
What is important for attracting and retaining farm employees? Evidence from the Australian orchard industry

Michael Santhanam-Martin ^a, Roger Wilkinson ^b, Lisa Cowan ^c

^a The University of Melbourne, Victoria, Australia

^b Roger Wilkinson Social Research, Warrnambool, Victoria, Australia

^c Department of Jobs, Precincts and Regions, Tatura, Victoria, Australia

Abstract: We report on a study of the job experiences of employees in the orchard industry in the Goulburn-Murray region of the Australian state of Victoria. The focus was employees' satisfaction with their jobs and with the industry and their future career intentions. In 2018 we surveyed 57 current, ongoing employees of orchard business across a range of sizes.

We used psychological contract theory as a theoretical framework for exploring the relationship between employees' experience of their jobs and their job satisfaction and future career intentions. The theory proposes that the relationship between an employee and their employer is a form of informal contract where the employer promises (explicitly or implicitly) to provide a range of benefits and that an employee's job satisfaction and commitment to their employer are positively correlated with the extent to which these promises and commitments are met. The theory also proposes that an employee's intention to leave their job is correlated with perceived breaches of the psychological contract.

Employment conditions and human resource management practices influenced employees' job satisfaction and career intentions. Where promises were made, employees rated fulfilment by their employers as generally high. Employees with high promise fulfilment scores for "Safety and security" and "Enabling good work" were the least likely to intend to leave their employer, so employers should focus on making sure that these basic elements are in place. Once those things are in place, employers can focus on offering training and career development opportunities.

There are particular pressures that affect employees in middle management positions (leading hands, supervisions, assistant managers and managers). They had lower job satisfaction, and their work hours were as long as those of senior managers even though they received a lot less pay. Yet they were no less committed to their employer. Individual employers and the industry should consider ways to make these roles more attractive, for example by ensuring that the expectations of the roles are reasonable, and that these expectations are set out clearly in position descriptions.

Keywords: horticulture, employees, retention, job satisfaction, psychological contract

Introduction

This paper presents the results of a 2018 survey of permanent employees in the fruit industry in the Goulburn-Murray region of Victoria, Australia which aimed to improve understanding of their career journeys and job experiences. The study builds on previous work by Santhanam-Martin and Cowan (2017, 2018), which investigated the industry's workforce structure and recruitment and retention challenges from the perspective of employers.

Workforce challenges in the Goulburn-Murray fruit industry

The Goulburn-Murray region is of national significance for the production of temperate tree fruits including pome fruits, stone fruits and cherries. Key industry facts are summarised in RMCG & GVFGSWG (2013): In 2013 there were 306 fruit farms in the region, with a total area planted of some 11,500 hectares. Almost all these farms remain family-owned and operated. The farm gate value of fruit production in the region was \$485 million in 2013. There is also a significant food processing industry within the region.

The industry has recently experienced a period of significant restructuring and transition (RMCG & GVFGSWG, 2013), and this provides the context for this research. Major trends include: an increase in

the area planted (26% increase between 2001 and 2011), combined with increasing planting density, on-going decline in the number of growers as businesses consolidate, decrease in fruit demand for processing, which has led to a shift in the varieties planted towards fruit for the fresh market and a growing interest in export markets, and growing export sales (although export sales remain a small portion of total production).

These trends have implications for the structure of the industry's workforce. As individual businesses get larger and adopt more intensive (higher density) planting systems, they require more permanent employees, sourced from outside the business-owning family. There are several trends, including the shift from processing to fresh fruit production, increasingly stringent quality specifications from buyers and increasing pressure on profit margins, that are driving a requirement for greater precision in orchard management, thus requiring higher skill levels and effective supervision of workers.

In a strategic planning exercise in 2015, fruit growers identified labour and skill shortages as "the major concern for their enterprises" (Catalyst Exchange 2015:13). While this concern related in part to the availability of seasonal workers for fruit picking and packing, it also related to the availability of suitably skilled people for what the report refers to as "middle management" roles. In the general industrial human resource management literature middle management refers to a layer of employees who sit between senior management and the general workforce. They are "active agents at the frontier of control" (Delbridge and Lowe 1997:411), "smoothing exceptions, handling exceptions, overcoming unexpected problems, and reaching goals and objectives" (Bitsch and Yakura 2007:2). In family farm agriculture, middle managers also provide a critical interface between the owner-managers and the non-family workers (Bitsch & Yakura, 2007).

