



Case study reports: Poland CS2



AgriDemo-F2F has received funding from
the European Union's Horizon 2020
Research and innovation program under
grant agreement No 728061

1. Background

Polish Union of Cereal Grain Producers (PZPRZ) is a branch organisation of farmers cultivating mainly cereals. The organisation was established in order to improve cereal production, monitoring of the grain market, expressing farmers' opinions regarding economic conditions of cereal production and giving opinions on the creation of the law. The Association consists of farmers from large (as per Polish conditions) farms with an area of over 100 ha. (from 120 to 2500 ha).

Programme

In accordance with the assumptions of the program, the Association conducts trainings for members and farmers, representing mostly high-income farms located near members' farms. The biggest event organised periodically are "Days of Corn" in Skrzelew (<http://kukurydza.home.pl/>). They are held in 2018 for the twentieth time. They are organised on the fields of the association member of the board.

Funding and governance

Funds for conducting training come mainly from the Association's statutory funds. National and European funds are also used, among others, from the funds of the Fund for Promotion of Cereal Grains and Cereals Products, RDP funds 2014-2010. For organising thematic events, e.g. concerning cereals, corn and rape, the funds are obtained from producers of seeds, fertilisers and plant protection products. For organising events on regional level, funds are also obtained from local self-governments.

The Association is managed by a Management Board composed of 6 people (the president of the vice president, spokesperson and 3 members).

The second statutory body is the Council of Experts, consisting of 17 people. It consists mainly of research workers (7 professors, 4 doctors, MEPs) and the trade union representatives. Council of Experts consists of four teams: for breeding and seeding, agrotechnics, storage, as well as economics and the cereals market.

The Council together with expert teams sets up a plan of action for the term of office. An integral part of the action plan is the training program and field visits program.

Actors and networks

There are stationary trainings are organised in rented local motels or in conference rooms of Municipal Offices. Field shows are carried out on the farms of Board members.

How it Works

The field trainings are carried out in the farm specializing in the corn production, Corn days and pest monitoring as well, mainly of the corn borer (European corn borer) is also carried out there. Trainings are also conducted during the vegetation period, which end with Corn Days.

On the farms of other members of PZPRZ, trainings on other topics are conducted.

On one farm, trainings and demonstrations regarding the belt cultivation are conducted. Using the RDP funds, a modern didactic room for 100 people with multimedia equipment was built. Demonstrations of machines for direct and belt cultivation of cereals and rape are also organised there.

On another farm, trainings on plant protection are conducted.

Event Farm and location

The farm in Skrzelew is located in central part of Poland, in the Masovian voivodships. It is a farm with field production (corn, cereals, rape). There are separate fields on the farm, conveniently located near the road, on which experimental fields are located. During the Corn Days in October, the harvest of corn, weighted yields of individual varieties is carried out in the presence of participants. Lectures and demonstrations of machines, among others maintenance-free GPS-controlled tractor, observation drones, corn sprayers, signal traps are organised there.

Event date: as part of the Case study, the training took place in July 2018 (CS2)

2. Method

In line with the Methodological Guidelines, three main data sources are used: a background document and interviews at Programme and Farm level to analyse structural and functional characteristics, and event tools and surveys to analyse event level participation and learning, as follows:

1. A background document for every case study was completed by the AgriDemo-F2F partner who carried out the case study.
2. Interviews with representatives of programme/networks (level 1) and farm level interviews with demonstrators/hosts (Level 1) to reveal how the functional and structural characteristics enable learning. Analysis of these interviews is reported in Sections 3 and 4. Data is sourced from 1 interview at the programme level and 1 at the farm level. The analysis followed 4 themes: (1) Coordinating effective recruitment of host farmers and participants, (2) Developing and coordinating appropriate interaction approaches, (3) Planning, designing and conducting appropriate demonstration processes, (4) Enabling learning appropriate to purpose, audience, context, (5) Follow-up activities.
3. Event tools and surveys (level 3) to reveal peer to peer learning processes. Event details and analysis is reported in Section 5. Data is sourced from 12 pre and post-demonstration participant surveys, pre and post event surveys with 1 demonstrator, 1 post event interview with the host farmer and an event observation tool completed by an observing researcher. This data is mainly used for the analysis of learning processes and learning outcomes related to the specific event and overall comments on the effectiveness of the event.

Finally, partners reviewed the case study reports to prepare their workshops with different stakeholders related to the case studies. These workshops aimed at validating the data presented in the case study reports and to discuss on key characteristics related to effectiveness of demonstrations.

3. Structural Characteristics

T1: Programme/network level

1. The main organisations involved in the demonstration activities and their roles

The demonstration programme, is managed by the board of Polish Union of Cereal Grain Producers (PZPRZ) of which consists of farmers and other actors (representatives of research institutes carrying out research in area of cereal grain production). Approximately five to ten people are the active members of the association who are involved at the demo activities. The association is in close contact with industry representatives and they jointly select the demo topics.

