

Farmer Quality of Life as Influenced by Work Organisation

Dr. Conor Hogan

Animal and Grassland Research and Innovation Centre, Teagasc, Moorepark, Fermoy, Co. Cork, Ireland. Contact – conor.hogan@teagasc.ie

Farm workforce issues in a global context

Total numbers of people working in agriculture



30% reduction in agri's share of total employment in industrialised countries



Dairy farm expansion in most developed countries - increased demand for *non-family* workforce

Assistant/farm hands; Assistant/managers; operations managers: different issues



Global skills shortage



Global competition for midrange and higher level skills (labour mobility)



Ireland – Current Situation

- Extra cows increased workload; 30% increase in workforce demand
- Aging workforce (average age 55 years old)
- Highest working hours of any sector in the economy (CSO, 2015)
- Seasonality challenge and availability of seasonal staff







AGRICULTURE AND FOOD DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY



AGRICULTURE AND FOOD DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY

The role of work organisation and labour productivity

- Critical to identify an approach to improve seasonal workload and labour demand issues on farms
- Improved work organisation/ labour productivity has a positive impact on a number of key aspects of social sustainability
 - Reduced stress (Brennan et al., 2021) and improved quality of life (Contzen and Haberli, 2021)
 - Improved health and safety (Osborne et al., 2010)
 - More attractive farm workplaces (Eastwood et al., 2018)
 - Farm profitability (Wilson, 2011)





Overall research question

 How can labour demand be minimised and labour productivity maximised on dairy farms so as to create socially sustainable farming systems?



AGRICULTURE AND FOOD DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY

Methodological approach

- Two key challenges:
 - 1. The measurement of peak farm labour time-use and efficiency
 - 2. Development of an understanding of the key strategies required to improve labour efficiency





2. Work practices & technologies





Study design

- Data collected in real-time once per week on an alternating day each week from February to June
 2019 on 76 farms
- Data collected using a smartphone app
 - Ten tasks on the app
 - Used by all farmers and any staff or family with smartphone access
- Weekly online survey
 - Captured any labour not using the app, contractor hours, and livestock details
- Study repeated in February, March and April 2021 on 57 farms





Hours worked by labour type (Feb – June)



AGRICULTURE AND FOOD DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY

Farm hours and labour efficiency (Feb – June)



% of time devoted to each farm task (Feb – June)





Average labour input (h/ day) for each task for each month





Effective work organisation

 The way tasks are organised and co-ordinated with a focus on the workers available, the tasks being completed and when they are being completed





Descriptive characteristics of the farmers' working day

-	Work organisa	ntion effectiveness pking ¹		
Item	Тор 25 %	Bottom 25 %	Average ²	P-value
Herd size	112	113	108	
Labour efficiency (h/ cow)	17.4	20.9	20.4	0.60
Start time (h)	07:00	06:47	06:48	0.72
Finish time (h)	18:25	19:58	19:08	< 0.001
Length of working day (h/ day)	11.4	13.2	12.3	< 0.001
Non-farm activity (h/day)	4.2	3.4	3.8	0.03
Labour input per week (h/ week)	51.2	70.0	61.1	< 0.001
Farmer days off between start of calving and end of breeding	2.0	0.9	1.7	0.71
Number of tasks completed per day	9.6	12.5	10.9	0.02

¹1 = Top 25 % - 13 farms (average 112 cows); 2 = Bottom 25 % - 15 farms (average 114 cows).

²Average of all farms used in the analysis (n=55).

Working day patterns in March – Daily task timelines of 4 farmers

20:00

20:00

easasc

22:00

22:00



Preliminary results – Survey of 313 farms

Work organisation effectiveness ranking

Top 25 %	Bottom 25 %	Average	P-value
16.6	5.1	10.3	< 0.001
8.3	2.4	4.5	< 0.001
3.4	4.5	3.9	0.02
	Top 25 % 16.6 8.3 3.4	Top 25 % Bottom 25 % 16.6 5.1 8.3 2.4 3.4 4.5	Top 25 % Bottom 25 % Average 16.6 5.1 10.3 8.3 2.4 4.5 3.4 4.5 3.9

Key characteristics

- Better facilities
- Implementing more labour efficient and HRM practices
- Less difficulty attracting and retaining employees
- More positive attitudes towards careers in farming