Our previous work elucidated more about these middle management roles in the Goulburn-Murray fruit industry (Santhanam-Martin and Cowan 2017, 2018). There are a variety of job titles in use to refer to middle management positions including "leading hand", "supervisor", "assistant manager" and "manager", and these titles are not used consistently by different employers and it was generally orchards of 100 hectares in size and larger that required one or more people in middle management positions. Santhanam-Martin and Cowan (2018:10) contains a tabulation of the typical tasks and duties performed by orchard employees of different types, and indicates that it is common for permanent orchard jobs, especially at the "middle manager" level to include a wide range of tasks and duties ranging from practical tree husbandry work to administrative and supervisory work. A number of interviewees spoke of the need for employees to be multi-skilled and flexible, and especially the need for more senior employees to be willing to take on practical and perhaps menial orchard work such as pruning during the winter season, when that is the only work that is required. Conversely, some skills in supervising the work of other people are part of the job requirements for jobs over the full range from Orchard Hand up to General Manager since Orchard Hands are sometimes called on to supervise seasonal workers undertaking routine picking.

Where the previous study explored workforce issues from the perspective of employers, this study focuses on the experiences and perspectives of employees. It starts with the premise that addressing orchard employers' current difficulties recruiting to middle management positions requires either that existing employees be retained and developed (internal recruitment); and/or that new employees be attracted to the industry (and then developed).

Conceptualising career journeys

Employees' work experiences in the fruit industry can be conceptualised as a career journey involving initial entry followed by either retention or exit. Employees who remain in the industry may stay? with the same employer or may change employers, and they may experience career progression into more senior positions, or they may not. This conceptualisation highlights three important processes that contribute to a business or industry's ability to meet its workforce needs: attraction, retention and development. As noted by Nettle *et al.* (2011), these three processes also influence each other:

- Employees' perceptions and experiences of development opportunities contribute to retention.
- Retention and development enable each other.
- A reputation for development and retention enables attraction.

This conceptualisation of a career journey influenced by attraction, retention and development processes underpins the approach taken in this study.

Focusing on the permanent workforce rather than seasonal labour, this study aimed to identify factors that are affecting workforce attraction, retention and development in the Goulburn-Murray fruit industry, through collecting data about current employees' career journeys and job experiences. It was guided by two broad research questions:

1. What career journeys have current employees followed (including employees' perception of how skills have been acquired)?
2. What aspects of the industry and of individual jobs are contributing to employee satisfaction or dissatisfaction with their jobs and with the industry, and to their future career intentions?

We used psychological contract theory (PCT, Kickul 2001) as a theoretical framework for exploring the relationship between employees' experience of their jobs and their job satisfaction and future career intentions. PCT proposes that the relationship between an employee and their employer or workplace can be considered as a form of informal contract where the employer promises (explicitly or implicitly) to provide a range of benefits and that an employee's job satisfaction and commitment to their employer are positively correlated with the extent to which these promises and commitments are met (*i.e.* "promise fulfilment"). PCT also proposes that an employees' intention to leave their job is correlated with perceived breaches of the psychological contract. CPT has been used previously to explore employment relationships and factors affecting employee retention in the Australian dairy industry (Nettle *et al.* 2011; Ford *et al.* 2018), but to our knowledge has not been used elsewhere in agricultural studies. A further aim of this paper is to comment on the utility of this theoretical and research approach.

Method

Our survey, comprising 61 questions, was open for responses for 4 months in late 2018. Some respondents completed it online using the Qualtrics online survey platform; other respondents completed paper copies. The URL link was distributed through a range of industry networks and organisations including Apple and Pear Australia Limited, the GV Growers Group (a local industry Facebook group) and the networks of the state agriculture agency, Agriculture Victoria. We also contracted two local grower associations (Cobram and District Fruit Growers Association and Fruit Growers Victoria) to visit orchards and recruit respondents.

