

**Center for Latino Health Research  
Wake Forest University School of Medicine**

**Characteristics of Farmworker Family Housing in North Carolina**

Thomas A. Arcury, PhD  
Julie Early, MS  
Stephen W. Davis, MA  
Pamela Rao, PhD  
Beverly M. Snively, PhD  
Sara A. Quandt, PhD

**Center for Latino Health Research  
Department of Family and Community Medicine  
Wake Forest University School of Medicine  
Winston-Salem, NC 27157-1084  
Voice (336) 716-9438 FAX (336) 716-3206**

### **Ordering Information**

This working paper may be ordered from the Center for Latino Health Research, Department of Family and Community Medicine, Wake Forest University School of Medicine, Winston-Salem, NC 27157-1084. The charge is \$5.00, which includes postage and handling. Please make payment by check or money order to "Department of Family and Community Medicine, WFUSM." For orders to be mailed outside the United States, remittance must be in United States dollars payable on a United States bank.

---

---

Copyright © 2004 by Wake Forest University School of Medicine. All rights reserved. No part of this paper may be used or reproduced in any manner without written permission, except in the case of brief quotations in critical articles or reviews.

## **Characteristics of Farmworker Family Housing in North Carolina**

Thomas A. Arcury, PhD  
Julie Early, MS  
Stephen W. Davis, MA  
Pamela Rao, PhD  
Beverly M. Snively, PhD  
Sara A. Quandt, PhD

### **Acknowledgments**

The research was supported by a grant from the National Institute of Environmental Health Sciences (ES08739) and the National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health (OH07611). Address correspondence to: Thomas A. Arcury, Department of Family and Community Medicine, Wake Forest University School of Medicine, Medical Center Boulevard, Winston-Salem, NC 27157-1084.

## **Abstract**

### **Background**

Adequate housing is a basic human right and an important determinant of environmental health. Little research has documented the housing quality of immigrant Latino farmworker families. This analysis uses data from four surveys of North Carolina farmworker communities conducted in 2001 and 2003 to document aspects of housing quality that could affect farmworker family health. Three housing domains are considered: dwelling characteristics, household characteristics and household behaviors.

### **Main Findings**

Most of the surveyed farmworker families live in mobile homes, and few own their dwellings. Many are located near agricultural fields. Most houses are small, but household size is large, containing adults in addition to the nuclear family. Crowding is widespread. Many farmworker households lack basic facilities such as clothes washing machines. Farmworkers attempt to reduce exposure to environmental contaminants by frequently cleaning their dwellings. These findings suggest that the health of farmworker families is at risk due to inadequate housing.

### **Recommendations**

There are several actions that can be taken to improve farmworker housing.

- Efforts must be made by regulatory agencies to enforce existing housing inspection and housing quality standards for these migrant farmworkers. This includes addressing overcrowding and ensuring adequate laundry facilities.
- Farmworker health advocates must work with local housing inspection and public health agencies to ensure that the dwellings in which seasonal farmworker families reside meet minimal standards for public health and safety.
- Advocates for public health and social justice must work toward the implementation of state and local regulations that provide for safe and quality housing for all residents.

Few studies specifically address the housing needs of farmworker families. More research is needed on housing availability, quality, and affordability. Ethnographic research that would inform us better on farmworker perceptions of their housing quality, how they make decisions about their living arrangements, and how their housing situations may affect their sense of well-being would be extremely helpful.

## ***Farmworker Family Housing in North Carolina***

Adequate housing is a basic human right, and housing quality is an important environmental determinant of health (1 – 3). Crowding, as well as inadequate sanitary facilities, contribute to a higher incidence of infectious diseases. Injuries due to structural or electrical problems are frequent for those living in substandard housing. Toxic substances, such as lead, PCBs, and pesticides, are often present in substandard housing. Inadequate housing also affects psychological well-being (4, 5).

Children are particularly susceptible to health problems as a result of poor housing conditions. Exposure to lead and other heavy metals in old peeling paint impairs motor function and neurological development. Long-term exposure to dust and mold, because of water leakage or broken windows, is related to respiratory and dermatological conditions (5, 6). Insect and rodent infestations may trigger allergies and increase the likelihood of pesticide exposure (7). Upper respiratory infections brought on by inadequate housing may be particularly harmful to children (8). Finally, the housing environment in which people live in their early life may have a long-term negative effect on their health (9).

While rates of inadequate housing in developed countries such as the US may be relatively low, sub-populations, such as immigrants, experience high rates of substandard housing. Overcrowding, lack of affordability and structural deficiencies have been well documented among immigrants in urban areas (10, 11). Immigrants to rural communities, such as migrant and seasonal farmworkers, are also at risk for inadequate housing. Over 80% of migrant and seasonal farmworkers are immigrants; most live in poverty (12). Living primarily in rural areas, farmworkers face different housing challenges than their urban immigrant counterparts. While service providers who work with farmworkers are well aware that farmworkers live in substandard housing, few studies have documented these housing conditions (6).

The purpose of this paper is to describe the housing conditions of farmworker families in North Carolina and identify housing features that place these families at risk for environmental exposures. This description focuses on dwelling characteristics, household characteristics, and household behaviors. Dwelling characteristics, such as building type, construction material, and tenure status contribute to an overall picture of farmworker family housing. Some dwelling characteristics, e.g., living close to agricultural fields, indicate health risks for these families, such as pesticide exposure (6). Household characteristics, such as overcrowding, are problems that have been suggested to negatively affect mental health and to increase infectious diseases. Household behaviors, such as frequency of cleaning and laundry, can help families counter environmental exposures.

### ***Background***

There are approximately 2.5 million farmworkers in the US. Most farmworkers are Mexican nationals who are paid very low wages for their work (13). Some farmworkers migrate from Mexico to the US each year, leaving their families in Mexico. However, the majority of farmworkers who are married with children, approximately 60% of the farmworker population, live with their spouses and children in the US while working (13).

Similar to the national farmworker population, North Carolina's farmworkers have been predominantly Latino since the early 1990s (12, 13). Estimates of the number of seasonal and migrant farmworkers in the state range from 100,000 to 250,000 (14). In contrast to some other states, with more established Latino communities receiving social and farmworker services (e.g., California), North Carolina farmworkers are not part of such established communities and may have greater language barriers, perhaps increasing their vulnerability. While there are Latino farmworkers in most of North Carolina's 100 counties, there are regional variations in terms of numbers and density of workers as well as in the crops they tend. Those in the western, more mountainous counties work primarily with Christmas trees, and those in the eastern part of the state work with other crops such as cucumbers, sweet potatoes and tobacco. Common to both populations, however, is the need for affordable, decent housing.

