

Under the shadow of structural violence: Work and family dynamics for Latina farmworkers in southwestern Idaho

Rebecca L. Som Castellano,^{a*} Lisa Meierotto,^b and Cynthia L. Curl^c
Boise State University

Submitted June 18, 2021 / Revised November 10, 2021, and February 4, 2022 / Accepted February 4, 2022 /
Published online April 8, 2022

Citation: Som Castellano, R. L., Meierotto, L., & Curl, C. L. (2022). Under the shadow of structural violence:
Work and family dynamics for Latina farmworkers in southwestern Idaho. *Journal of Agriculture, Food Systems,
and Community Development*, 11(3), 157–176. <https://doi.org/10.5304/jafscd.2022.113.002>

Copyright © 2022 by the Authors. Published by the Lyson Center for Civic Agriculture and Food Systems. Open access under CC-BY license

Abstract

Latina farmworkers play an essential role as agricultural laborers while at the same time managing responsibilities at home. However, little attention has been paid to these women's lives, including how they manage the multiple roles they occupy. This is problematic in part because occupying multiple roles, particularly roles that may conflict with each other, can negatively influence well-being, including physical, mental, emotional, and economic well-being. In this research, we examine the

work-family interface for Latina farmworkers, asking: What factors shape the experiences of Latina farmworkers as they navigate the work-family interface? Building from a broader multi-method and interdisciplinary study, this paper utilizes interview and focus group data to examine Latinas laboring in the agricultural fields of Idaho. Findings suggest that many supports in the work and family domains (e.g., supportive co-workers, friends, and

Funding Disclosure

Support for this research came from the Mountain West Clinical Translational Research—Infrastructure Network and the National Institute of General Medical Sciences of the National Institutes of Health under Award Number 2U54GM104944; the Boise State University School of Public Service Research Grant Program; and National Institute of Environmental Health Sciences of the National Institutes of Health under Award Number K01ES028745.

Conflicts of Interest

The authors declare no conflict of interest. The funders had no role in the design of the study; in the collection, analyses, or interpretation of data; in the writing of the manuscript; or in the decision to publish the results.

^{a*} *Corresponding author:* Rebecca Som Castellano, Associate Professor, Sociology Department, College of Arts and Sciences, Boise State University, 1910 University Drive; Boise, Idaho 83725-1945 USA; rsomcastellano@boisestate.edu

^b Lisa Meierotto, Associate Professor, School of Public Service, Boise State University, Boise, ID; lisameierotto@boisestate.edu

^c Cynthia L. Curl, Associate Professor, Department of Community and Environmental Health, College of Health Sciences, Boise State University, Boise, ID; cynthiacurl@boisestate.edu

family) can aid Latina farmworkers in fulfilling the various forms of labor they are responsible for. However, several family and work demands (e.g., single parenthood, difficult work hours and conditions) make it challenging for Latina farmworkers to fulfill the various forms of labor they are responsible for. Structural violence and intersectionality shape these women's experiences with both supports and demands in the work and family domains. Relatedly, we find that organizational, community, and geographic contexts shape the experiences of Latina farmworkers in fulfilling labor in the public and private spheres. In particular, race and gender, immigration and documentation status, community organizations, and rurality all shape the navigation of the work-family interface for these farmworkers.

Keywords

Gender, Latina Farmworker, Intersectionality, Rurality, Structural Violence, Work-Family Interface

Introduction

Across the U.S. and beyond, women are increasingly working in agriculture (Wright & Annes, 2016). Many factors have driven this feminization of agriculture, including changing norms around gender and work and shifts in rural labor markets. Idaho has one of the fastest-growing populations in the U.S. (U.S. Census Bureau, 2018). As Idaho's population has grown, work opportunities have risen in more lucrative sectors of the economy, particularly construction (Idaho Department of Labor, 2019), which can be a draw for men who previously worked in agriculture (Meierotto & Som Castellano, 2019). Further, Idaho's dairy industry, whose workforce is predominantly Latinx, has experienced structural transformation and increased industrialization (Salant et al., 2017), drawing Latinos from fieldwork to dairy production. These transitions, in turn, provide fieldwork opportunities for women. In addition, at times women are considered 'flexible labor,' and some view women as being more reliable, more precise, and possessing a stronger work ethic (Meierotto & Som Castellano, 2019).

Farm work can provide income, meaning, social connection, and empowerment for Latinas (Meierotto & Som Castellano, 2019). At the same time, farm work can be dangerous and insecure (Holmes, 2013; Murphy et al., 2015). Farmworkers, including women, can have high stress levels, and agricultural work can be detrimental to physical and mental health (Arcury et al., 2018; Castañeda & Zavella, 2003; Habib & Fathallah, 2012).

In addition to their labor in the public sphere, Latina farmworkers are often responsible for most (if not all) of the household labor, including child-care. Family obligations can be of great importance among Latinx households (Kossek et al., 2005), where traditional gender roles often persist (Beutell & Schmeer, 2013). As Schmalzbauer notes, "Mexican women [living in the U.S.] today often live difficult, isolated lives while charged with ensuring their families' survival and well-being" (2014, p. 5).

The demands of farm work, which occur in the public sphere, may not be well-matched with other forms of labor for which Latina farmworkers are responsible, including gendered labor in the private sphere. This conflict between work and family domains can be detrimental to the well-being of this population, including physical, emotional, psychological, social, and economic well-being. However, despite the feminization of agriculture and the central role that Latinas play in the agricultural system, limited research focuses on the experiences of Latina farmworkers. Some scholarship has examined the experiences of Latinas in farmworking families, highlighting their marginalization, poor health status, health risks, and exposure to sexual harassment and assault (e.g., Arcury et al., 2015; Arcury et al., 2018; Castañeda & Zavella, 2003; Grzywacz et al., 2007; Habib & Fathallah, 2012; Kossek et al., 2005; Murphy et al., 2015). Yet, this literature rarely focuses on women whom themselves engage in fieldwork. Research on farmworker experiences also often focuses on farmworkers who migrate. However, farmworkers are increasingly settling in, including in Idaho, making homes and building communities (Meierotto & Som Castellano, 2019).¹ Given these trends, it is important to think about the work-life dynamics of

¹ Here we are referring to workers who labor outside of the H-2A system.

Latina farmworkers. Yet literature on work-family dynamics often centers the experience of white, middle-class, cis-gender families. In this research, we focus on the experiences of Latina farmworkers laboring in the fields of Idaho, asking: what factors shape the experiences of Latina farmworkers as they navigate work-family dynamics? This research is important given the central role that farmworkers, including Latina farmworkers, play in national and global food supply chains and the ways in which responsibility for multiple roles can influence well-being, including physical and mental health, economic opportunity, and safety. We hope this research can contribute to policy and programs supporting and protecting farmworkers, particularly Latina farmworkers, in the U.S.

Work-Family Dynamics for Latina Farmworkers

There is a broad literature examining work-family² dynamics, recognizing the critical ways in which the domains of work and family influence each other, creating conflict and enrichment (Kaufman & Taniguchi, 2020; McManus et al., 2002; Robinson et al., 2016). This literature has identified a range of factors that can shape experiences within and between these two domains. For instance, research has found that perceptions of time conflict can vary based on the presence of children and employment level (Stadelmann-Steffen & Oehrli, 2009), which may be particularly important for Latina farmworkers given that their occupational mobility is likely low. As Segura noted, “Occupational mobility or improvement in job status and income can be impeded by social and structural features of the labor market, familial responsibilities, and individual characteristics” (1989, p. 37). Single mothers can experience higher levels of work-family conflict, although some scholars have found that when controlling for variables like social capital and income, the effects of single parenthood on work-family conflict diminish (Ciabattari, 2002; Dziak et al., 2010). Scholarship has also found that work-family conflict can be more

significant for families with lower incomes (Ford, 2010). Together these findings suggest that attention to the experiences of Latina farmworkers and how they experience the work-family interface is important, given the many forms of marginalization and discrimination this population often experiences (Carney, 2015; Meierotto et al., 2020).