We received 52 completed questionnaires, and an additional five questionnaires which were sufficiently complete to allow inclusion in the analysis for some questions. Hence the number of responses available for analysis varied between 52 and 57 for individual questions. This small sample size limits the statistical power of the analysis and means that caution is required in making generalisations from these results. It cannot be

assumed that the results obtained from this small sample are representative of the experiences of all permanent workers in the Goulburn-Murray fruit industry. However, the sample size is sufficient to demonstrate the capabilities and limitations of this theoretical framework and research approach.

Respondents were asked to identify which of the items in a list their employer had promised or committed to provide. Our list of promises was based on those used by Nettle *et al.* (2011), which in turn were based on Kickul (2001). We adapted the individual items to suit the current research context. The 'promise items' are listed Table 1 below. For each item where the respondent indicated that a promise or commitment had been made, they were then asked to indicate the extent to which the promise had been fulfilled, using a 5-point Likert scale (1 = not fulfilled at all to 5 = completely fulfilled).

In her original analysis, Kickul (2001) used Principal Components Analysis to group the individual promise items into categories. Each of these categories then became a variable in the psychological contract model. Nettle *et al.* (2011) and Ford *et al.* (2018) also used Kickul's structure, though the Chronbach's alpha values reported by Ford *et al.* for the items grouped according to Kickul's structure were low, suggesting an alternative structure may have been more useful. Preliminary analysis of our data using Principal Components Analysis and manual examination of variables (including correlation coefficients) showed that the individual promise items did not fit well into Kickul's classification: items grouped together by Kickul exhibited different patterns in our data. We therefore decided to develop our own classification of the items into a set of variables that better reflected the patterns in our data. Table 1 presents our final variables and their component promise items.

Variable	Components 'promises'
Training and opportunity (alpha=0.761)	Career guidance and mentoring Opportunity to develop new skills Recognition of my accomplishments Meaningful work Opportunities for personal growth Off-site training during work hours On the job training, Opportunities for promotion and advancement
Enabling good work (alpha=0.970)	Challenging and interesting work Well-defined job responsibilities A reasonable workload Enough resources to do the job Adequate equipment to perform the job
Safety and security (alpha=0.910)	Job security Competitive salary Safe work environment A pleasant working environment
Benefits (alpha not calculated because of small number of responses for some items):	Paid annual holidays Cost of living benefits (e.g. discounted rent, farm produce) Lifestyle benefits (e.g. pleasant living environment)
Autonomy (alpha=0.816)	Freedom over how the job is done Participation in decision-making
Increasing responsibilities (alpha not relevant for a single item)	Single item

Table 1. Variables and component promises for the PCT analysis.

In addition to the PCT questions, the survey also collected data on the conditions of respondents' current job (e.g. salary, working hours) and their career history in the fruit industry, including free text response questions probing their reasons for entry, employer change and exit. These free text questions were analysed thematically to create category data. All quantitative data including the PCT response were analysed using SPSS Version 21.

The employee respondents were spread across all levels of seniority, from general manager, through various levels of management, to workers with no management role (Table 2). Some respondents had specialist roles that may have involved seniority without necessarily having a management role.

Position title	Frequency of response (per cent)
General manager	11
Manager	26
Assistant manager	9
Supervisor or leading hand	21
Hand	13
Administration	7
Other (generally specialist roles)	13

Table 2. Position title (n=54).

Results

Career journeys

Individuals whose role changed while they were with an employer stayed significantly longer with that employer than those whose role did not change (mean of 7.3 years, compared with 3.8 years, F test, $p < 0.01$). In every case, the change of role involved a promotion.

We also tested whether employees' initial attraction to the fruit industry was associated with differences in their subsequent career pathway. The classifications we used were "there was a job available that met my needs", "something about the industry attracted me to it" and "other". There were slight differences in length of time with employers between employees with different reasons for their initial attraction to the fruit industry, but the differences were not significant. Comparing the "job available" group with the "industry attraction" group, there was little difference in length of time with their current employer but the "job available" people had stayed less time with their previous employer than the "industry attraction people" (Table 3). The relatively high mean length of time with their current employer for people who gave other reasons for their initial attraction to the industry as "other" may be because half of them had a family history in the industry (people working in their own family's business had been in their current position much longer than other respondents).