Farmworker families face unique risks, as agricultural work is one of the most dangerous occupations. Individuals who work in fields where pesticides have been applied bring pesticide residues home with them on their clothes, boots and skin. Therefore, housing characteristics that allow the farmworkers to take the proper safety measures to protect their families are important. Laundry facilities in the home allow the farmworker to wash the pesticide residues from their clothes immediately (15). The number of bathrooms available to farmworkers is another important consideration. Farmworkers who have to wait to shower increase the possibility of spreading pesticide residues into the home. Functional windows and the presence of air conditioning may help prevent pesticide drift from contaminating dwellings. Pesticide residues have been found in dust in the homes of farmworker families (16 – 19). Frequent cleaning is one way to decrease pesticide residue levels. Documenting the frequency of cleaning or the presence of a working vacuum cleaner in the home can inform educational programs designed to help families reduce pesticide exposure in the home. Finally, home ownership may be related to a sense of mastery, control or security (20, 21) and thus have implications for psychological health.

While there is general agreement about the importance of farmworker housing to health, there is surprisingly little research on farmworker housing quality or the relationship of housing to the health of farmworker families. Only a handful of studies have attempted to document the quality of farmworker housing, and these universally decry the abysmal state of this housing (22 – 25). Farmworker housing is generally characterized as crowded, in disrepair, lacking basic facilities (e.g., in-door plumbing) and appliances (e.g., washing machines, fully functioning stovetops), and located near fields in which pesticides are applied, and costly.

## **Methods**

Data for this analysis were collected for two different projects, La Familia and Casa y Campo. Both projects were conducted primarily in North Carolina; however, some of the La Familia participants reside in Virginia. Both are community-based participatory research projects conducted collaboratively by the North Carolina Farmworkers Project, a non-profit advocacy and service organization that assists farmworkers, Student Action for Farmworkers, a non-profit organization that places bilingual college students in agencies that assist farmworkers in North and South Carolina, and Wake Forest University School of Medicine. The projects each conducted two separate surveys that provided data for this analysis. Each survey was approved

by the Wake Forest University School of Medicine Institutional Review Board.

### **La Familia**

La Familia is an intervention project aimed at reducing pesticide exposure among Latino farmworker families in the mountain counties of northwest North Carolina and southern Virginia. Mountain agriculture in this region is dominated by Christmas tree production. In addition to planting, cultivating and harvesting Christmas trees, farmworker men and women make garlands and wreaths from Christmas tree branches. Data from the formative research used in the development of the La Familia intervention and from the baseline survey of intervention participants provide information about farmworker housing.

La Familia Formative Research (LF Formative): This component of the project was designed to document and evaluate farmworker women's knowledge and perceptions of pesticide exposure in their homes, as well as to assess the actual levels of pesticides and to identify the pathways for environmental exposure. Assessments included in-depth interviews, survey interviews, the collection of environmental samples, and the collection of urine samples. Data collection was completed in 2001.

Eligible households included at least two related persons, one of whom had to be employed as a seasonal, migrant, or year-round farmworker within the last twelve months, and the other had to be a child between 12-84 months of age. The primary contact was the adult female in the household. Since no list of farmworkers was available, and due to the dispersed nature of farmworker residences, a standard random sample design could not be used. Potential candidates were found via a site-based sampling approach (26), which first identified locations where members of farmworker families could be found. Details of the sampling procedures are described elsewhere (19, 27). Data were collected in the participants' homes. After describing the study, answering questions, and obtaining informed consent, interviews were conducted by bilingual females. Forty-one families participated in the La Familia Formative Research.

La Familia Baseline Survey (LF Survey): Before the implementation of the La Familia lay health advisor intervention, participating families were asked to complete a baseline survey that measured pesticide safety knowledge and behavior, as well as characteristics of the participating households and their dwellings. Participants included the families recruited by the nine trained lay health advisors, with the inclusion criteria being a family in which at least one person had done farm work in the previous year, and having a child. The primary respondent was the adult female of the household. The baseline survey included 117 farmworker families. Data collection was completed in 2003.

### **Casa y Campo**

Casa y Campo is a community health education project aimed at reducing pesticide exposure and addressing the health concerns of the farmworker community. It is being conducted in four counties in central and eastern North Carolina, the area with the highest concentration of migrant and seasonal farmworkers in the state. Agriculture in this region is dominated by the production of tobacco, sweet potatoes, cucumbers and other vegetables. Data from the formative research

used in the development of the Casa y Campo community education program and from a survey of household lead exposure both provide information about farmworker housing.

Casa y Campo Formative Research (CC Formative): In-depth and survey interviews were conducted with 25 farmworker families to document knowledge and beliefs about pesticide exposures and prevention at work and at home. Included in the interviews were fixed response items about living conditions such as number of years in residence, type of structure, and house cleaning.

A site-based sampling method was used to locate a representative sample (26). Project staff visited sites, approached individuals and asked if they wanted to participate. They explained the purpose of the study, study procedures, and risks and benefits involved. Once informed consent was obtained respondents were interviewed by trained bilingual interviewers. Interviews were conducted with twenty-one women and four men in 2002.

Lead Exposure Survey (CC Survey): The design of the Casa y Campo project provided for data collection during each project year that addressed concerns of the farmworker community. In 2003, a survey was conducted to document lead exposure in farmworker dwellings. Eligible households had to have at least one adult who had done farm work within twelve months and at least one child under the age of six present. A site-based sampling approach was used to locate potential participants.

Following an explanation of the purpose of the study, the study procedures, and an explanation of the risks and benefits of the study, informed consent was obtained, and survey interviews were completed by trained bilingual interviewers. Data were collected from 51 households.