Demands and Supports in Work and Family

Scholarship on work-family dynamics has identified work and family demands and supports that may influence navigating roles within and conflict between these domains. Family supports include emotional, attitudinal, financial, and instrumental supports offered by those in the family domain (McManus et al., 2002; Shaffer et al., 2011).³ Family demands are associated with household responsibilities (like chores and childcare) and can influence hours at home, family expectations, and other family stressors that can influence work-family conflict (McManus et al., 2002; Shaffer et al., 2011). Formal work supports can include workplace policies and programs that support workers in meeting family demands, such as flextime policies, childcare provision in the workplace, and level of autonomy (McManus et al., 2002). Informal work supports are related to the attitudes and behaviors of those a person works with, including supervisors and fellow employees (McManus et al., 2002; Shaffer et al., 2011). Finally, work demands refer to the demands associated with a job and may include hours and time pressures, job expectations, flexibility in scheduling, and work location (McManus et al., 2002; Shaffer et al., 2011).

Research on work-family dynamics often focuses on white, middle or upper-class, cis-gender households with two parents and has not sufficiently focused on other groups (Beutell & Schmeer, 2014; Grzywacz et al., 2005; Grzywacz et al., 2007; Kossek et al., 2005; McManus et al., 2002; Powell et al., 2019; Robinson et al., 2016). In turn, traditional work-family conflict frameworks have typically been applied to “non-Hispanic Whites”

² While some relevant literature focuses on work-life rather than work-family, in this study work and family are the primary domains where women engage. For this reason, we are utilizing the language of work-family here.

³ Instrumental supports are tangible, such as providing financial assistance, offering someone a ride or meal, and assisting with finding a job. Attitudinal supports refer here to having family members with a positive attitude (McManus et al., 2002; Shaffer et al., 2011).

and, therefore, may not always be sufficient in framing the work-family dynamics for other populations (Glick, 2010), including populations who are more likely to face racism and institutional discrimination. Powell et al. (2019) call for greater incorporation of culture and diversity, including along the lines of race, ethnicity, and socioeconomic status, when considering work-life dynamics. The centering of other populations in work-family research is important because race and ethnicity can influence work-family conflict (Grzywacz et al., 2007). For instance, racism can shape the types of education and work people have access to, influencing the work domain, the family domain, and interactions between them. Further, the relationship between work and family life can vary by culture, including understandings about the purpose of work, the degrees to which these spheres are separate, and how work may contribute to the family and vice-versa (Hong et al., 2021; Lewis & Beauregard, 2018; Sayer & Fine, 2010).

Scholars have also called for greater consideration of context, including organizational, community, and geographic context (Christiansen et al., 2019; Lewis & Beauregard, 2018). In this paper, we similarly consider how context may influence the work-family dynamic. Organizational context can include unique features of farm labor, including the structural hierarchies on farms, work hours, the conditions of work, and the heavy reliance on immigrants, particularly Mexican-origin immigrants. The organizational context also involves considering the structural violence of this work, which we expand upon below. Further, we challenge the idea of flexibility as always being beneficial; the hours of fieldwork can be highly flexible, but this may make the work-family dynamic more rather than less challenging.

Community context involves considering the role of the community in shaping the work-family dynamic. For instance, living in an immigrant community, including one shaped by fears of deportation and, in turn, social and physical isolation, can influence access to and use of social supports (Meierotto et al., 2020). Moreover, geographic context challenges us to consider how rurality may shape the lives of marginalized women (Christiansen et al., 2019). A useful concept here is spatial

inequality, which focuses on how space and place influence life chances and experiences. Uneven development in rural parts of the U.S. has led to “differential distribution of industries, firms, and jobs across places and in turn, differences in social structural statuses that emerge as people make their livelihoods in particular places” (Kelly & Lobao, 2019, p. 673). Rural places tend to have fewer work opportunities, which may be particularly true for marginalized women (Schafft et al., 2018; Schmalzbauer, 2014), and rural work can involve long commutes to worksites (Christiansen et al., 2019). Further, many of the most dangerous occupations are in rural places (e.g., agriculture, mining). People living in rural places also tend to have lower levels of education, higher rates of poverty, and lower levels of access to social supports (Adua & Beard, 2018; Kelly & Lobao, 2019). Access to childcare, which can be important in helping women navigate work-family conflict, can also be limited (Stier et al., 2012). Finally, experiences with social isolation can be more significant for those residing in rural places and may be particularly acute for those experiencing other forms of marginalization (Schmalzbauer, 2014). These forms of marginalization can be contextualized within the framework of structural violence.

Structural Violence, Intersectionality, and the Context of Labor for Latina Farmworkers

While the concepts of work and family supports and demands can help frame how Latina farmworkers navigate the work and family domains, their experiences with labor in both the public and private spheres are shaped by various forms of marginalization they face, which may not be reflected in this framework. Here we use a theory of structural violence and the concept of intersectionality to further understand how Latina farmworkers may experience the work-family interface.

Latina farmworkers may be more vulnerable to work-family imbalance in part because of structural violence. Structural violence refers to “a series of large-scale forces—ranging from gender inequality to racism and power—which structure unequal access to goods and social services” (Farmer, 1996, p. 369, cited in Carney, 2015, p. 6). The concept of structural violence can help frame our understand-

ing of how social and economic forces, including the jobs available to women, the conditions of those jobs, their opportunities to receive social support and protection, and more, shape the experiences of Latina farmworkers as they navigate the multiple roles they perform in the work and family domains and the interactions between these domains. In addition, structural violence can influence the ways in which, or the degree to which, individuals are able to meet their own needs. For instance, it calls for us to consider how the “social machinery of oppression” (Farmer, 2004) can influence a woman’s ability to take care of her own health.

An intersectional approach provides additional explanatory power here. Initially developed by Kimberlé Crenshaw (1989, 1991), intersectionality asserts that multiple systems of oppression and marginalization intersect to shape life circumstances, including burdens and privileges. Latina farmworkers are subordinated within a global agri-food system that privileges profit over well-being, resulting in poor work conditions such as low pay, contingent labor, and long hours. Latina farmworkers are more likely to engage in this work because they are situated at the bottom of multiple hierarchies, including racial and gender hierarchies. They are further vulnerable because of their actual or perceived citizenship and/or immigration status (Holmes, 2013). These factors intersect to make them often unable to stand up for their rights. For instance, research has found a lack of enforcement of regulatory protections for Latina farmworkers, which some Latina farmworkers refuse to report because of their vulnerability (Curl et al., 2021).

Structural violence and intersectionality also shape the conditions of work for Latinas in the private sphere (Carney, 2015), including their gender-based responsibility for the care of the household and children, in addition to the work they perform in the public sphere. It shapes the ability of women to fulfill normative, gendered expectations around work performance, including what it means to be a good mom or a good wife. In addition, structural violence can influence access to safety nets, such as SNAP (food stamps). Such safety nets can help women manage the various forms of labor they engage in and, in turn, can influence work-family

conflict (Kossek et al., 2005). Structural violence can also increase physical and social isolation, limiting access to support from family, friends, or community organizations (Kossek et al., 2005).

Structural violence further shapes the dynamic relationship between these two domains. For instance, the early and often long hours of farm work may create challenges with childcare. The poverty often inherent in farm work due in part to the racialization of the U.S. workforce and the low wages paid to farmworkers also shapes where farmworkers can live, the conditions of housing, and their access to food.

Together, this literature suggests that Latina farmworkers live and work within a context of social and political marginalization, which shapes the demands and supports that influence their lives. This paper utilizes structural violence and intersectionality, which upholds the notion that Latina farmworkers face a unique set of supports, challenges, and contexts that collectively influence how they experience work and family dynamics.

Challenges navigating work-family dynamics can have important and often negative consequences for women and their families (Hardy et al., 2016; Poms et al., 2016). This may be particularly true for Latina farmworkers, who face a range of intersecting forms of marginalization. By highlighting the experiences of Latina farmworkers engaged in fieldwork in the Intermountain West of Idaho, we argue that supports and demands in the work and family domains are shaped by the structural violence facing our study population and the multiple identities they hold, undermining their overall experience and well-being.

