53.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>302</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need to carry drinking fluids</td>
<td>54.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>33.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>302</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety Instructions:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brief (&lt;5 minutes)</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>302</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detailed (&gt; 5 minutes)</td>
<td>21.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>40.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>302</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health and safety risks they may</td>
<td>21.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>encounter</td>
<td>28.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>302</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issue</td>
<td>Frequency of event</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Never/rarely (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Farm employee (n = 195) Contractor employee (n = 75) Farm employee (n = 195) Contractor employee (n = 75)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discouraged from stopping to drink water (^1)</td>
<td>60.6%          41.3%            23.3%          34.7%          16.1%          24.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working in extreme heat (35 degrees-plus) (^2)</td>
<td>41.5%          30.7%            28.5%          22.7%          30.1%          46.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drinking water supplied (^3)</td>
<td>21.8%          39.2%            17.1%          27.0%          59.1%          29.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raise OSH issues without negative consequences (^4)</td>
<td>26.4%          31.1%            25.9%          32.4%          37.3%          20.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^1\) \(\chi^2 = 8.127, \text{DF} 2, \ p < .05\)

\(^2\) \(\chi^2 = 6.614, \text{DF} 2, \ p < .05\)

\(^3\) \(\chi^2 = 18.605, \text{DF} 3, \ p < .01\)

\(^4\) \(\chi^2 = 7.534, \text{DF} 3, \ p < .05\)
for the day. He interpreted this to mean about 750 millilitres of water (barely half of what was required); by midday, his co-workers had to hose him down for 20 minutes under the shade of a tree to overcome dehydration and heat stress.

Many WHMs come from cooler climates and have not experienced working in extreme heat for extended hours. The assumption that their 'common sense' will ensure they protect themselves from exposure is misplaced.

Turning to ways in which work organisation impacted on WHMs' OSH experience, the two least preferred employment practices encountered by WHMs were being forced to work for a contractor (when farmers were not hiring their own workers) and being paid piece rates. Both practices were regarded as unfair by WHMs, and both carried greater risks. Table 4 provides survey responses on four OSH issues on which employers had discretion, and where significant differences were found between the practices of farmers and contractors.

Those employed by contractors experienced less discretion and endured more intense work pressures, measured by being discouraged from drinking water when it took too long to access the water (such as having to walk 5 minutes) and working in temperatures greater than 35 degrees Celsius (focus group participants employed by farmers reported a standard practice of finishing work when this temperature was reached). These responses are consistent with the pressures that flow from the contractor promising the farmer a defined output within a set timeframe. Contractors' employees were also half as likely as farmers' employees to be regularly supplied with water by the farmer, suggesting farmers pass responsibility for workers' safety over to contractors. These practices are consistent with the pressures and risks associated with contracting more generally.52–54 In addition, having to choose between working for a contractor or not work at all was a source of resentment among WHMs. They received lower rates of pay, experienced greater work pressures, and ran a greater risk of not being paid.8 Enforcement processes for lost wages were mostly regarded as futile; steps to reduce OSH risks could only be traded off against job loss.

A second dimension of work organisation is payment systems. Around 40 per cent of survey respondents, irrespective of whether they were hired by a farmer or contractor, were paid piece rates. Their average hourly earnings were significantly lower than those paid hourly rates (A$11.69 compared to A$16.20 for hourly rates) and, as shown in Table 5, they responded to incentives to speed up production by taking more risks.

Those paid piece rates were, for example:

• four times more likely to often, or always, not stabilise a ladder before climbing on it (noting that orchards typically have uneven terrain)
• two times more likely to work in extreme heat
• three times more likely to carry excessive loads such as climbing a ladder with a heavy bag of fruit
• two times more likely to be discouraged from taking lunch breaks.