### **Measures and Analysis**

This analysis relies primarily on the four survey interview data sets. From the survey data we constructed measures of respondent characteristics, dwelling characteristics, household characteristics, and household behaviors. Respondent characteristics include gender, age, country of origin, and number of years in the US. Dwelling characteristics were reported by observation of the trained interviewers as well as from participant self-report (Table I). These included tenure, housing type, type of construction material, adjacent to agricultural fields, number of rooms, ease of cleaning, and presence of air conditioning. Household characteristics included length of residence, household composition, household size, crowding (Table II). Behaviors included frequency of cleaning and laundry facilities (Table III). Equivalent data were not collected to construct all of the measures for each survey. However, there is a sufficient overlap of questions to get a preliminary assessment of the state of housing for North Carolina farmworker families.

Data from the in-depth interviews collected as part of the La Familia Formative Research and the Casa y Campo Formative Research were also reviewed for this analysis. Quotations from these in-depth interviews that illustrate the survey data were included with the results. Quotations are labeled with "LF" if they are from the La Familia Formative Research and "CC" if they are from the Casa y Campo Formative Research; numbers in the labels refer to specific respondents.




## Results

### Respondent Characteristics

Data were available for 234 households across the four surveys (41 LF Formative; 117 LF Survey; 25 CC Formative; 51 CC Survey). Respondents were predominantly female by study design (n=220), although a few males were included in CC Formative (n=4) and CC Survey (n=10). About half (52%) of those interviewed were in the 25-34 year age group, with 34% less than 25 years of age and 13% greater than 35. LF Survey respondents tended to be a little younger, with 40% less than 25 years of age.

Most respondents in all four groups had migrated from Mexico (over 90%). Most respondents in LF Survey (71.3%) and CC Survey (74.5%) had been in the US at least three years. Almost 40% of the CC Survey respondents had lived in the US for seven or more years, compared to 18% of the LF Survey respondents.



**Figure 1:** Farmworker Houses:

A. Old farm house, B. Contemporary single family, C. Converted tobacco barn, and D. Trailer.

## Dwelling Characteristics

About 20% of the dwellings in three of the surveys were owner occupied (Table I). A large percentage of the dwellings in which farmworkers lived were mobile homes; hence the predominant exterior was aluminum siding. More of the La Familia than Casa y Campo participants lived in single family homes and apartments. Measures of dwelling size are only available for the La Familia surveys, and reflect the types of dwellings. About half of the dwellings had five or six rooms (excluding kitchens). Most had two or three bedrooms, and most had a single bathroom.

Participants gave different evaluations of the sizes of their dwellings. Some were very positive; for example, "It's a big trailer. It has two bedrooms, a big kitchen – well, it's not real big, but it's not small either. We all fit into it. And the living room is big. It's a big trailer. I believe that we are very comfortable here because the living room is big. The bedrooms are big" (CC04). Others participants were less sanguine. For example, in describing the trailer in which two families lived, a participant stated, "I think the other trailers are bigger. This is the smallest one. It only has two bedrooms, but for us it's fine with just two bedrooms" (CC07). Another participant, whose household included four adults and a small child, described her dwelling as "It doesn't have bedrooms. It's just one big space. And it doesn't have a place for bathing. It's just this" (CC05).

Structural factors related to the potential for pesticide exposure were also available. Eleven percent of LF Survey families, 44% of LF Formative families, and 28% of CC Formative families lived in dwellings directly adjacent to agricultural fields. Reports of windows being permanently shut ranged from 32 to 49%. Over half of the households in Casa Formative (64%) and Casa Survey (74.5%) owned air conditioners. This compares to only 17% of the La Familia Formative respondents, who live in higher and presumably cooler altitudes.


The trained interviews rated each house as to its difficulty to clean. Forty-five percent of CC Survey houses and 49% of LF Formative dwellings were rated as difficult to clean. Few (14%) LF Survey houses were rated as difficult to clean, and data were not available for CC Formative houses. Observational data on housing conditions were collected for the CC Survey. Peeling paint (interior, exterior, or windows) was observed by interviewers in over 20% of the dwellings. Participants often noted the deteriorated conditions of their dwellings.

The thing is that this house is the oldest and that's why it's like this. I told the boss to buy me some paint because the house needed to be painted on the outside because it's ugly already. And I told him I wouldn't charge him for that. (CC18)

It's not very nice. It's a little bit dirty, but since there are no other trailers or houses here, here's where we come. It's a little dirty. We wanted a clean trailer, but there aren't any. And we came here and it's dirty, a little bit dirty. (CC19)

Because this house is very cold, and when we arrived, the house had lots of holes everywhere, like on the edges of boards, there in the kitchen, all along this hallway, and over there, behind the bedrooms. (LF11)

It's very small and there are a lot of problems. I had to take out the carpet because the water pipes would bust open all the time. They don't work and it would flood, and I had to take off the other one that was on top of this one, and the owner doesn't come and fix it. (LF36)