Methods

Building from an ongoing ethnographic project, data for this research comes from an interdisciplinary study aimed at identifying challenges to well-being among Latina farmworkers. For this broader study, a research team consisting of three faculty members, one professional staff member, and three graduate students examined a range of factors influencing well-being among Latina farmworkers, including social, cultural, and workplace-related factors. We collected data via surveys, focus groups, semi-structured interviews, and urinary

biomonitoring.⁴ Given the nature of the inquiry presented here, we are presenting qualitative data collected through five focus groups with 22 women, interviews with 11 Latina farmworkers, and interviews with five farmworker advocates. Six of the women who participated in the focus groups also participated in one-on-one interviews. In these interviews and focus groups, we asked questions related to the challenges of navigating work and family life. In addition, some of the survey data collected are used to provide basic descriptions below of the women who participated in this research.

The farmworker interviews were semi-structured and focused on understanding women's experiences with farm work, including the benefits and challenges of this labor and how this labor related to family and other life responsibilities. For example, we asked questions like, "Do you have children? Can you tell us a bit about how you manage childcare?" Interviews with farmworker advocates aimed to capture the advocates' perceptions about challenges and resource availability and use. Focus groups involved discussions and activities to understand participants' definitions of well-being, the dimensions of well-being that were of greatest concern to them, and challenges in the work and family domains related to well-being. For example, we asked participants, "What challenges do you experience to your well-being?"

To participate in the study, women had to be 18 years of age or older and identify as Latina or Hispanic farmworkers. Women were recruited for participation in the interviews and focus groups when survey data was collected, via snowball sampling, contacts with advocacy organizations, and targeted posting of recruitment flyers. We gained IRB approval before data collection, and we obtained informed consent via a signed consent process.

The research team conducted interviews and focus groups between October 2018 and June 2019 with women 18 years and older across Southwestern Idaho who identified as Latina or Hispanic farmworkers. Interviews lasted between 45 and 90 minutes and were conducted at a location chosen

by the participants. Interviews occurred in either English or Spanish, based on participants' preferences. Focus groups occurred across rural Southwestern Idaho, most often in community centers. The focus groups were conducted primarily in Spanish. Members of the research team took notes to capture the main ideas discussed and the context of the interactions. Audio recordings were also used to capture this qualitative data. The notes and audio recordings were then translated into English as needed and transcribed.

On average, farmworkers interviewed were 42 (SD 13.8) years of age and had worked in agriculture for 15 years. Over 70 percent reported a household income of less than US\$34,999, and over 35 percent of respondents reported a household income of less than US\$20,000 per year. On average, they worked seven months of the year in agriculture. All but two reported having lived in their current residence for the past 12 months. The women who participated in the focus groups had an average age of 38.7 (SD 13.7), and 43 percent reported a household income below US\$20,000 per year. On average, they worked eight months in agriculture during the previous year, and all but two had lived in their current residence for the past 12 months. Farmworkers in the region generally work for contractors rather than for specific farmers, thus work on farm type and size varied for women throughout the years and seasons. All of the women who participated in the interviews and focus groups worked in crop agriculture, and the most common crops worked in were onions and corn. All but one woman had children.

The transcribed audio recordings and notes were analyzed using line-by-line thematic coding with NVIVO. Three members of the research team coded the data deductively, guided by previous literature, with a primary focus on considering the various dimensions of well-being established by previous literature. We also coded the transcriptions inductively, allowing the data to guide our analysis further. Examples of some of our a-priori codes include *barriers to medical care* and *work schedule challenges*. An example of an inductive code includes *concern with quality of childcare*. This approach allowed

⁴ See Curl, Meierotto, and Som Castellano (2021) for a review of this larger research project.

additional key themes to emerge. Members of the research team initially co-developed a coding scheme and then independently coded a small number of transcripts. We then compared our coding schemes to ensure accuracy and provide an opportunity to discuss emerging themes and ensure we were exhaustively coding the data. We then returned to coding the data individually, eventually comparing results to ensure consistency in the coding process. Overall, we found that consistency in coding was high. In the few instances where we noticed discrepancies, we discussed the results and made adjustments to the coding as necessary.

Results

In the results section, we use the conceptual framework articulated above, focusing first on family and work demands, followed by family and work supports, to organize the findings for this qualitative research. We also call out the role of organizational, community, and geographic context, and throughout, we emphasize how structural violence and intersectionality shape experiences with labor in these domains.

Family Demands

Responsibility for Household Labor

A prominent family demand for our research participants was household responsibilities. All the women we spoke with were primarily responsible for household labor, including childcare. One woman in her 80s who had worked in the fields for most of her life noted that “the men, they don’t really help ... It’s a machismo type of the thing. The men do not get involved in the kitchen.” Women frequently spoke about the ways in which their responsibility for household labor created conflict in the work-family interface. For instance, one woman said:

But you still have to come home to cook and—and to clean, and—and when I was with my significant other, it was really hard, because being a mom and then being in a relationship um, and I say in a Hispanic relationship where the women [do] everything, literally everything, is really hard because you have to cook, clean

um, take care of the children, make sure the kids are doing their homework, make sure nobody’s skipping school and make sure, you know, the man’s happy and fed and blah, blah, blah, and it’s just—it’s um—that’s rough.

Another woman, with small children at home, said,

I will get up at least at 3:30, 3:00, to start doing my lunch, pack the girl’s stuff, make sure that they have snacks or anything for the babysitter. So, I would ... drop them off and then head to work. Be at work all day, and then come home around 6:00, 6:30, by the time I pick them up, the girls are, I’m bathing them around 8:00, dinner, everything rushing. So, the girls will go to sleep around 9:30 or 10:00, and then meanwhile I have laundry. I have to prepare, make sure I have everything that they need for the next day, and then put it together in the morning. So, I usually go to sleep around 11:00. No later than 11:00, by the time I’m done cleaning and everything. ... It is a very long day.

These quotations illustrate that the gendered responsibility for household labor combined with the labor of farm work made for long days; as noted further below, this combination of responsibilities can take away time with children or self-care. Thus, the structural violence that can stem from gendered work in the private sphere can importantly influence these women’s physical and emotional well-being.

Caring for Children

As reflected in the above quotations, caring for children was a primary way that family and work conflicted for the mothers we spoke with. Women would talk about the importance of spending time with their kids. “I’d say 15 minutes of individual time with each kid is mandatory for our kids’ well-being. Just throughout the day.” However, as noted in the previous section, the care of children combined with work and other household responsibilities could be a stressor. One woman spoke about her mother managing fieldwork with household responsibilities, saying, “She was always working,

trying to come home and trying to do everything. Taking care of us, basically.”

Farm work requires women to secure childcare, which was a common source of stress. First, childcare is expensive. “... a lot of good daycares are a good penny.” Most of the women we spoke with live and work in rural places, where services for children, including childcare, can be more difficult to acquire (Graham & Underwood, 2012). In addition, the quality of childcare was a common concern, and this often preoccupied women during the day. One woman stated that finding childcare was “Hard because not everyone takes care of them well.” Another stated that she worried about childcare “All the time. All the time, because you don’t ever know who you’re going to get.” Another said,

You don’t know people well, like when you go to work, you just wonder, ‘Are my children okay? How are they?’ They’re too little to tell you what’s wrong with them, or what happened to them, or something like that. You have that concern, the well-being of the children and whether they’re well taken care of, how they’re treated.

Most women, however, felt that they had no other options. As one woman noted, “It’s very scary, just to leave your kids. Yeah. You worry a lot. But what else [can you do]?”

Given this, it is not surprising that some women bring their children to work with them, especially in the summers. One woman had observed mothers bringing their children to the fields, saying,

Yeah. I think that’s why they take them, to be honest. [childcare is] expensive ... there are women that they do take their kids to work. And they just leave them under a little shade that they take, and the kids are just playing all day with their mom. And sometimes they just put them to work.