We tested whether differences in subsequent career pathways were associated with differences in initial attraction to the fruit industry. There were no significant associations for any of the variables we tested. Employment pathway variables we tested included years in the industry, level of seniority achieved, time in various jobs, and whether they had received a promotion. We also tested for differences in job satisfaction, organisational commitment, advancement intention, intention to leave employer and intention to leave the fruit industry.

Initial attraction to working in fruit industry	Mean number of years with employer	
	Current (n=55)	Previous (n=33)
There was a job available that met my needs	9.4	4.7
Something about the industry attracted me to it	8.9	6.0
Other	11.4	5.8

Table 3. Length of time with different employers by initial attraction to working in fruit industry.

Job experiences at different levels of seniority

Respondents with more senior jobs tended to have had more years since they first worked in the fruit industry and supervised a greater number of staff (both directly and indirectly) than those with more junior jobs (Table 4). They also were more likely to have a higher salary. Higher salaries were also associated with having more years of industry experience.

Position title	Mean years since first worked in fruit industry	Mean number of staff supervised	Most likely weekly salary (\$Aus)
General manager	26	11	\$2000–\$2999
Manager	14	7	\$1000–\$1499
Assistant manager	14	4	\$1000–\$1499
Supervisor or leading hand	16	8	\$800–\$999
Hand	10	0	\$600–\$799
Administration	13	2	\$1000–\$1499
Other (generally specialist roles)	15	5	\$1000–\$1499

Table 4. Seniority by position title (n=50).

The term “middle manager” covers a range of positions, including supervisors, leading hands, assistant managers and managers. Those in “Manager” positions were spread across small and large firms. In contrast, those in “Assistant manager” positions were almost all in small firms. It is not clear how their jobs differ from “Manager” jobs. Further, supervisors or leading hands had similar years since first working in the fruit industry as managers and assistant managers, and similar numbers of staff to supervise, yet received much lower salaries.

All respondents said they worked significantly more hours per week at the busiest times of year than they usually worked (Table 5). There was only a small difference in weekly hours usually worked for people with different levels of seniority. However, at the busiest times of year both senior and middle managers worked substantially more hours than workers.

Workload	Senior managers	Middle managers	Workers	Significance of difference (F test)
Mean hours usually worked per week	44 ^{ab}	43 ^a	38 ^b	* (p=0.05)
Mean hours worked per week at busiest times	65 ^a	63 ^a	50 ^b	** (p=0.01)
<i>Values with different letters appended are significantly different from others in the same row (LSD, p<0.05)</i>				

Table 5. Workload by seniority (n=54).

The “psychological contract” between employer and employee

All the psychological contract variables were negatively and significantly correlated with intention to leave the employer (Table 6). The strongest correlations were for “Safety and security” and “Enabling good work”. “Training and opportunity” and “Benefits” were also highly correlated (negatively) with intention to leave the employer, and “Autonomy” was correlated but not significantly so.

		Job satisfaction	Organisational commitment	Advancement intention	Intention to leave employer	Intention to leave industry
1	Training and opportunity	.743 ***	.603 ***	.259	-.402 **	-.030
2	Enabling good work	.642 ***	.623 ***	.517 ***	-.596 ***	-.181
3	Safety and security	.617 ***	.515 ***	.522 ***	-.597 ***	-.333 *
4	Benefits	.306	.198	.325	-.349 *	-.397 *
5	Autonomy	.604 ***	.572 ***	.307	-.235	-.041
6	Increasing responsibilities	.576 ***	.552 ***	.272	-.213	-.252
<i>Pearson correlation (n varies from 27 to 51): * p<0.05; ** p<0.01; *** p<0.001</i>						

Table 6. Correlations between variables in the psychological contract model and other selected variables.