**Figure 2:** Farmworker dwelling surrounded by Christmas trees.



**Figure 3:** Christmas wreath materials on porch of farmworker dwelling.

Table I: Dwelling Characteristics of Farmworker Households in North Carolina.\*

| Dwelling Characteristics          | Survey                    |      |                         |      |                           |       |                    |      |
|-----------------------------------|---------------------------|------|-------------------------|------|---------------------------|-------|--------------------|------|
|                                   | La Familia                |      |                         |      | Casa y Campo              |       |                    |      |
|                                   | Formative Research (n=41) |      | Baseline Survey (n=117) |      | Formative Research (n=25) |       | Lead Survey (n=51) |      |
|                                   | n                         | %    | N                       | %    | n                         | %     | n                  | %    |
| Tenure                            |                           |      |                         |      |                           |       |                    |      |
| Own                               | 9                         | 22.0 | 19                      | 16.2 | 0                         | 0.0   | 10                 | 19.6 |
| Rent                              | 32                        | 78.0 | 84                      | 71.8 | 25                        | 100.0 | 41                 | 80.4 |
| Housing provided by employer      |                           |      | 14                      | 12.0 |                           |       |                    |      |
| Dwelling Type                     |                           |      |                         |      |                           |       |                    |      |
| Mobile home or trailer            | 22                        | 53.7 | 68                      | 58.1 | 16                        | 64.0  | 36                 | 70.6 |
| Single family detached            | 12                        | 29.3 | 31                      | 26.5 | 9                         | 36.0  | 12                 | 23.5 |
| Apartments                        | 7                         | 17.0 | 18                      | 15.4 | 0                         | 0.0   | 3                  | 5.9  |
| Exterior Material                 |                           |      |                         |      |                           |       |                    |      |
| Aluminum siding                   | 20                        | 48.8 |                         |      | 15                        | 60.0  | 32                 | 62.7 |
| Wood siding                       | 13                        | 31.7 |                         |      | 7                         | 28.0  | 14                 | 27.5 |
| Aluminum and wood siding          | 4                         | 9.8  |                         |      | 0                         | 0.0   | 4                  | 7.8  |
| Brick                             | 3                         | 7.3  |                         |      | 2                         | 8.0   | 1                  | 2.0  |
| Other                             | 1                         | 2.4  |                         |      | 1                         | 4.0   | 0                  | 0.00 |
| Condition of Paint                |                           |      |                         |      |                           |       |                    |      |
| No peeling or no paint            |                           |      |                         |      |                           |       | 31                 | 60.8 |
| Exterior paint peeling            |                           |      |                         |      |                           |       | 6                  | 11.8 |
| Interior paint peeling            |                           |      |                         |      |                           |       | 3                  | 5.9  |
| Window frames peeling             |                           |      |                         |      |                           |       | 1                  | 2.0  |
| Two or more surfaces peeling      |                           |      |                         |      |                           |       | 10                 | 19.6 |
| Number of Rooms                   |                           |      |                         |      |                           |       |                    |      |
| Two to four                       | 19                        | 46.3 | 17                      | 14.5 |                           |       |                    |      |
| Five or six                       | 19                        | 46.3 | 73                      | 62.4 |                           |       |                    |      |
| Seven or more                     | 3                         | 7.3  | 27                      | 23.1 |                           |       |                    |      |
| Number of Bedrooms                |                           |      |                         |      |                           |       |                    |      |
| One                               | 3                         | 7.3  | 5                       | 4.3  |                           |       |                    |      |
| Two                               | 17                        | 41.5 | 72                      | 61.5 |                           |       |                    |      |
| Three                             | 16                        | 39.0 | 32                      | 27.4 |                           |       |                    |      |
| Four or more                      | 5                         | 12.2 | 8                       | 6.9  |                           |       |                    |      |
| Number of Bathrooms               |                           |      |                         |      |                           |       |                    |      |
| One                               | 34                        | 82.9 | 90                      | 76.9 |                           |       |                    |      |
| Two                               | 7                         | 17.1 | 27                      | 23.1 |                           |       |                    |      |
| Adjacent to Agricultural Fields   | 18                        | 43.9 | 13                      | 11.1 | 7                         | 28.0  |                    |      |
| Any Window Permanently Shut       | 13                        | 31.7 |                         |      | 12                        | 48.0  | 25                 | 49.0 |
| Difficult to Clean                | 20                        | 48.8 | 16                      | 13.7 |                           |       | 23                 | 45.1 |
| Air Conditioning                  |                           |      |                         |      |                           |       |                    |      |
| None                              | 34                        | 83.0 |                         |      | 9                         | 36.0  | 13                 | 25.5 |
| Window Unit                       | 1                         | 2.4  |                         |      | 9                         | 36.0  | 25                 | 49.0 |
| Central                           | 3                         | 7.3  |                         |      | 7                         | 28.0  | 13                 | 25.5 |
| Do not know                       | 3                         | 7.3  |                         |      | 0                         | 0.0   | 0                  | 0.0  |
| Use Air Conditioning (if present) | 4                         | 57.1 |                         |      | 16                        | 100.0 | 37                 | 97.4 |

\*Blanks indicate that the variable was not collected in that survey.

## Household Characteristics

While length of time in the US is a potential indicator for stability, from the standpoint of housing quality, another important variable is length of time in current residence (Table II). The longer a family lives in a particular dwelling, the greater the opportunity to make repairs. At least a quarter of the individuals in all four groups had lived in their current residence for less than one year. The CC Survey had the highest percentage of respondents living in their current house for less than one year (37%), and for five or more years (27.5%). These data illustrate significant variability between and within all four groups in terms of housing stability.

A large percentage of the respondents in all four surveys had households composed of more than the traditional nuclear family (a married couple with children). About half of the two Casa samples had relatives beyond the nuclear family living with them, while about one-quarter of the two La Familia samples had co-resident non-nuclear family relatives. About 10% of the households from all of the samples had unrelated co-resident members, with the greatest percentage for LF Formative.

A large percent of households in each survey had seven or more residents, ranging from 12.03% of the LF Survey households to 39.2% of the CC Survey households. Most households had at least two children, with about half of the Casa households having three or more children. At least 40% of the households in every survey had more than two adults living in the household, and at least 40% of the households had at least two adults employed as farmworkers. Participants described problems caused by households with many adults.

The house is fine. The thing is that living with a lot of people is difficult, very difficult. They don't keep things clean, the bathroom, the kitchen, and the living room. There are nine [people]. They don't fit in the beds, but there are nine. They leave everything thrown around and I would have to go around picking things up. And I also work everyday and I have to straighten everything up before I go to work. I have to leave everything clean before I go because, sometimes, the American comes and if he sees that it's dirty, he says things like, "There's a woman living in this trailer, and she doesn't even keep it clean." But it's not that, I clean it, but it's impossible for me to keep it clean because I'm not the only one living here. (CC14)

Estimates of crowding, defined as those households with a mean of more than one person per room (excluding bathrooms), were available for LF Formative and Survey. Crowding for both samples was about forty percent (LF Formative 46.3%; LF Survey 36.2%). Issues surrounding crowding often came up in the in-depth interviews. "It's somewhat comfortable, but for me, it's not too comfortable because I just have this small room. The things that are here belong to my brother-in-law" (CC25). A woman whose household included three adults and two children stated, "It's not as big as I would like it to be, but the measurements – I don't understand inches. But it's a little house. A normal trailer for one family" (CC17). "This trailer, I don't know how old it is because, like I told you before, we have only been here for three years. I don't know how old it is. But it has two bedrooms. We turned that one into a bedroom since we are seven [people]. Here sleeps one and the girl who will turn fifteen. And we are at the end, over there.

So, we turned that one into a room, so you can say we have three bedrooms. But in reality, in reality it has two bedrooms. Two bedrooms only, and a bathroom” (LF25). “Well, sometimes we don’t all fit. It’s like they want to go to sleep, well, yeah, there is enough room because that right there is a sofa-bed. My two sisters sleep there and over there my sister sleeps over there and my father and my mother sleep there, and we sleep in the room. It doesn’t look good when everything is all mixed up. We really need a room, or a bed, because that way the living room would have sofas and a table, a real living room. We need more space right? So we can have some order over here. We don’t fit anymore” (LF30A).