Some women also reported not working or not working as much as they would like because of childcare dilemmas. “Sometimes you have to stay

with them because you don’t have no one.” In all, caring for children and securing childcare were substantial challenges for the Latina farmworking mothers we interviewed. At times, the flexibility of farm work allowed these women to bring their children with them or stay home. However, in these instances, flexibility is not necessarily understood as a benefit or support. Here we see that structural violence associated with gendered responsibilities in the private sphere can conflict with labor in the public sphere. This can be made more difficult for those struggling with challenging work schedules and limited childcare, which can be exasperated in rural communities.

Single Motherhood

Single parenthood can increase strain in the work-family interface; single parents can have increased role demands and fewer resources available to them, are required to work outside the home for pay, and often have lower occupational mobility. Echoing previous findings, many of our research participants spoke about how single mothers were more time-constrained and lacked social support and financial resources. One woman said, “I have heard women who are single mothers who say that it’s difficult for them to pay rent or groceries because sometimes they don’t have families either, they are alone.” Another told us that “When you’re a single mother, it’s also very difficult—like, to work, bring everything home, and—and, like, when they get sick. I’ve been a single mother for many years—and I’ve suffered a lot. I had a hard and difficult life.” Another spoke about needing to work long hours when she was single, saying, “I would work 10, 12, or even 14 hours depending on the job. I would even work 80 or 90 hours in a week. ... I am a single mother, and I had to manage somehow.”

Family Health Issues

Women also spoke about family health issues interfering with paid labor. One woman shared how one of her children had medical issues. Because of this, she had to reduce her work hours. She said: “My son got very ill. So ... we’re going through a lot of medical issues ... I think the doctor’s appointments are one of the hardest.” Other

women spoke about their own experiences with illness or work-related injuries, including knee and ankle sprains, heatstroke, and injuries that landed them in the hospital. Such illnesses and injuries often limited their ability to work and, in turn, support their families.

Throughout this section, we can see the ways in which intersectionality and structural violence can shape experiences with family demands. For instance, structural violence shapes these women's experiences via exhaustive gendered demands in the private sphere. These gendered experiences intersect with geography by, for instance, making childcare more difficult to find. Low incomes and unsafe working conditions, which are also connected to structural violence, further exacerbate these family demands, making it difficult, for example, to address illness and injury.

Work Demands

Challenging Work Schedules

Many farmworkers talked about their jobs' long and irregular hours, which could interfere with other responsibilities. For instance, some women expressed concern about how their work schedules influenced their children's well-being and led them to express feeling like a "bad mom." As one woman told us, "I have to take them [to childcare] really early. That is hard too—poor kids. Dropping the kids around 5:30 in the morning. And then you have to stay there until 5:00. So, they basically—babysitter is raising them."

The hours of fieldwork do not align well with the hours that childcare centers are open. As one woman noted, the local childcare center opens at 7:30 and closes at 4, not aligning with her work schedule. Many women had to supplement childcare in a center with care from a babysitter. "Because the daycares don't open until like 8:00 in the morning, you know, and you gotta be out in that field by 6:00 in the morning or earlier. Um, it's just not going to work. ... you still need that person that's going to either take your kids there or you show up late to work."

As noted above, women also reported that good childcare was expensive and that the long and sometimes unusual hours of farm work could also

contribute to the expense. "It is hard. Very hard, because, I mean—and then people are just like, charging you more. Like if you don't come from this time to this time, then they just start charging you like two hours extra. So, that's really hard."

The seasonality of farm work also conflicted with childcare, particularly for those with school-aged children. "Like depending if it's summer break or not summer break, and most times it's—you're working when it's—schools out, and so, you need to pay more and [arrange for] childcare."

Further, during specific times of the growing season, work would be available seven days a week, and most of the women working in the fields needed the income. Many women worked seven days a week at the height of harvest season and for more than 10 hours per day. One woman told us, "The most time it was over eight hours, or 10 hours every day. Every day, seven days a week." This same woman continued by discussing the responsibilities women would have at the end of their shift, saying that after coming home from work, they were "Cooking dinner, getting ready for the next day." She noted that women working in these conditions do not get much sleep. Here we see that collectively the intensity of farm work and the seasonality of this work conflict in many ways with the care of children, which these women are predominately responsible for.

Migrant and Seasonal Head Start programs, which provide childcare for migrant and seasonal farmworkers, can be an important source of childcare for farmworkers (Kossek et al., 2005). Many women we spoke with had experience with this program. Women appreciated the quality of childcare at Head Start, and Head Start programs aim to align with the seasonality of farm labor. However, Head Start does not always align with the hours of farm labor, nor does it allow children over five years of age. Further, Head Start programs fill up quickly. When asked if she uses Head Start, one woman said, "it depends if they have availability, because ... slots fill up quick and stuff. So, you have to – and depending on the age and stuff. So, maybe your younger children might be able to go, but your older children ... won't be able to go there."

Work and family responsibilities also made it difficult, if not impossible, for women to engage in self-care, such as accessing health care. As one woman noted, “I think a lot of us, we don’t go to the doctor often. I think our priority is our kids, most of the time. But a lot of women ... they don’t have that time.” Many women lacked adequate time to care for their own needs between managing work and childcare, yet another example of structural violence.

Difficult Work Conditions

There were many difficult work conditions that these women contended with, which influenced their physical well-being and their ability to have time and energy for household responsibilities or self-care. Environmental and occupational health issues, such as sun exposure, extreme heat, mud, and working with heavy equipment, were discussed in relation to the work-family interface. As one woman told us,

And you’re just exhausted, and it’s really hard to even keep your kids straight like, because after you’re working so hard and you’re in the sun, you come home, and you’re tired. That sun’s hittin’ on you all day. You’re just exhausted like—and that—I mean the work itself makes you exhausted, but it’s just the whole situation.

Another woman said, “Yes, and in the field, you are not taking care of your kids enough ... because you wake them up super early, poor things. And then you get home really late, and you arrive really frustrated from walking and walking all day. ... You come home tired, frustrated, beat by the sun.”

Low Pay

The low pay of farm work can also be a work demand that can influence the family domain. A woman spoke about this, saying, “it’s just getting harder and harder to be a fieldworker like what do you do when your wage is only—I think the maximum now that they pay is US\$10 an hour, and I’m like, how do you live off of that?” The low pay of farm work makes earning a living difficult, and it

can also require women to work more hours or work multiple jobs, limiting time and energy for family and self. Low pay is demonstrative of the ways in which gender, race, class, and occupation intersect to limit the ability of women to take time off from work to care for household responsibilities or themselves. As one woman noted, “Sometimes I would end my shift in one job and head straight to another one because I needed to work. I needed to do that in order to pay my bills.”

Throughout this section, we again see the ways in which structural violence and intersectionality shape the experiences of Latina farmworkers. Being women who hold multiple and intersecting identities associated with marginalization makes them more likely to engage in farm work, which is low-paid, seasonal, and highly contingent. Structural violence influences the conditions of this work, which includes challenging occupational and environmental conditions. Further, the intersections of race, gender, class, and geography make accessing childcare more difficult. Results of this violence include an inability to care for one’s health. For instance, many of these women lacked adequate sleep, and they found it hard to access health care.

Family Supports

Instrumental and Emotional Supports from Family

Research participants frequently mentioned family supports that helped them manage their dual roles as mothers and farmworkers, including emotional and instrumental support. Emotional support can involve providing care, trust, and love to others (French et al., 2018). Instrumental supports are tangible, such as providing financial assistance, offering someone a ride or meal, and assisting with finding a job.

Respondents spoke about how family helped with childcare and finances, provided food, and assisted with finding employment. Such help often came from extended family. As one woman noted, “If I had problems, even financial problems, even though I don’t like to, I know that I have [support] sometimes with my family.” Another woman said, “Well, if I don’t have enough ... [my Dad] helps me, or I ask an aunt, or they lend me money.”

Things like that.”