Perceptions of the psychological contract varied with seniority. Middle managers responded that they had been made more employment promises by their employer than senior managers or workers. Middle managers also perceived that their employer’s promises had been fulfilled less than senior managers or workers. Overall, large scale employers made more promises to employees than small scale employers and fulfilled their promises to a greater extent. This difference was particularly noticeable for training and development.

Discussion

Usefulness of Psychological Contract Theory

Psychological contract theory was useful in revealing factors that influence retention of employees in the Goulburn-Murray fruit industry. For our fruit industry respondents, promise fulfilment in the psychological contract is generally high. For all promises the mean fulfilment score is more than 4.0. This is much higher than in Kickul’s (2001) study of small businesses, where none of the mean fulfilment scores were more than 3.0 on a comparable scale. In their study of dairy farm workers, Ford *et al.* (2018)

used a slightly different 4-point scale with all points labelled, so direct comparison with that study is difficult, but all their mean fulfilment scores were more than 3.0 on the 4-point scale, suggesting comparably high fulfilment scores to this study.

The fact that the promise variables do not arrange themselves in the same way as in the Kickul (2001) study, combined with the higher fulfilment scores in this study, suggests that additional work is needed to adapt the PCT approach, promise items and variable structure to suit the particular features of farm employment situations. Kickul's respondents were all university students, who may have different characteristics from farm employees. The high fulfilment scores in the Ford *et al.* (2018) study of dairy farm employees further affirms that farm employees might have different characteristics.

A further possibility is sampling bias. Although the demographic profile of the sample was broadly similar to that of the population, the small size of the sample and the fact that respondents could self-select makes it possible that the attitudes of the sample were not representative of those of the population. A truly random sample would be needed to be confident the findings from the survey sample accurately predict the characteristics of the population of fruit industry employees in the Goulburn-Murray.

Biggest contributors to retention in the Goulburn-Murray fruit industry

The biggest psychological contract contributors to intention to not leave one's employer are "Safety and security" and "Enabling good work". "Training and opportunity" is the next largest contributor, followed by "Benefits". "Autonomy" and "Increasing responsibilities" appear less important. It is difficult to compare the results of this study with those of Nettle *et al.* (2011) because the psychological contract variables in this study were structured differently.

The psychological contract model also includes the intermediate measures of "Job satisfaction" and "Organisational commitment". Both these are highly (negatively) correlated with intention to leave employer. All the psychological contract variables except "Benefits" are highly correlated with "Job satisfaction". The one most highly correlated is "Training and opportunity", followed by "Enabling good work". All the psychological contract variables except "Benefits" are highly correlated with "Organisational commitment". The one most highly correlated is "Enabling good work", followed by "Training and opportunity". The high correlations of "Enabling good work" and "Training and opportunity" to both "Job satisfaction" and "Organisational commitment" reinforce the findings that "Enabling good work" and "Training and opportunity" are linked to retention of staff.

"Safety and security" and "Enabling good work" contributed the most to intention to stay with an employer. Both are relatively basic and fundamental needs, which psychological theory suggests must be met before a person seeks to fulfil higher-order needs (Maslow 1943). This suggests fruit industry employers mostly need to focus on basic aspects of the employment relationship. This means things like offering a secure job, safe workplace, and adequate pay, and providing what employees need to do their job.

This finding aligns with the findings on why individuals entered the fruit industry. More than half the respondents entered the fruit industry for pragmatic reasons. For many it was simply that there was a job available that met their needs. For some it was the family business. Despite not expressing an enthusiasm for or specific attraction to the fruit industry, their careers have not been harmed by this pragmatism: they stayed as long in the fruit industry as their industry-attracted colleagues, stayed as long in jobs, and reached similar levels of seniority.

One component of "Safety and security" is a competitive salary. This has been shown to be a factor in employee retention (Nettle *et al.* 2011). Yet fewer than half of our respondents said it had been promised

to them, and fulfilment of this promise was lower than for most of the promises. There may be a lack of clarity within the fruit industry as to what constitutes a competitive salary, which suggests there is an opportunity for the industry to be more transparent about salaries.