About a third of both LF Formative and Survey households (39% and 31.9%) had two to three farmworkers per bathroom, a potential indicator of limited access to personal hygiene facilities to bathe following farm work and potential exposure to pesticides.

When we arrive [from work], we have to wait for awhile and then the other one takes a bath. But getting home everyone takes a bath and then we wait until the next one takes a bath. We stay here inside and there are some who go outside to walk and then when one person finishes bathing, that person comes in and takes a bath and so on. (CC06)  
You have to wait until the one who’s taking a bath comes out and the one who won goes in and the next one continues to wait because there’s just one bathroom. There’s one outside but it’s just for men and this one, too. It’s just that when this one is occupied, that one is on hand if you need to use it. But the problem is that when you’re using this one, there’s hardly any water out there. (CC21)

Table II: Household Characteristics of Farmworker Households in North Carolina.\*

| Household Characteristics                       | Survey                    |      |                         |      |                           |      |                    |      |
|---|---------------------------|------|-------------------------|------|---------------------------|------|--------------------|------|
|   | La Familia                |      |                         |      | Casa y Campo              |      |                    |      |
|   | Formative Research (n=41) |      | Baseline Survey (n=117) |      | Formative Research (n=25) |      | Lead Survey (n=51) |      |
|   | n                         | %    | N                       | %    | n                         | %    | n                  | %    |
| Length of Residence                             |                           |      |                         |      |                           |      |                    |      |
| Less than one year                              | 14                        | 34.1 | 33                      | 28.2 | 7                         | 28.0 | 19                 | 37.3 |
| One or two years                                | 8                         | 19.5 | 50                      | 42.7 | 5                         | 20.0 | 9                  | 17.6 |
| Three or four years                             | 14                        | 34.1 | 26                      | 22.2 | 8                         | 32.0 | 7                  | 13.7 |
| Five or more years                              | 5                         | 12.2 | 8                       | 6.9  | 5                         | 20.0 | 14                 | 27.5 |
| Household Composition                           |                           |      |                         |      |                           |      |                    |      |
| Nuclear family only                             | 23                        | 56.1 | 67                      | 57.3 | 9                         | 36.0 | 21                 | 41.2 |
| Nuclear family with relatives                   | 12                        | 29.3 | 28                      | 23.9 | 12                        | 48.0 | 25                 | 49.0 |
| Nuclear family with non-relatives               | 3                         | 7.3  | 21                      | 17.9 | 3                         | 12.0 | 4                  | 7.8  |
| Nuclear family with relatives and non-relatives | 3                         | 7.3  | 1                       | .9   | 1                         | 4.0  | 1                  | 2.0  |
| Household Size                                  |                           |      |                         |      |                           |      |                    |      |
| Two to four persons                             | 16                        | 39.0 | 70                      | 59.8 | 6                         | 24.0 | 10                 | 19.6 |
| Five or six persons                             | 18                        | 43.9 | 33                      | 28.2 | 13                        | 52.0 | 21                 | 41.2 |
| Seven or more persons                           | 7                         | 17.1 | 14                      | 12.0 | 6                         | 24.0 | 20                 | 39.2 |
| Number Children                                 |                           |      |                         |      |                           |      |                    |      |
| None (pregnant participant)                     | 0                         | 0    | 5                       | 4.3  | 1                         | 4.0  | 0                  | 0    |
| One   | 13                        | 31.7 | 59                      | 50.4 | 7                         | 28.0 | 12                 | 23.5 |
| Two   | 13                        | 31.7 | 30                      | 25.6 | 6                         | 24.0 | 10                 | 19.6 |
| Three or more                                   | 15                        | 36.6 | 23                      | 19.7 | 11                        | 44.0 | 29                 | 56.9 |
| Number of Adults                                |                           |      |                         |      |                           |      |                    |      |
| One or two                                      | 25                        | 61.0 | 66                      | 56.4 | 9                         | 36.0 | 17                 | 33.3 |
| Three or four                                   | 10                        | 24.4 | 42                      | 35.9 | 10                        | 40.0 | 22                 | 43.1 |
| Five or six                                     | 6                         | 14.6 | 9                       | 7.7  | 6                         | 24.0 | 12                 | 23.5 |
| Number of Farmworkers                           |                           |      |                         |      |                           |      |                    |      |
| One   | 18                        | 43.9 | 69                      | 59.0 | 4                         | 16.0 | 19                 | 37.3 |
| Two   | 14                        | 34.1 | 30                      | 25.6 | 7                         | 28.0 | 14                 | 27.5 |
| Three or more                                   | 9                         | 22.0 | 18                      | 15.4 | 14                        | 56.0 | 18                 | 35.3 |
| Crowding Index (people/rooms)                   |                           |      |                         |      |                           |      |                    |      |
| Less than or equal to one per room              | 22                        | 53.7 | 74                      | 63.8 |                           |      |                    |      |
| More than one person per room                   | 19                        | 46.3 | 42                      | 36.2 |                           |      |                    |      |
| Farmworkers per Bathroom                        |                           |      |                         |      |                           |      |                    |      |
| Less than or equal to one                       | 19                        | 46.3 | 73                      | 62.9 |                           |      |                    |      |
| More than one and less than four                | 16                        | 39.0 | 37                      | 31.9 |                           |      |                    |      |
| Four or more                                    | 6                         | 14.7 | 6                       | 5.2  |                           |      |                    |      |

\*Blanks indicate that the variable was not collected in that survey.

## Household Behaviors

Direct indicators of behaviors related to housing quality are reported in Table III. Household cleaning practices are consistent across the surveys. About two-thirds dust their homes daily or several times each week. Most sweep their floors daily. Over sixty percent mop their floors daily. Vacuuming is less frequent, but many do not own a vacuum cleaner.