Husbands and partners also provided emotional and instrumental support. While women were still predominantly responsible for household work and childcare, some partners were occasionally helpful with managing children and work schedules. One woman, whose husband would travel back to Mexico frequently to care for his parents, spoke about him helping when he was present, particularly with getting the children ready for and transporting them to school. Similarly, another woman spoke about her husband helping in the mornings: “The bus comes to get [their youngest child] at around 6:22 a.m. And my husband is still here [to help out].” Having a partner in the household could also help with expenses, including insurance. “My husband and I are separated. But through the regulation of his insurance, we’re still legally married. So, he has to cover my health insurance.” Some women with partners were able to work more seasonally and were less concerned about missing shifts to meet family needs, such as doctor’s appointments. A woman whose husband worked full time in construction was able to take advantage of the flexibility that can exist in farm work, stating that:

I think that—that it’s better to work in the field because the hours are not long and you can spend more time with your family, children, and husband. And I think that in other occupations, like in the warehouses, for example, the hours are long. And that is too long to leave your children alone or under another person’s care. The children find whatever they can find in the fridge and—and when you—when you work on the field, you have enough time to cook yourself, to clean, to tend to them a little better and not leave them alone.

Another woman was recently remarried and spoke about the relief of now having a partner. She said, “Uh, like now, that I’m here with him, well I feel more, more at ease because he works, I also work ... [being a single mom] It’s very hard.”

However, as noted elsewhere, the ability to benefit from flexibility is connected to intersectionality. For many women, particularly those with

lower incomes and/or without a partner, the flexibility of agricultural work had more disadvantages than benefits, given that flexibility in this occupation involves lower pay and more piecemeal work. In short, flexibility as a benefit was contingent on statuses of relative privilege.

Lack of Support from Family, and the Role of Friends

Family can be vital for immigrants in providing social and instrumental support (Glick, 2010). However, several women lacked social support from family. This lack of support from family was often connected to more recent immigration, suggesting that structural violence can influence the benefits that family can provide. One woman stated that “There’s a lot of people who come up here who don’t have anybody.” Another woman spoke about needing help when she was injured in the fields. When asked if she had family nearby that could help out, she replied, “Uh, no.” But she told us that her friends helped her by providing groceries, offering transportation, including to the hospital, and caring for her children. As noted further below, friends were also often co-workers. The instrumental and emotional support provided by friends could thus be important in helping manage challenges in work, challenges in non-work life, and the intersections between these two domains.

Multiple women also spoke about the impact of family estrangement or lack of acceptance from family. For instance, one woman, whose family mostly lived in Mexico, had a sister nearby, but they were estranged. “I have a sister, but it’s like she doesn’t exist.” One woman, whose husband brought her up from Mexico, talked about having no family in the country. She felt unwelcome by her husband’s family, some of whom lived in the local community, because of cultural and socioeconomic differences. When we asked if there were people she could receive support from, she said, “No. ... Not even my family because my family is not here. ... I’m here alone.”

In this section, we see that a number of family supports can help women manage labor in the work and family domains. However, these supports were still shaped by structural violence and intersectionality. For instance, being a more recent immigrant reduced the potential support provided by

family and friends. This can be exacerbated by the isolation that recent immigrants, as well as those without documentation status, often feel (Meierotto et al., 2020), leading to the endurance of mistreatment. As one woman noted, “It’s just that, sometimes one can feel alone. With no family, or anything, one has to endure being mistreated.” The potential flexibility of farm work was also limited by structural factors and the various statuses these women held. For instance, being a single mother often meant that women could not take advantage of or benefit from this flexibility.

Work Supports

Work supports can include formal and informal work policies and supportive co-workers, supervisors, or bosses. Few formal work policies existed to support the women we spoke with, but some informal work supports helped women navigate the work-family interface.

Supportive Co-workers

Many respondents emphasized that co-workers provided instrumental and emotional support, which made going to work and managing life easier. When asked what they like most about their work, they would say things like, “Well, you know what? Interacting with the people. ... Being with people,” or “Mm-hmm, mm-hmm! Like – since I like more uh, to go around like, hmm with the ladies, chatting, working.”

Women also received instrumental support from co-workers. One woman said, “I like ... for my friend [to] be in the next row. We will just help each other, like, ‘Oh, I have a big [watermelon]. Can you help me?’ ... and that kind of makes it like easy for us.” Another woman spoke about getting injured on the job. Her supervisor didn’t help her; instead, her co-workers put her in their car and drove her to the hospital. Others spoke about receiving loans, help with childcare, or sharing food with co-workers.

The Role of Farm Owners, Contractors, and Supervisors

Participants shared that farmers, contractors, and supervisors (representing the various forms that a boss can take for fieldworkers) could all act as

work supports. For instance, some bosses occasionally provided food on the job or to take home. “Um, the owners, he’s just really nice because, um, they—they allow the people just to, you know, take corn home.” Some women reported working for bosses that seemed to care about their well-being. One woman talked about a farmer she worked for with fondness, saying, “he just—he seems to be more, like he cares more about the people that are working with him.”

However, farmers, supervisors, and contractors could also be difficult to work for, adding to conflict in the work-family interface. For instance, one woman told us about an exchange she had with a supervisor: “I’m like ... ‘I don’t think that’s fair, you know, you need to have a bathroom.’ And he’s like, ‘If you don’t like to work here, why don’t you just leave.’ That was their answer.” A lack of support from bosses was also reported in cases of illness or injury. For instance, one woman experienced an injury at work, and she received little to no financial support from the farm owner. Such stress in the work domain can spill over into the family domain, creating further conflict. Here we see that structural vulnerability and intersectionality shape the lack of legal protections and fulfillment of agricultural regulations.

Flexible Schedules

While work schedules for farmworkers can be challenging, some women noted that fieldwork allowed them to have a flexible schedule, making it easier for them to manage the work-family interface, including managing children’s activities and caring for sick children. This type of flexibility depended on their supervisors; while some supervisors were good at providing flexibility, others were not. Furthermore, as noted above, even with a flexible boss, there was still a tradeoff, as paid time off did not exist for these women. One woman told us about how her children often had to miss extracurricular activities because of her work, and she noted the importance of a flexible contractor, stating that “[My kids] miss most of the activities out in the community, or any of that because we can’t miss work. ... where I’m working, he’s very flexible. But I’m not gonna ask the day off just to take them for an activity. You know, I have to be strict

for doctor's appointments or any of that." We followed up by asking if this woman ever got paid time off, and she said, "You're not paid. You're not there." This passage echoes other research finding that mothers from marginalized populations experience tension between work schedules and family responsibilities, often forcing women to make difficult decisions that may involve forgoing family events, like school conferences (Crocker, 2016). In short, as noted above, the flexibility inherent in fieldwork is not always a benefit; while fieldwork can involve more flexible schedules, this flexibility is often unpaid. Further, other forms of flexibility, such as moving between farms and having unpredictable hours, are generally a disadvantage for workers.

Related to this, the women who benefited from the potential flexibility of farm work were those with partners with a steady income and willingness to help out. For instance, when asked about challenges related to the schedule of farm work, one woman with an employed husband said, "Sometimes but when I have appointments, or I need to take [my kids] to the doctor, I ask to be excused, so in things like that it's not a problem." When asked about things she liked about farm work, another woman with a husband with a stable job said, "I like [that] you have the freedom [to] just go and work, and you know, when you want to work. [Laughs] It's like, uh, a flexible schedule."

Here we again see the ways in which intersectionality can shape the experiences of labor for Latina farmworkers. The topic of flexible schedules illustrates this well; flexibility in farm work only benefits those positioned to economically and socially withstand having time away from work. The intersections of race, gender, class, and geography combine with single parenthood, for instance, to shape the degree to which this flexibility is a benefit. We also see here that the lack of formal work supports is further associated with structural violence, where women are unable to meet their needs because of the ways in which social structure funnels them into work that lacks the various forms of support that people with other statuses benefit from (e.g., paid time off).