Santhanam-Martin and Cowan (2017) identified that Goulburn-Murray fruit industry employers who use position descriptions have found that their use helps to clarify role expectations for both the business and the employee. Yet, their use tended to be limited to larger businesses. Expanding the use of position descriptions could be a useful communication tool for ensuring employer and employee expectations are aligned.

The fruit industry as a whole could add value by working with training providers to develop a targeted human resource management training package for employers within the industry, as suggested by Nettle (2015). The fruit industry could also support improved human resource management through the provision of tools that can be used by businesses, such as clear checklists that provide some structure to discussions between employer and employee regarding expectations.

Our earlier report identified frustration in some employers that they had invested in developing staff who then left the business (Santhanam-Martin and Cowan 2017). Yet this study has shown that “Training and opportunity” help retain staff and that employees stay longer at a fruit industry business when they are promoted.

Employee development implies increased job skills, which can be linked to promotion. The relatively low proportion of employees saying they were promised opportunities for promotion and advancement contrasts with our finding regarding the importance of receiving a promotion to retention in their previous position. This suggests employers and the fruit industry more generally may be underestimating the importance of promotion to employee retention.

There can be a number of issues that influence development and promotion opportunities, such as differences in how skills are valued and awareness of current and future knowledge gaps in the business. Employers need to be explicit about the promotion opportunities for employees. As well, human resource planning may help employers consider current and future needs for their businesses, such as where development and growth in roles can be prioritised.

The challenge of middle management

Middle managers seem to be in a difficult position. They have lower levels of job satisfaction than both more senior and junior employees, their work hours are as long as those of senior managers, yet they receive significantly lower salaries. Despite this squeeze, middle managers are no less committed to their organisation than other employees. Our earlier research with fruit industry employers identified aspects of middle management that presented a development challenge, particularly around the transition from being a ‘doer’ to being a ‘decider’ (Santhanam-Martin and Cowan 2017).

There is ambiguity in role definition for middle managers. The term “middle manager” covers a range of positions and roles. The role of an Assistant Manager in a small firm may be different from that of an Orchard Manager, Shed Manager or Office Manager in a large firm. Expectations of employees may be clearer if the fruit industry could develop a set of shared job titles and position descriptions. Agreed position descriptions could also clarify expectations of the transition from a supervisor or leading hand position to a manger position.

The pressure we have observed on middle managers in the Goulburn-Murray horticulture industry is not an isolated phenomenon. It is part of the internationally observed hollowing-out of the middle class

(OECD 2011). There are challenges for industry, researchers and policymakers in identifying ways to manage these international trends within local industry contexts.

The challenge for small businesses

Small fruit industry businesses face the biggest challenge. Their employees have the highest scores regarding intention to leave their employer and the industry. Their managers have lower job satisfaction, had fewer promises made to them overall and scored lower on having their training and development promises kept. Further, small businesses are unlikely to be able to offer their employees the promotion opportunities available in large businesses.

Small businesses will find it difficult to manage these employment challenges on their own. Multiple small businesses may be able to work together to create career pathways for their employees rather than working in isolation. This might involve an employee having roles in multiple businesses across their career, or even at the same time.

The fruit industry may have a role in developing approaches to support small businesses in addressing these challenges. For example, it could work with small businesses to create collective development and training opportunities for employees. It could also develop human resource management training that targets the specific needs of small businesses.

Conclusion

This study has confirmed that Psychological Contract Theory provides useful insight into farm employees' experiences of their jobs, which can be used to identify points of intervention for individual employers, industry bodies and policy makers, aimed at improving employee attraction, retention and development. Businesses in the Goulburn-Murray fruit industry have consistently identified labour and skills shortages as critical constraints to business success and growth, and this study has shown that employment conditions and human resource management practices do indeed influence employees' job satisfaction and career intentions.

The PCT analysis helped identify that the fruit industry would benefit from clear career pathways with the capability requirements of each position understood by both employees and employers. Employers need to link skills development to actual promotion opportunities and create opportunities for lower-level workers to aspire to and desire skills development. An industry training scheme that focuses on on-the-job training with more formal elements for more senior roles would receive broad support from employees. An industry-wide approach to skills development would mean that even if an employee left one business, they would be likely to stay in the industry and the benefits of their training would still be retained within the fruit industry.