The vacuum cleaner, I hardly ever use. I use the broom because the vacuum doesn't work well. [How do you wash the carpet?] With a bucket of water. You put some soap and a little bit of bleach in it and with that you scrub it. And then with clean water, you rinse it. (CC15)

When my husband has a day that he doesn't work, he always helps me take out the carpet and we put it outside. And with the brooms I scrub it and then I clean it with water. And then, I put it out to dry. Then I return it to the house. (CC07)

About 60% of the participants have a working washing machine, with almost 40% of the

La Familia respondents also having a working dryer. However, about half of the La Familia households still use public laundromats, as do about one-third of the CC Formative participants. "For example, we are three in my family. We do laundry on a weekly basis. I take two baskets per person. Because sometimes I do more loads because I use at least like 8 washers every time I do laundry. Because her [child's] clothes – I wash her color clothes separately. And I wash her white clothes separately. Same with his [husband's] clothes" (LF17). "I do my husband's laundry that is why he can change, but the others [farmworkers] go to the laundromat every week, so they have to keep their clothes in the same room. So, I think that could be a source of pesticide contamination" (LF02).




Figure 4: Laundry facility for farmworker family.



Table III: Household Behaviors in Farmworker Households in North Carolina.\*

| Household Behaviors     | Survey                    |      |                         |      |                           |      |                    |      |
|-------------------------|---------------------------|------|-------------------------|------|---------------------------|------|--------------------|------|
|                         | La Familia                |      |                         |      | Casa y Campo              |      |                    |      |
|                         | Formative Research (n=41) |      | Baseline Survey (n=117) |      | Formative Research (n=25) |      | Lead Survey (n=51) |      |
|                         | n                         | %    | n                       | %    | n                         | %    | n                  | %    |
| Frequency Dust          |                           |      |                         |      |                           |      |                    |      |
| Daily                   | 11                        | 26.8 |                         |      | 13                        | 52.0 | 18                 | 35.3 |
| Several times per week  | 15                        | 36.6 |                         |      | 5                         | 20.0 | 17                 | 33.3 |
| Once per week or less   | 15                        | 36.6 |                         |      | 7                         | 28.0 | 16                 | 31.4 |
| Frequency Sweep Floors  |                           |      |                         |      |                           |      |                    |      |
| Daily                   | 32                        | 78.0 |                         |      | 24                        | 96.0 | 49                 | 96.1 |
| Several times per week  | 6                         | 14.6 |                         |      | 0                         | 0.0  | 2                  | 3.9  |
| Once per week or less   | 3                         | 7.3  |                         |      | 1                         | 4.0  | 0                  | 0.0  |
| Frequency Mop Floors    |                           |      |                         |      |                           |      |                    |      |
| Daily                   |                           |      |                         |      | 15                        | 60.0 | 37                 | 72.5 |
| Several times per week  |                           |      |                         |      | 8                         | 32.0 | 12                 | 23.5 |
| Once per week or less   |                           |      |                         |      | 2                         | 8.0  | 2                  | 4.0  |
| Frequency Vacuum Floors |                           |      |                         |      |                           |      |                    |      |
| Daily                   | 13                        | 31.7 |                         |      | 2                         | 8.0  | 10                 | 19.6 |
| Several times per week  | 7                         | 17.1 |                         |      | 2                         | 8.0  | 10                 | 19.6 |
| Once per week or less   | 8                         | 19.5 |                         |      | 2                         | 8.0  | 3                  | 5.9  |
| Do not own a vacuum     | 13                        | 31.7 |                         |      | 19                        | 76.0 | 28                 | 54.9 |
| Laundry Facilities      |                           |      |                         |      |                           |      |                    |      |
| Working washing machine | 25                        | 61.0 | 67                      | 57.3 | 16                        | 64.0 |                    |      |
| Working dryer           | 16                        | 39.0 | 43                      | 36.8 | 4                         | 16.0 |                    |      |
| Indoor clothesline      | 4                         | 10.0 | 5                       | 4.3  | 0                         | 0.0  |                    |      |
| Outdoor clothesline     | 24                        | 58.5 | 31                      | 26.5 | 18                        | 72.0 |                    |      |
| Hand Launder            | 15                        | 36.6 |                         |      | 4                         | 16.0 |                    |      |
| Use Public Laundromat   | 20                        | 48.8 | 56                      | 47.9 | 8                         | 32.0 |                    |      |

\*Blanks indicate that the variable was not collected in that survey.

## **Discussion**

The health of farmworker families in North Carolina is at risk due to inadequate housing. Most farmworker families live in mobile homes, and few own their dwellings. Many are located near agricultural fields. Most houses are small, most with six or fewer rooms. However, the size of farmworker households is large, many containing related and unrelated adults in addition to the nuclear family of the householders. Crowding is widespread. Many farmworker households lack basic facilities such as clothes washers and dryers, and vacuum cleaners. Farmworkers attempt to keep their dwellings clean with frequent sweeping, dusting and mopping.

There are noticeable differences between our results and housing surveys completed among other rural populations. Farmworkers have extremely low rates of home ownership compared to the general US rural population (Table IV). Krivo (10) found that Hispanics who have lived in the US longer and spoke English were more likely to own their homes. She also found that income, education, and age had a positive effect on homeownership for Hispanics. As the farmworker population in North Carolina has little education, low income, and limited ability to speak English, it is not surprising that its rate of home ownership is low. While it is important to address barriers for farmworker families to buy their own home, it is also important to examine whether home ownership is a goal for farmworker families, many of whom migrate from state to state or see their time in the US as temporary.

Across the four surveys, 54% to 71% of the participants lived in mobile homes, compared to 7% of the general US population, and 15% of the rural US population (Table IV). New mobile homes could provide some benefit to farmworker families as they would not contain lead paint and might have laundry facilities, as well as central heating and air conditioning. However, the observations of the interviewers and the statements of the participants indicate the mobile homes in which these farmworkers live are old and deteriorating. Further, while home ownership may bring a sense of mastery and control, many families who own mobile homes do not actually own the land it occupies.

Variables considered in this analysis, such as access to laundry facilities and adjacency to fields, are particularly relevant to farmworker populations. Laundry facilities at home are especially important in rural households, where distance to the public laundromat is often great. From 63%-84% of farmworker families in our surveys lacked either a washer or dryer at home, compared to 16% for the rural US population. Apart from being convenient and cost-efficient, easy access to laundry facilities is important for farmworker families because it helps protect them from pesticide exposure (15).