Contextual Factors Shaping the Work-Family Dynamic

As noted throughout the above sections, our results confirm that the traditional framework used to describe the demands and supports that women may experience in navigating work-family dynamics may not be sufficient for Latina farmworkers. Aspects of organizational context were mentioned throughout the above results section. However, it is important to note that community context played an important role for many of the Latina farmworkers we spoke with. Many relied upon local community organizations' support, a factor not often mentioned in research utilizing traditional work-family frameworks. Local community organizations often stepped in to address the ways in which intersectionality shaped the experiences of labor for these women and worked to help alleviate some of the structural violence they experienced. As one woman stated, "I do believe here ... that there is a lot of organizations that will help." As noted above, Head Start programs were often identified as important sources of childcare. Churches were also highlighted as essential sources of support. For instance, when asked what organizations provided help for Latina farmworkers, one woman said, "Churches. I – I say churches all the time because a lot of people go to churches, and I do find a lot of people who struggle, and they give, you know, food vouchers, clothing vouchers to these kids." Local secondhand stores that provided clothing and other basic needs were also mentioned.

Local and state programs were also highlighted as sources of support, such as school and state-supported programs. These childcare and enrichment programs were often particularly helpful during the summer. "My girls will be with [a school-based summer program], and my son will probably just be on watch with [a state-based childcare summer program]." Many women also relied on school meal programs. When asked about school meal programs, one woman said, "Um, I thank God. I thank God that they have that program."

Women also spoke about mistrust of organizations that provide social supports. Based on previous research (e.g., Carney, 2015), a significant portion of Latina farmworkers are likely underutilizing

social supports. As one woman told us, “[Latina farmworkers] don’t really trust in any of [the local organizations.]” In addition, Latinx communities can promote cultural norms that may limit the utilization of social supports (Carney, 2015), which was reflected in our results. When asked if there were organizations she relied on when she needed help, one woman said, “No, because I am a very reserved person. If I need this or that, I don’t tell anyone.”

Some women believed that certain programs, particularly federally funded programs, were burdensome and intrusive.

I have heard that – that getting the food stamps is very difficult because they ask ... a lot of questions and sometimes they say no. ... There are many people who say they’d rather not ask for them and there are people who say that since it’s very – it’s very helpful, well, it doesn’t matter what they ask them or what they have to do as long as they help them.

Many respondents also believed that help from organizations could be dependent on immigration status. As one woman noted, “It all depends on your situation though as well. And if, another thing, I mean – I believe if you have papers too. ... Because if – if you don’t have documentation, how do you get food stamps?”

Relatedly, immigration and documentation status were frequently noted as influencing the work-family dynamic for our respondents. In addition to creating the conditions of much of the work they engaged in, women discussed how recent immigrants did not know their rights, did not stand up for themselves, or seek help when they had troubles at work or home. Here again, we see how intersectionality shapes the experience of Latina farmworkers and how various forms of marginalization result in structural violence. For instance, immigration status, language barriers, and fear of losing jobs were noted as reasons that some women experienced isolation and did not report problems or assert their rights. As one woman told us, “the women think because – I guess I don’t even know what it’s under nine that if you work that many hours that you need to have a break in

between. They don’t know any of that stuff. ... they think that’s the way it’s supposed to be. They accept it. They don’t say nothing.” And a farmworker stated that “many of us aren’t from here, and sometimes, since you don’t have your papers, you shut up.” This silencing combined with separation from family and isolation from community contributes to the strain of labor by limiting access to many social supports that can help women manage conflict and fulfill their multiple responsibilities.

As noted in the above sections, geographic context also influenced the work-family dynamic. For example, much of the isolation described above, which often stemmed from immigration-related fears and language barriers, was compounded by physical distance from individuals and organizations, further limiting supports and opportunities. For many of the women we spoke with, farm work was one of the only jobs they had access to. Further, their access to housing and childcare was shaped by the rurality of where they lived and worked, limiting the availability of these critical resources. In addition, transportation was challenging. Many respondents reported that women in their community often do not have a driver’s license. Further, getting to work often involved long commutes; more than 70 percent of respondents reported traveling more than 10 miles to get to work, and nearly 30 percent reported traveling 25 or more miles each way for work. Thus, rurality operates as an additional factor intersecting with race, gender, class, and immigration status to shape the challenges of fulfilling the roles and responsibilities of many Latina farmworkers.

Summary of Results

In sum, these results show that a range of factors in the work and family domains, as well as community organizations and programs, can act as supports, helping Latina farmworkers navigate that work-family interface. However, many demands stemming from these domains can make navigating this interface more difficult. These demands and supports occur within the context of structural violence and intersectionality, as these women’s experiences are shaped by many forms of marginalization and oppression, including race, class, gender,

and geography. One woman summarized this by stating, “It’s difficult to be a farmworker and a mother. That’s – I don’t know. You know? I don’t have answers for it, but I mean, um, I feel like it’s one thing to live life, and it’s one thing to survive life. And so, I think a lot of people are just surviving life.” Table 1 provides a summary of themes, quotes, and the role of structural violence and intersectionality outlined above.

Discussion and Conclusion

In this research, we build on work-family literature, examining how demands and supports shape

Latina farmworkers’ experiences with work-family dynamics. The data presented here reveal that several supports in the work and family domains can make their labor more manageable. The most commonly discussed work supports were family and friends who provide emotional and instrumental support, supportive co-workers and bosses, and flexible schedules. However, not all women were equally able to access these supports. Structural violence and intersectionality importantly shape the degree to which these supports were available or helpful for Latina farmworkers navigating the work-family interface. For instance, being a single

Table 1. Summary of Findings

	Theme	Illustrative Quote	Role of Structural Violence, Intersectionality
Work Demands	Work Schedules	“I have to take them [to childcare] really early. That is hard too—poor kids. Dropping the kids around 5:30 in the morning. And then you have to stay there until 5:00. So, they basically—babysitter is raising them.”	Hierarchies of gender, race, documentation status, and rurality can all shape the jobs available to women. Farm work is low-paid and highly contingent. Work hours and seasonality often conflict with family responsibilities and self-care.
Family Demands	Gendered Responsibility for Household Labor	“. . . in a Hispanic relationship where the women [do] everything, literally everything, [it is] is really hard, because you have to cook, clean um, take care of the children, make sure the kids are doing their homework, make sure nobody’s skipping school and make sure, you know, the man’s happy and fed and blah, blah, blah, and it’s just—it’s um—that’s rough.”	Persistent structural inequalities related to gender have been found to be even more rigid in certain populations, including in some Latinx communities. Responsibility for labor in the private sphere adds physical, emotional, and mental labor to the long hours and difficult conditions that farmworkers often face.
Work Supports	Supportive Co-workers	“I like . . . for my friend [to] be in the next row. We will just help each other, like, ‘Oh, I have a big [watermelon]. Can you help me?’ . . . and that kind of makes it like easy for us.”	Despite the many challenges faced by Latina farmworkers, including those associated with their race, class, gender, and geographic location, the presence of friends at work can help with the physical, psychological, and emotional burdens of this work, including the navigation of this work with other responsibilities.
Family Supports	Instrumental Supports, Financial Assistance	“If I had problems, even financial problems, even though I don’t like to, I know that I have [support] sometimes with my family.”	Having a partner or immediate family member who is able and willing to provide assistance, whether in the form of providing more income to the household or helping to manage transitioning children between work and home, can importantly assist women in navigating the work and family domains.
Contextual Factors	Organizational Supports	“It all depends on your situation though as well. And if, another thing, I mean—I believe if you have papers too. . . . Because if—if you don’t have documentation, how do you get food stamps?”	Local organizations and government programs were noted as important sources of support. However, structural violence and intersectionality shaped the degree to which these supports were accessible and utilized.

mother and being a recent immigrant made managing the various forms of labor these women were responsible for particularly difficult, partly because access to social supports was limited. Flexibility, in particular, needs to be understood differently in the case of Latina farmworkers navigating work and family. While it may be a support for some, the flexibility of farm work for many Latina farmworkers is a disadvantage, and the benefits of flexibility are more likely to be accrued by farm owners or contractors. Further, for some farmworkers, language barriers, fear, and lack of knowledge about and/or access to supports restricted their ability to thrive as both workers and mothers.