The study confirmed that the greatest challenge faced by the Goulburn-Murray fruit industry in managing its permanent workforce appears to be with middle managers in small firms. While large firms have their own middle management challenges, as larger businesses they have some ability to manage these challenges on their own. Small businesses are unlikely to be able to meet these challenges without help. This points to a clear role for the fruit industry in working with small business to develop human resource management systems that provide employees with clear expectations, training opportunities and growth pathways.

This study has some limitations. The sample size was small, which limits the statistical power of the analysis. Although there was a demographic spread among the respondents, they likely self-selected,

which may limit the generalisability of the findings. The statistical modelling process necessarily simplifies complex phenomena to allow the questions to apply to all respondents.

Further research would enhance the value of this study:

- With much stronger industry support, an updated survey could be distributed more widely in the region or across other fruit production regions to develop more generalisable results.
- Case studies of small groups of fruit industry employers and employees could be used to understand in greater depth current human resource management practices and their effects on employees' job experiences, job satisfaction and career intentions (leading to the identification of best practice and "what works" for retention and development).
- Action research collaboration with industry could be used to understand and improve processes for transitioning employees from "doing" (worker) to "deciding" (middle management) roles. This would involve structured support and mentoring for employees and managers, to maximise the success of this transition. If such an approach was successful, it would provide industry with skills to sustain this approach to talent development beyond the life of the initial research project.

These findings may also be of benefit to researchers and practitioners exploring attraction, retention and development issues in other agricultural industries and locations.

References

- Bitsch V., Yakura E.K., 2007. Middle management in Agriculture: roles, functions, and practices, *International Food and Agribusiness Management Review* 10, 1-28.
- Catalyst Exchange, 2015. *Food Futures: Goulburn Valley Cluster Process and Tools*, Unpublished report.
- Delbridge R., Lowe J., 1997. Manufacturing control: supervisory systems on the 'new' shopfloor, *Sociology* 31, 409-426.
- Ford R., Nettle R., Lee K., 2018. *The psychological contract, employee engagement and dairy farm business success: Toward a framework for farmers, advisers and researchers*, Unpublished manuscript, University of Melbourne.
- Kickul J., 2001. Promises Made, Promises Broken: An Exploration of Employee Attraction and Retention Practices in Small Business, *Journal of Small Business Management*, 39, 4, 320-335.
- Maslow A.H., 1942. A hierarchy of human needs, *Psychological Review*, 53, 4, 370-396.
- Nettle R., 2015. More than workforce shortages: How farm human resources management strategies will shape Australia's agricultural future, *Farm Policy Journal*, 12, 17-27.
- Nettle R., Semmelroth A., Ford R., Zheng C., Ullah A. 2011. *Retention of people in dairy farming – What is working and why?: Final Research Report*, Gardiner Foundation, Melbourne.
- OECD, 2011. *Divided we stand: Why inequality keeps rising*, OECD Publishing.
- RMCG & GVFGSWG, 2013. *Goulburn Valley Fruit Growing Industry Roadmap – Final*, RMCG in conjunction with the Goulburn Valley Fruit Growers Strategic Stakeholder Group.
- Santhanam-Martin M., Cowan L. 2017. *Understanding Skilled Workforce Issues in the Goulburn Valley Fruit Industry*, University of Melbourne and Agriculture Victoria, Melbourne.
- Santhanam-Martin M., Cowan L., 2018. Making "middle managers": Workforce development for agricultural industries in transition, 13th European IFSA Symposium.' Mediterranean Agronomic Institute Of Chania (CIHEAM – MAICH), Greece, 1-5 July 2018, 1-5 July 2018, http://ifsa.boku.ac.at/cms/fileadmin/Proceeding2018/1_SanthanamMartin.pdf [Accessed 23/7/2018].
- Wilkinson R., Santhanam-Martin M., Cowan L., 2019. *Career Journeys and Job Experiences in the Goulburn-Murray Fruit Industry*, University of Melbourne and Agriculture Victoria, Melbourne.