Proximity to agricultural fields was considered by the Housing Assistance Council as an important housing variable (24). They found that 26% of farmworker households in the US lived near agricultural fields, and 29% of those in the Eastern Migrant Stream. Children lived in 60% of these households. In our surveys, 11% to 44% of dwellings were adjacent to agricultural fields, and all of the households contained children.

When compared to rural households in the US, the percentage of crowded farmworker households is striking. Two percent of rural households and 3% of very low income rural households were

crowded in 1997 (28), compared to 36% and 46% among farmworkers in these studies. Rates of crowding were higher in other surveys with farmworker households; HAC found that 52% of farmworker households in the U.S. and 72% in the Eastern Stream are crowded (24). Crowding has long been regarded as an important housing problem and is much more prevalent among immigrant populations in the US than in the general population. It has been suggested that the differences between immigrants and the general population may reflect cultural differences in their living arrangements (30). This argument poses important questions for researchers and policy makers about how cultural background might play a role into the way that living arrangements affect psychological well-being. Our in-depth interview data indicates that many Latino farmworker families feel that their housing is crowded, and that this crowding is detrimental to their quality of life.

To understand the problem of crowding among farmworker families and how to address it, more research is needed on how farmworkers make decisions about their living arrangements. For some families there may be issues of affordability, or they might prioritize sending money to relatives in their communities of origin over having more space. Another important issue to explore is the living arrangements for these families before they came to the US, and their expectations for how they would be here in the US. Overcrowding, as it is defined, may be more of a stressor in households that include unrelated adults than in households with several small children. Women living with their husband's relatives may experience more stress than women who live with, in addition to their husband and children, their mother or brother.

The surveys described in this paper are important in that they focus on farmworker "family" housing. The housing reports that have been published are rare and have looked at farmworker housing as a whole. While unaccompanied male farmworkers face some of the same challenges with regard to housing and environmental health, farmworker families have different needs, resources, and lifestyles. The sub-group of farmworker families could be divided into two more sub-groups: migrant families and settled families. It has been suggested that while both of these sub-groups experience problems with housing quality, migrant families are less likely to have their housing needs met (22).

Advocating for farmworker families is challenging. Agencies who work toward protecting the rights of farmworkers do not have much leverage when it comes to seasonal farmworker families. Employers who hire workers legally under the H2A visa program, a guest-worker program used widely in North Carolina, must comply with the migrant housing code or face penalties. The housing for workers with H2A visas must be inspected before it is occupied. Undocumented migrant farmworkers who live in camps, often without their families, are covered under the migrant housing code (31). However, there are no specific housing regulations for seasonal farmworkers, and they are more likely than migrant farmworkers to live with their families. Children in seasonal farmworker families are the most vulnerable to the health implications of poor housing quality.

This analysis has several limitations. Some housing quality indicators, such as structural problems, presence and functioning of cooking appliances and fixtures, and exterior and interior quality of the home were not collected as part of the survey data. However, field notes indicate that many farmworker families experienced problems in these areas. Cost burden was not

addressed. While rent paid may be relatively easy data to collect, reliable data on family income among this population is very difficult to obtain, due to factors such as job dependence on the ever changing agricultural cycle or non-nuclear families co-residents. Finally, the differences between farmworkers in this state compared to other states are still unclear.

### ***Recommendations***

All adults and children have the right to live in housing that does not compromise their health or well-being (1). Many families in the US enjoy this right, but many other families live in moderately or severely inadequate housing. Several actions can be taken to improve farmworker housing.

#### **Regulation and Enforcement:**

- Efforts must be made by regulatory agencies to enforce existing housing inspection and housing quality standards for these migrant farmworkers. This includes addressing overcrowding and ensuring adequate laundry facilities.
- Farmworker health advocates must work with local housing inspection and public health agencies to ensure that the dwellings in which seasonal farmworker families reside meet minimal standards for public health and safety.
- Advocates for public health and social justice must work toward the implementation of state and local regulations that provide for safe and quality housing for all residents.

#### **Research:**

While farmworker families are a particularly marginalized population in the US whose housing needs are not being met; yet few studies specifically address the housing needs of farmworker families. This study is one of the first steps in addressing this need.

- More research is needed on housing availability, quality, and affordability.
- Ethnographic research that informs us about farmworker perceptions of their housing quality, how they make decisions about their living arrangements, and how their housing situations may affect their sense of well-being would be extremely helpful.

Table IV. Comparison of North Carolina Farmworker Family Housing Characteristics with Regional and National Farmworker Data, and National US Data.

| Housing Characteristics | La Familia y Casa y Campo Projects (Range)          | Farmworkers Eastern Stream (28)        | Farmworkers National (23)                 | United States Rural (27)                | United States Total (27)                |
|-------------------------|---|--|---|---|---|
| Tenure                  | Rent: 71% - 100%<br>Own: 0% - 22%                   | Rent: 99.7%<br>Own: .03%               | Rent: 97%<br>Own: 3%                      | Rent: 25%<br>Own: 75%                   | Rent: 34%<br>Own: 66%                   |
| Dwelling Type           | Single family: 23% - 29%<br>Mobile home: 54% - 71%  | Single family: 32%<br>Mobile home: 22% | Single family: 42%<br>Mobile home: 15%    | Single family: 72%<br>Mobile home: 15%  | Single family: 62%<br>Mobile home: 7%   |
| Peeling Paint           | 20%   | Not reported                           | 41%                                       | 3%                                      | 3%                                      |
| Adjacency to Fields     | 11% - 44%   | 29%                                    | 26%                                       | Not reported                            | Not reported                            |
| Household Composition   | Living with non-nuclear family members: 43% - 64%   | Not reported                           | Living with unrelated family members: 52% | Not reported                            | Not reported                            |
| Household Size          | Means: 5.62 - 6.39                                  | Not reported                           | Mean: 5                                   | Not reported                            | 10% had 5 or more in household          |
| Crowding                | 36% - 46%   | 72%                                    | 52%                                       | 4%                                      | 3%                                      |
| Laundry Machines        | Lacked washer: 36% - 42%<br>Lacked dryer: 61% - 84% | Not reported                           | Lacked one or more laundry machines: 52%  | Lacked washer: 16%<br>Lacked dryer: 21% | Lacked washer: 24%<br>Lacked dryer: 28% |