Work practices and technologies

Study using combination of on-farm surveys and time-use data collected in 2019

Aims

- 1. Identify the work practices and technologies associated with labour efficiency
- 2. Estimate the potential improvements in labour efficiency achieved by implementing these practices



Development of a scoring system to measure the effects of work practice/ technology implementation

Steps

- 1. 59 work practices/ technologies associated with labour efficiency of their particular task
- Each farmer was allocated a score 1 point allocated for each work practice/ technology where best practice was implemented and 0 if not
- 3. Points totalled to give a labour efficient work practice and technology implementation score for each farm

A high score = high number of labour efficient work practices/ technologies implemented

A low score = low number of labour efficient work practices/ technologies implemented



Labour efficient work practice/ technology scores

- 59 work practices/ technologies
 - Milking 19
 - Calf care 9
 - Cow Care 12
 - Grassland Management 5
- Average score of 30.9 (max 59)
- Range: 10 45

- Admin/ business 2
- Heifer Care 3
- Feeding 5
- General 4





Work practice/ technology scores on most and least labour efficient farms

Score	Maximum	Labour effici		
	score	Top 25%	Bottom 25%	P - Value
Total score	59	37.1	25.3	< 0.001

- Total labour efficient work practice/ technology score and herd size explained 54% of the variation in labour efficiency
- On average, each additional work practice/ technology implemented estimated to improve labour efficiency by 0.6 h/ cow



Key work practices/ technologies affecting milking labour efficiency

- One person milking for mid lactation (-3.04 h/ cow)
- Automatic cluster removers present (-2.55 h/ cow)
- Not leaving to feed calves during milking (-1.31 h/ cow)
- Cow exit gates can be operated from anywhere in the pit (-0.94 h/ cow)
- Cows herded in and out mechanically (-0.87 h/ cow)





*labour savings relate to the February to June period during which the study was completed

Key work practices/ technologies affecting calf care labour efficiency

- Contract calf rearing before weaning (-0.79 h/ cow)
- Using automated or ad libitum calf feeding methods once trained (-0.71 h/ cow)
- Not rearing bull calves on farm (-0.69 h/ cow)
- Calves trained on group feeders (days 1-4) (-0.52 h/ cow)





*labour savings relate to the February to June period during which the study was completed

Key work practices/ technologies affecting grassland management labour efficiency

Contracted slurry spreading (-1.78 h/ cow)





*labour savings relate to the February to June period during which the study was completed

Farm facilities and technologies

- Longitudinal study completed in spring 2021
 - Aimed to measure the effect of facilities and technologies changes on labour demand and efficiency (57 farms)
- Real-time on-farm case studies could reassure farmers of the labour saving benefits support modelled data
- Farm labour input increased by 3% but labour efficiency improved by 7% between 2019 and 2021
- Farmer hours worked in spring remained similar (64.0 vs 64.5 h/ week)





Differences on farms that made significant calf care changes

Efficiency improved and	Farms that made significant calf care changes (n=19)			Farms that didn't make significant calf care changes (n=38)		
time input remained the same despite herd size	2019	2021	% Difference	2019	2021	% Difference
Herd size	135	160	18.3%	150	160	6.8%
Calf care labour input (h)	231	232	0.5%	251	282	12.5%
Auto calf feeders had the greatest impact on labour efficiency - 21% improvement						

** Significant changes were mainly automatic calf feeders/ new calf sheds/ selling bull calves



Differences on farms that increased milking units or built new milking parlours





Farm performance indicators among the most and least labour efficient farms

Item	Labour effici					
	Top 25%	Bottom 25%	r - value			
6 week calving rate (%)	86	78	0.05			
Farms can be highly labour efficient and still achieve high levels of farm performance						



Take home messages

- Quality of life on dairy farms in terms of workload It can be done!
- Positive cases in terms of farmer working hours and the potential flexibility of the dairy farming workload should be highlighted –
 - To show farmers what can be achieved on their own farms
 - To address the negative perceptions associated with careers in dairy farming
- Time-off flexibility remains a key challenge





Thank You For Listening

Acknowledgements – Prof. Jim Kinsella, Dr. Bernadette O'Brien, Dr. Marion Beecher

> Animal and Grassland Research and Innovation Centre, Teagasc, Moorepark, Fermoy, Co. Cork, Ireland. Contact – conor.hogan@teagasc.ie