Our findings also reveal several demands that make fulfilling the labor these women are responsible for difficult. These demands are again shaped by intersectionality and structural violence and include responsibility for household labor, child-care responsibilities, demanding work schedules, challenging work conditions, difficult bosses, and low pay. Similar to findings from other researchers (e.g., Hoser, 2012), we found that women were more likely to discuss how work interfered with meeting family obligations rather than the other way around. This, in part, illustrates how these women prioritized their children and viewed both their paid labor and household labor as being in service to caring for their families. At times, work demands and lack of work supports prevented women from engaging in family responsibilities and further limited their ability to care for themselves.

Additionally, the results above emphasize that demands and supports in the work and family domains are contextual. Looking at the organizational context, we see the agricultural industry complicating the various forms of labor that Latina farmworkers engage in. Vulnerability based on structural violence and intersectionality, including hierarchies linked to gender, poverty, race, and immigration, not only shaped the types of work and the conditions of work for these Latina farmworkers but further limited their resources and minimized their knowledge about the rights and protections they should be afforded. The community context provides additional sources of support, such as those emerging from local nonprofit organ-

izations. However, structural violence and culture also limit the use of these supports, including through fear of deportation and isolation. The geographic context (e.g., rurality) shapes the time needed to fulfill work and family obligations, the availability of essential resources, such as childcare, and further heightens isolation, adding an additional status that intersects with other forms of marginalization faced by these women.

This combination of demands and supports and the contexts within which they are embedded creates a unique dynamic for Latina farmworkers as they navigate the work-family interface. In particular, demands in family and work domains were complicated by political, cultural, geographic, and structural factors that limit access to a range of rights and privileges, such as fair wages, workplace safety, equal protections, access to childcare, and access to health care. Structural violence further shapes work conditions, the multiple and often demanding roles they play, their degree of isolation, their access to support from individuals and organizations, and their ability to meet their personal needs and experience well-being.

As noted above, work-family conflict can be detrimental to women's well-being. Of particular note here are the ways in which not meeting societal norms and expectations can contribute to decreasing well-being for women. Importantly, gendered expectations often stem from white, middle-class hegemonic ideals, which do not account for the life experiences and structural vulnerability of women with lower incomes who are not white. Furthermore, the tensions experienced between the work and family domains may also influence women's willingness to fight for better workplace conditions. As noted by Crocker (2016), marginalized women often "work to protect their own employment in the interest of their family responsibilities—often maintaining an image of compliance against even direct assaults on their dignity" (p. 171). Family can act as a motivator for women to tolerate unjust or harmful workplace conditions. Thus, the work-family interface can also negatively influence women by limiting their willingness or ability to advocate for themselves and their well-being.


In conclusion, this research finds that women who are integral to the U.S. agriculture and food

system face many challenges in managing the work-family interface. These findings have many implications. First, while much of the research on work-family conflict has focused on white, middle-class, cis-gender households with two parents, here we expand existing literature to interrogate how various factors may influence the multiple forms of labor that settled-in Latina farmworkers engage in. We find that while some of the demands and supports these women face are similar to the challenges of women in other professions and demographics, such as needing to balance paid labor with a second or third shift, these women have some unique challenges, influenced by the various forms of marginalization that intersect to shape their work domains, their non-work lives, and the intersection between these domains. This research further expands understanding of the role of structural violence and intersectionality in shaping the work-family interface, the impact of organizational, community, and geographic contexts on demands and supports shaping the work-family domains, and how flexibility should be understood in managing the work-family dynamic, particularly for farmworkers laboring in agricultural fields. Given that generalizability of these findings is limited, further research should examine the degree to which these results echo the experiences of other women farmworkers across the U.S. and how reflective these findings are of other women holding multiple and intersecting identities that can result in greater marginalization and compound with pre-existing structural violence.

In the practice of agriculture and food system development, including sustainable and regenerative agriculture, this article is a reminder that issues of labor should be front and center. Considering

the well-being of farmworkers, particularly Latina farmworkers, is vital in agri-food system development given the structural violence and experiences with intersectionality many farmworkers likely face. As others have importantly pointed out, we need to consider large-scale structural changes, including fair wages, safe working conditions, gender equality in household labor, and more, while also considering the role that incrementalism can play in creating change (Allen, 2016). Accordingly, this research can shed light on policy and programmatic changes that may improve the lives of Latina farmworkers. For instance, the data presented here can help support policies related to workplace safety, including at the state and federal level, as well as policies that support fair wages, labor standards in agriculture, paid time off, and affordable, safe, and accessible childcare. In addition, we hope that organizations and programs advocating for farmworkers, and actively working to alleviate the suffering of farmworkers, may also benefit from these findings. For instance, these findings provide evidence for the importance of expanding HeadStart in rural areas. HeadStart has proven successful in many ways, and expanding hours, the months it operates in, and the ages it serves could all improve the lives of many of the Latina farmworkers we worked with.

Acknowledgments

The authors extend their gratitude to the women and organizations who shared their time and expertise in support of this research, as well as Meredith Spivak, Rachel Phinney, Chris Torres, Christopher Herrera, Alondra Murillo, Karen Sanchez, and Kalie Gydesen (Boise State University, Boise, ID) for their assistance in the research process. 

References

- Adua, L., & Beaird, A. (2018). Place-based inequality in “energetic” pain: The price of residence in rural America. *Socius*, 4, 1–18. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2378023118803032>
- Allen, P. (2016). In this issue: Labor in the food system, from farm to table. *Journal of Agriculture, Food Systems, and Community Development*, 6(2), 1–4. <https://doi.org/10.5304/jafscd.2016.062.022>
- Arcury, T. A., Sandberg, J. C., Talton, J. W., Laurienti, P. J., Daniel, S. S., & Quandt, S. A. (2018). Mental health among Latina farmworkers and other employed Latinas in North Carolina. *Rural Mental Health*, 42(2), 89–101. <https://doi.org/10.1037/rmh0000091>

- Arcury, T. A., Trejo, G., Suerken, C. K., Grzywacz, J. G., Ip, E. H., & Quandt, S. A. (2015). Work and health among Latina mothers in farmworker families. *Journal of Occupational and Environmental Medicine*, 57(3), 292–299. <https://doi.org/10.1097/JOM.0000000000000351>
- Beutell, N. J., & A. Schneer, J. (2014). Work-family conflict and synergy among Hispanics. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 29(6), 705–735. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JMP-11-2012-0342>
- Carney, M. A. (2015). *The unending hunger: Tracing women and food insecurity across borders*. University of California Press.
- Castañeda, X., & Zavella, P. (2003). Changing constructions of sexuality and risk: Migrant Mexican women farmworkers in California. *Journal of Latin American Anthropology*, 8(2), 126–150. <https://doi.org/10.1525/jlca.2003.8.2.126>
- Christiansen, K., Gadhoke, P., Pardilla, M., & Gittelsohn, J. (2017). Work, worksites, and wellbeing among North American Indian women: A qualitative study. *Ethnicity & Health*, 24(1), 24–43. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13557858.2017.1313964>
- Ciabattari, T. (2007). Single mothers, social capital, and work–family conflict. *Journal of Family Issues*, 28(1), 34–60. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0192513X06292809>
- Crenshaw, K. (1989). Demarginalizing the intersection of race and sex: A Black feminist critique of antidiscrimination doctrine, feminist theory, and antiracist politics. *University of Chicago Legal Forum*, 1989(1), Article 8. <http://chicagounbound.uchicago.edu/uclf/vol1989/iss1/8>
- Crenshaw, K. (1991). Mapping the margins: Intersectionality, identity politics, and violence against women of color. *Stanford Law Review*, 43(6), 1241–1299. <https://doi.org/10.2307/1229039>
- Crocker, J. (2016). Individual constraint and group solidarity: Marginalized mothers and the paradox of family responsibility. In D. Courpasson & S. Vallas (Eds.), *The SAGE handbook of resistance* (pp. 170–184). <https://doi.org/10.4135/9781473957947.n9>
- Curl, C. L., Meierotto, L., & Som Castellano, R. L. (2021). Understanding challenges to well-being among Latina farmworkers in rural Idaho using in an interdisciplinary, mixed-methods approach. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 18(1), Article 169. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph18010169>
- Dziak, E., Janzen, B. L., & Muhajarine, N. (2010). Inequalities in the psychological well-being of employed, single and partnered mothers: The role of psychosocial work quality and work-family conflict. *International Journal for Equity in Health*, 9(1), Article 6. <https://doi.org/10.1186/1475-9276-9-6>
- Farmer, P. (2004). An anthropology of structural violence. *Current Anthropology*, 45(3), 305–325. <https://doi.org/10.1086/382250>
- Ford, M. T. (2011). Linking household income and work–family conflict: A moderated mediation study. *Stress and Health*, 27(2), 144–162. <https://doi.org/10.1002/smi.1328>
- French, K. A., Dumani, S., Allen, T. D., & Shockley, K. M. (2018). A meta-analysis of work-family conflict and social support. *Psychological Bulletin*, 144(3), 284–314. <https://doi.org/10.1037/bul0000120>
- Glick, J. E. (2010). Connecting complex processes: A decade of research on immigrant families. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 72(3), 498–515. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1741-3737.2010.00715.x>
- Graham, K., & Underwood, K. (2012). The reality of rurality: Rural parents' experiences of early years services. *Health & Place*, 18(6), 1231–1239. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.healthplace.2012.09.006>
- Grzywacz, J. G., Arcury, T. A., Marín, A., Carrillo, L., Burke, B., Coates, M. L., & Quandt, S. A. (2007). Work-family conflict: Experiences and health implications among immigrant Latinos. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 92(4), 1119–1130. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.92.4.1119>
- Grzywacz, J. G., Quandt, S. A., Arcury, T. A., & Marín, A. (2005). The work–family challenge and mental health: Experiences of Mexican immigrants. *Community, Work & Family*, 8(3), 271–279. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13668800500142236>
- Habib, R. R., & Fathallah, F. A. (2012). Migrant women farm workers in the occupational health literature. *Work*, 41(Suppl.1), 4356–4362. <https://doi.org/10.3233/WOR-2012-0101-4356>