## **References Cited**

1. United Nations: The Right to Adequate Housing. UN Commission on Economic, Social, and Cultural Rights. <http://www.unhchr.ch/housing/fs21.htm>. Accessed 08/02/2004
2. Shaw M: Housing and public health. *Annu Rev Public Health* 2004; 25:397-418
3. Bonnefoy XR, Annesi-Maesano I, Moreno Aznar L, Braubach M, Croxford B, Davidson M, Ezratty V, Fredouille J, Gonzalez-Gross M, van Kamp I, Maschke C, Mesbah M, Moissonnier B, Monolbaev K, Moore R, Nicol S, Niemann H, Nygren C, Ormandy D, Robbel N, Rudnai P. Review of evidence on housing and health. Background document Fourth Ministerial Conference on Environment and Health, Budapest, Hungary, 23-25 June 2004. World Health Organization; 2004
4. Hopton J: Housing conditions and mental health in a disadvantaged area in Scotland. *J Epidemiol Community Health* 1996; 50:56-61
5. Butler S, Williams M, Tukuitonga C, Paterson J: Problems with damp and cold housing among Pacific families in New Zealand. *NZ Med J* 2003; 116:494-526
6. Holden C: Housing. In *Migrant Health Issues*. pp. 40-43. Buda, TX: National Center for Farmworker Health, Inc; 2001:40-43
7. Leaderer B, Belanger K, Triche E, Holford T, Gold D, Kim Y, Jankun T, Ren P, McSharry J, Platts-Mills T, Chapman M, Bracken M: Dust mite, cockroach, cat, and dog allergen concentrations in homes of asthmatic children in northeastern United States: Impact of socioeconomic factors and population density. *Environ Health Perspect* 2002; 110:419-425
8. Dales RE, Zwanenburg H, Burnett R, Franklin CA: Respiratory health effects of home dampness and molds among Canadian children. *Am J Epidemiol* 1991; 2:196-203
9. Dedman DJ, Gunnell D, Davey Smith G, Frankel S: Childhood housing conditions and later mortality in the Boyd Orr cohort. *J Epidemiol Community Health* 2001; 51:10-22
10. Krivo L: Immigrant Characteristics and Hispanic-Anglo Housing Inequality. *Demography* 1995; 32:599-615
11. Schill M, Friedman S, Rosenbaum E: The housing conditions of immigrants in New York City. *Journal of Housing Research* 1998; 9:201-235
12. Mehta K, Gabbard SM, Barrat V, Lewis M, Carroll D, Mines R: Findings from the National Agricultural Workers Survey (NAWS), 1997-1998: A demographic and employment profile of United States farmworkers. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Labor; 2000

13. Mines R, Gabbard S, Steirman A: A Profile of U.S. Farmworkers, Demographics, Household Consumption, Income, and Use of Services. U.S. Dept. of Labor, Office of Program Economics Research Report #6; 1997
14. Larson AC: Migrant and seasonal farmworker enumeration profiles study: North Carolina. Report prepared for the Migrant Health Program, Bureau of Primary Health Care, HRSA; 2000
15. Grieshop JI, Villanueva NE, Stiles MC: Wash day blues: secondhand exposure to agricultural chemicals. *J Rural Health* 1994; 10:247-257
16. Bradman MA, Harnly ME, Draper W, Seidel S, Teran S, Wakeham D, Neutra R: Pesticide exposures to children from California's Central Valley: results of a pilot study. *Expo Anal Environ Epidemiol* 1997; 7:217-234
17. Curl CL, Fenske RA, Kissel JC, Shirai JH, Moate TF, Griffith W, Coronado G, Thompson B: Evaluation of take-home organophosphorus pesticide exposure among agricultural workers and their children. *Environ Health Perspect* 2002; 110:A787-A792
18. McCauley LA, Lasarev MR, Higgins G, Rothlein J, Muniz J, Ebbert C, Phillips J: Work characteristics and pesticide exposures among migrant agricultural families: a community-based research approach. *Environ Health Perspect* 2001; 109:533-538
19. Quandt SA, Arcury TA, Rao P, Snively BM, Camann DE, Doran AM, Yau AY, Hoppin JA, Jackson DS: Agricultural and residential pesticides in wipe samples from farmworker family residences in North Carolina and Virginia. *Environ Health Perspect* 2004;112:382-387
20. Rohe WM, Basolo V: Long-term effects of homeownership on the self-perceptions and social interaction of low-income persons. *Environ Behav* 1997; 29:793-819
21. Rohe WM, Van Zandt S, McCarthy G: Home ownership and access to opportunity. *Housing Studies* 2002; 17:51-61
22. Harrison, P: Safe, Clean, and Affordable: California Farmworker Housing Needs. *J Archit Plan Res* 1995; 12:19-34
23. Holden C: Bitter harvest: Housing conditions of migrant and seasonal farmworkers: In: Thompson CD, Wiggins MF, eds. *The Human Cost of Food: Farmworkers' Lives, Labor, and Advocacy*. Austin: University of Texas Press; 2002:169-193.
24. Housing Assistance Council: *No Refuge from the Fields: Findings from a Survey of Farmworker Housing Conditions in the United States*. Washington, DC: Housing Assistance Council; 2001

25. Peck S: Many harvests of shame: Housing for farmworkers: In: Belden JN, Wiener RJ, eds. *Housing in Rural America: Building Affordable and Inclusive Communities*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications; 1999:83-90
26. Arcury TA, Quandt SA. Participant recruitment for qualitative research: a site-based approach to community research in complex societies. *Hum Org* 1999; 58:128-133
27. Arcury TA, Quandt SA, Rao P, Doran AM, Snively BM, Barr DB, Hoppin JA, Davis SW: Organophosphate pesticide exposure in farmworker family members in western North Carolina and Virginia: Case Comparisons. *Hum Org* in press.
28. Housing Assistance Council: *Why Housing Matters: HAC's 2000 Report on the State of the Nation's Rural Housing*. Washington, DC: Housing Assistance Council; 2000
29. Housing Assistance Council: *Abundant Fields, Meager Shelter: Findings from a Survey of Farmworker Housing in the Eastern Migrant Stream*. Washington, DC: Housing Assistance Council; 2000
30. Meyers D, Baer W, Choi S: The changing problem of overcrowded housing. *J Am Plann Assoc* 1996; 62:66-84
31. North Carolina Department of Labor *Introduction to Migrant Housing Inspections in North Carolina*. Raleigh, NC: Agricultural Safety and Health Bureau; 2003