The nature of harvesting work means that the few short-cuts available to workers to increase output and earnings are inextricably linked to poorer health and safety. Focus group participants told how they would not stop picking to take meal breaks or access drinking water, even when cold drinking water was supplied (Mildura focus group, 06 March 2013). Others told of pickers urinating in the fields rather than losing time by walking to the toilet amenities (Maffra focus
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue (n = 268)</th>
<th>Frequency of event</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hourly wage</td>
<td>Piece rates</td>
<td>Hourly wage</td>
<td>Piece rates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not stabilising ladder before climbing on it</td>
<td>84.2%</td>
<td>62.1%</td>
<td>11.8%</td>
<td>24.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working in extreme heat (35 degrees-plus)</td>
<td>46.7%</td>
<td>26.7%</td>
<td>28.3%</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carrying excessive loads</td>
<td>65.1%</td>
<td>37.9%</td>
<td>23.7%</td>
<td>30.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discouraged from taking lunch breaks (n = 259)</td>
<td>45.0%</td>
<td>20.7%</td>
<td>27.2%</td>
<td>30.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 $^2 = 17.886$, DF 2, $p < .01$
2 $^2 = 17.332$, DF 2, $p < .01$
3 $^2 = 24.176$, DF 2, $p < .01$
4 $^2 = 23.296$, DF 3, $p < .01$
One apple picker who earned more than twice as much as her hostel companions also fell from her ladder three times in one week (Huonville focus group, 30 April 2013). As has been observed in relation to other low-paid piece workers, 'the immediate benefits of a high level of production for piece workers are a certainty that can be calculated, while an accident is only considered a possibility'.55 The pressures to work quicker and continuously were acute, especially given their low rates of pay. These workers faced unpredictable non-working periods, as well as the need to travel long distances to locate new jobs – time that was spent without an income. Notwithstanding the intensity of their work, the common retort among WHMs was that 'no one earns enough to save' (Mildura focus group, 06 February 2013).

Were harvest workers aware of the risks they were taking? Focus group participants treated such risks as 'part of the job', which could be managed through common sense. Survey responses showed that harvest workers were often poorly placed to make informed decisions about such risks. Asked whether they had performed tasks which they believed to be unsafe, 86 per cent said they had not. Of those who answered in the affirmative, their descriptions of unsafe tasks pointed to highly dangerous work carrying an immediate risk, such as 'working in close proximity to tractors with an obstructed view', 'working in a field sprayed with chemicals at the same time', 'climbing broken ladders', 'working in thunderstorms', 'being in an isolated paddock alone without phone coverage' and 'animal baits (poisonous) on bare skin'. The longer-term risks associated with continuous back and limb pain, and excessive ultraviolet exposure, were either not understood or simply not contemplated.

A small number (15) of WHMs incurred workplace injuries that required medical attention. Of these, three involved farm machinery, three arose from environmental exposure (sunburn and heat), two involved animals (spider and insect bites), two involved mango sap burns, and one was hospitalised with chemical poisoning. Of these, six believed their inexperience with the outdoor environment caused their injury, and only two attributed their injury to insufficient safety training. All workers in Australia are eligible for workers' compensation (the payment of medical costs and lost wages) irrespective of visa status, yet 40 per cent of those requiring medical attention paid their own medical costs. Of those whose injury prevented them from working, two-thirds were not compensated while off work.

Survey respondents included a minority of young Australian workers (15 per cent), who might be expected to fare better than WHMs less familiar with the legal environment supporting health and safety in Australia. They were more likely to claim they understood their rights and entitlements (56.8 per cent agreed, compared to 44.5 per cent of WHMs), yet their experience of harvesting work, including their exposure to risks, was similar to that of WHMs. Like WHMs, their expectations regarding healthy and safe harvesting work practices appeared commensurately low and their higher level of understanding of the OSH legal environment was not translated into safer working arrangements. Their employment precarity, and lack of discretion in the way work was performed, meant their circumstances did not differ from those with far less understanding of the regulatory environment.

Discussion and conclusions
Temporary migrant workers form a small but significant part of the precarious workforce, crossing national borders to take jobs that cannot be filled by the native workforce. Horticultural work, because of its seasonal nature, is especially reliant on such workers who may, depending on national immigration policies, be documented or undocumented. Australian horticulture has, in the past two decades, become reliant on both documented migrants (usually WHMs) and undocumented migrant workers. While nominally afforded employment protection
in law, their knowledge of OSH rights and capacity to claim them is open to question. It was noted that a two-tier labour market exists, one level (Australians and WHMs) which is better informed about jobs and able to access information about rights, and another level (undocumented workers hired by contractors) living in a clandestine environment where they cannot access information about their rights, are intimidated, and would be unlikely to claim OSH protections. The evidence reported in this paper does not inform us of the OSH risks experienced by undocumented workers, who are difficult for researchers to access.

The provision of information about OSH is important because farming (including horticulture) is a high-risk industry with a very high incidence of fatalities, workers’ compensation claims, and a wide range of risk factors. Legislation requires horticulturalists and contractors to both provide a safe working environment and to provide workers with OSH information and training. While there are copious industry-level OSH resources, the extent to which these filter down to the workforce through comprehensive and accessible training is open to question.

While focus group evidence found harvest workers to be initially over-confident about OSH risks, they also spoke of daily pain that mostly dissipated with overnight rest. Likewise, a majority of respondents routinely experienced sore backs and limbs, cuts, blisters, and heat stress problems. More rare were dangerous encounters with machinery, chemicals, or falls from ladders—the likely causes of severe injuries. This pattern is symptomatic of an industry which has routinised worker suffering, despite public promotion of a ‘fit and healthy lifestyle’. Given the young and inexperienced workforce on which horticulture now depends, the need for farmers and contractors to educate workers about their exposure to risks, and manage that exposure, cannot be taken lightly.