- Hardy, A., McDonald, J., Guijt, R., Leane, E., Martin, A., James, A., Jones, M., Corban, M., & Green, B. (2018). Academic parenting: Work–family conflict and strategies across child age, disciplines and career level. *Studies in Higher Education*, 43(4), 625–643. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03075079.2016.1185777>
- Holmes, S. (2013). *Fresh fruit, broken bodies: Migrant farmworkers in the United States*. University of California Press.
- Hong, P., Abdelmoneium, A. O., Badahdah, A. M., & Grzywacz, J. G. (2021). A conceptual model of work-family balance among Qatari adults. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 52(4), 406–423. <https://doi.org/10.1177/00220221211011251>
- Hoser, N. (2012). Making it as a dual-career family in Germany: Exploring what couples think and do in everyday life. *Marriage & Family Review*, 48(7), 643–666. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01494929.2012.691085>
- Idaho Department of Labor. (2019). *Idaho's Labor Market Outlook, SFY 2018–2020*. <https://www.labor.idaho.gov/dnn/Portals/0/Publications/Labor-EORAC-Presentation-2019.pdf>
- Kaufman, G., & Taniguchi, H. (2019). Gender equality and work–family conflict from a cross-national perspective. *International Journal of Comparative Sociology*, 60(6), 385–408. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0020715219893750>
- Kelly, P., & Lobao, L. (2019). The social bases of rural-urban political divides: Social status, work, and sociocultural beliefs. *Rural Sociology*, 84(4), 669–705. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ruso.12256>
- Kossek, E. E., Meece, D., Barratt, M. E., Prince, B. E., & Poelmans, S. A. Y. (2005). U.S. Latino migrant farm workers: Managing acculturative stress and conserving work-family resources. In S. A. Y. Poelmans (Ed.), *Work and family: An international research perspective* (pp. 47–70). Routledge.
- Lewis, S. and Beauregard, T. A. (2018). The meanings of work-life balance: A cultural perspective. In K. M. Shockley, W. Shen, & R. C. Johnson (Eds.), *The Cambridge handbook of the global work-family interface* (pp. 720–732). Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/9781108235556.039>
- McManus, K., Korabik, K., Rosin, H. M., & Kelloway, E. K. (2002). Employed mothers and the work-family interface: Does family structure matter? *Human Relations*, 55(11), 1295–1324. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0018726702055011919>
- Meierotto, L., & Som Castellano, R. L. (2019). A case study of transitions in farming and farm labor in southwestern Idaho. *Journal of Agriculture, Food Systems, and Community Development*, 8(4), 111–123. <https://doi.org/10.5304/jafscd.2019.084.008>
- Meierotto, L., Som Castellano, R. L., & Curl, C. (2020). Isolation and fear of deportation: Intersectional barriers to well-being among Latina farmworkers in southwestern Idaho. *Culture, Agriculture, Food and Environment*, 42(2), 93–102. <https://doi.org/10.1111/cuag.12255>
- Murphy, J., Samples, J., Morales, M., & Shadbeh, N. (2015). “They talk like that, but we keep working”: Sexual harassment and sexual assault experiences among Mexican Indigenous farmworker women in Oregon. *Journal of Immigrant and Minority Health*, 17(6), 1834–1839. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10903-014-9992-z>
- Poms, L. W., Fleming, L. C., & Jacobsen, K. H. (2016). Work–family conflict, stress, and physical and mental health: A model for understanding barriers to and opportunities for women’s well-being at home and in the workplace. *World Medical & Health Policy*, 8(4), 444–457. <https://doi.org/10.1002/wmh3.211>
- Powell, G. N., Greenhaus, J. H., Allen, T. D., & Johnson, R. E. (2019). Introduction to special topic forum: Advancing and expanding work-life theory from multiple perspectives. *Academy of Management Review*, 44(1), 54–71. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.2018.0310>
- Robinson, L. D., Magee, C., & Caputi, P. (2016). Burnout and the work-family interface: A two-wave study of sole and partnered working mothers. *Career Development International*, 21(1), 31–44. <https://doi.org/10.1108/CDI-06-2015-0085>
- Salant, P., Wulfhorst, J. D., Cruz, E., & Dearien, C. (2017). *Community impacts of Idaho's dairy workforce*. University of Idaho's McClure Center for Public Policy Research. <https://icha.idaho.gov/docs/community-impacts-dairy-2017.pdf>
- Sayer, L. C., & Fine, L. (2011). Racial-ethnic differences in U.S. married women’s and men’s housework. *Social Indicators Research*, 101(2), 259–265. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11205-010-9645-0>

- Schafft, K. A., McHenry-Sorber, E., Hall, D., & Burfoot-Rochford, I. (2018). Busted amidst the Boom: The creation of new insecurities and inequalities within Pennsylvania's shale gas boomtowns. *Rural Sociology*, 83(3), 503–531. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ruso.12196>
- Schmalzbauer, L. (2014). *The last best place? Gender, family, and migration in the New West*. Stanford University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9780804792974>
- Segura, D. A. (1989). Chicana and Mexican immigrant women at work: The impact of class, race, and gender on occupational mobility. *Gender and Society*, 3(1), 37–52. <https://doi.org/10.1177/089124389003001003>
- Shaffer, M., Joplin, J., & Hsu, Y.-S. (2011). Expanding the boundaries of work—family research: A review and agenda for future research. *International Journal of Cross Cultural Management*, 11, 221–268. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1470595811398800>
- Stadelmann-Steffen, I., & Oehrli, D. (2017). Perceiving reconciliation: Child care policies and gendered time conflicts. *Gender & Society*, 31(5), 597–623. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0891243217727719>
- Stier, H., Lewin-Epstein, N., & Braun, M. (2012). Work-family conflict in comparative perspective: The role of social policies. *Research in Social Stratification and Mobility*, 30(3), 265–279. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rssm.2012.02.001>
- U.S. Census Bureau. (2018, December 18). *Nevada and Idaho are the nation's fastest-growing states*. <https://www.census.gov/newsroom/press-releases/2018/estimates-national-state.html>
- Wright, W., & Annes, A. (2016). Farm women and the empowerment potential in value-added agriculture. *Rural Sociology*, 81(4), 545–571. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ruso.12105>