It is clear, however, that not only do many farmers and contractors pay cursory attention to OSH instructions, they contribute to OSH risks through a preference for output-based payments which encourage workers to take greater OSH risks to increase earnings. The low level of piece rate earnings reported by focus group and survey participants highlights problems with the way minimum piece rates are currently regulated. As long as piece rates fail to provide a living wage, workers will continue to take chances with their safety.

The contractor system also appears associated with work intensification under hostile conditions and with weaker environmental protection (such as water and sun blockout). Farmers place their confidence in contractors to manage the harvesting work, but mistakenly pass their OSH responsibilities onto contractors who, in turn, shirk it. The failure of both parties to assume OSH responsibilities suggests there is a considerable need for education about OSH laws. While almost 80 per cent of survey respondents received some level of OSH training, most often this training was brief and superficial, leaving WHMs poorly placed to recognise risks. Survey respondents instead relied on word-of-mouth information, which could be unreliable. Horticulture appears to suffer from a minimalist and unsystematic approach to meeting legal OSH obligations.

The findings in this study are similar to those identified in other studies of agricultural temporary migrant workers. Like other temporary migrant workers, WHMs perform labour intensive harvesting work that often requires continual bending, and is associated with back, neck and upper limb pain. The work is performed in extreme heat, exposing them to heat-related illness (and in some instances tropical lightning storms). Few receive sufficient training to understand the risks to which they are exposed, or to act on those risks, such as taking breaks, rotating tasks and remaining hydrated. Piece rate payments also discourage such actions. Most temporary migrant workers move from farm to farm, and district to district, without being employed long
enough at any one farm to receive sufficient training. While translating health and safety materials into the mother tongue of migrant workers is a common (minimum) recommendation to facilitate safer practices in most high-income economies, the sheer range of WHM's nationalities on Australian farms impedes such an approach. Instead, farmers and contractors rely, mistakenly, on others to provide such information.

Unlike migrant harvesting workers in other high-income countries, however, most WHMs employed on Australian farms are well-educated, do not have the economic pressures of supporting dependents, and only perform the work for the minimum time required (88 days) to receive a second year visa. Their higher education levels do not appear influential; their daily experience differs little from lesser educated local workers. Their relatively short-term exposure to hazards, however, may offset the risk of injuries commonly found in other studies of migrant agriculture workers. The musculoskeletal disorders associated with long-term exposure to harvesting tasks, for example, may not eventuate for these workers as they are generally not exposed to these tasks for more than one season.

This project has only been able to identify immediate risks and hazardous practices experienced by WHMs, not longer-term exposures, injuries or health implications. A significant minority of survey respondents, for example, reported being exposed to chemicals or pesticides, but it is not possible to establish whether that exposure was sufficiently enduring or substantial to produce longer-term disabilities. Only tracking of the longer-term health and injury outcomes of WHMs can overcome this information gap.

The transitory, short-term exposure of WHMs to the risks of horticultural work, nevertheless, does not alleviate their exposure to acute traumas and extreme environmental risks. A significant minority of focus group participants and survey respondents reported falling off ladders; receiving knife injuries requiring stitches; bites that required medical treatment; and hospitalisation from chemical exposure. At least one fatality among WHMs has occurred from heat exposure in the last five years. There is unfortunately no systematic data collection which identifies the visa status of injured workers; such incidents are only revealed through anecdotal sources and regional newspapers.

It also noteworthy that undocumented workers employed on Australian farms are likely to be exposed for much longer periods and, in turn, more likely to experience the permanent disorders evident among overseas temporary migrant workers. Their experiences have not been documented here, or elsewhere, but are likely to be compounded by their constant employment through contractors, as well as the risks (physical and psychological) associated with the threat of deportation.

Over the past few decades, changes in Australian visa arrangements have enabled the Australian horticultural industry to draw increasingly on temporary migrant workers to perform harvesting work that local workers have largely abandoned. The evidence in this paper points to the OSH risks encountered by these workers, and the accentuating affects of work organisation, especially payment systems and the unsystematic nature of compliance with OSH laws. Unlike temporary migrants performing harvesting work elsewhere, the workers exposed to these hazards are unlikely to return to this type of work after one picking season. They have the option of returning to professional positions in their home country after their travels are complete. Yet their youth and the one-off nature of this experience arguably contributes to their cavalier attitude towards the risks to which they are exposed. This leaves these workers especially vulnerable. Among them, an unfortunate minority will bear the scars for many years into the future.
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