Q: How is the programme/network managed? A: Programme is managed by association, its Board, also framers - members. In contact with the industry, they determine topics (Programme interviewee).

Q: Who are the main people involved in the demonstration activities and what are their roles? A: The most active members of association. 5-10 persons (Programme interviewee).

2. The main actors involved in the demonstration activities and their roles

Host farmer

The host farmers are always involved in the development of the individual demonstration activities. Moreover depending on the topic the host farmers are sometimes involved in the development of the overall demonstration programme. The Farm level Interviewee manages the demo activities on the farm together with his family and industry providers. Main people involved in the demonstration activities is the farm level interviewee/host farmer together with his family and a specialists (i.e. researchers from research institute Plant Breeding and Acclimatization Institute – National Research Institute carrying out on the host farm commercially funded researchers or representative of any seed company involved in topic covered at any given demo event). However, the farm level Interviewee is not involved in the overall development of demos at the programme / network level. The farm level Interviewee advertise the demo event to his neighbours in order to reach those who have never attended a demonstration event before. The farm level Interviewee is actively involved at the demo topic selection, as he is aware of farmers' interests. He also requests feedback informally on the event day from participants through questions. The event's host farmer is strongly involved at demo farm organisation together with other actors such as seed companies, institutes etc (Post host farmer interview).

Q: Are host farmers involved in the development of the individual demonstration activities? A: Always. He must to agree and earn. (Programme interviewee).

Q: Are host farmers involved in the development of the overall demonstration programme? R: Sometimes. Depending on topics (Programme interviewee).

Q: How are the demo activities on the farm managed? R: Me, my son and providers/researchers. No special committee (Farmer).

Q: Who are the main people involved in the demonstration activities and what are their roles? R: Me, son, specialists/researchers my wife (social parts) (Farmer).

Q: Are you involved in the overall development of demos at the prog / network level? R:No. Demo activities are arranged as an additional activities of the network, based on each farm level, not coordinated at network level. Farm level Interviewee).

Q: How effective are you in recruiting in 'the hard to reach' or those who have never attended a demonstration event before? R: Referring by neighbours (Farmer).

Q: Are participants (farmers, advisers, researchers etc.) involved in the overall development of the demonstrations? R: No. as a result discussion during my previous demo/discussion held in other formal and formal meetings with farmers I know which topics are most interested for them. (Farmer).

Q: How are demonstration topics selected? R: During my previous demo/using opportunities of other formal/informal meetings I collect information which topics are most interested for my audience. (Farmer).

Q: Do you request feedback on the event day from participants? R: Yes. Question, doubts. (Farmer).

Q: How are most demonstration event on the farm organised? R: Tight contact with seed companies, institutes, local volunteers fire brigade (providing some technical and organisational support), self-governmental local office (i.e. dissemination information on demo event) etc (Post host farmer interview).

Target Audience/type of participants

The intended audience of the demonstrations according to the Programme and the farm level Interviewees are mainly farmers and specialists in several plant production sectors. According to the farm level interviewee, farmers, advisors and specialists typically attend the demonstrations activities on his farm. Furthermore, it seems that participants (farmers, advisers, researchers etc.) are not involved in the overall development of the demonstrations on his farm.

Q: Who is your intended audience? R: Farmers - specialists in the plant production - cereals, rape, beets, corn (Programme interviewee).

Q: Who is your intended audience? R: Farmers - specialists. (Farmer).

Q: Who typically attends your demonstrations activities? R: Farmers, advisors, specialists (Farmer).

Q: Are participants (farmers, advisers, researchers etc.) involved in the overall development of the demonstrations? R: No. During my previous demo I know which topics are most interested (Farmer).

Industry

Industry representatives and providers are actively involved in demo activities management. Industry representatives determine the demo topics jointly with hosting farmer and members of the board of the Polish Union of Cereal Grain Producers (PZPRZ) having advisory voice. They offer the company's leaflets as a follow-up material to participants after the demo event. According to the post host farmer interview demonstration events on the case study farm are organised in tight contact between the host farmer and seed companies.

Q: How is the programme/network managed? R: Programme is managed by association, its Board, also farmers - members. In contact with the industry, they determine topics (Programme interviewee).

Q: Are follow-up materials made available to participants after demos? Company's leaflets, own farmers description. (Programme interviewee).

Q: How are the demo activities on the farm managed? R: Me, my son and providers. No special committee (Farmer).

Q: How are most demonstration event on the farm organised? R: Tight contact with seed companies, institutes, local volunteers fire brigade (providing some technical and organisational support), self-governmental local office (i.e. dissemination information on demo event) . (Post host farmer interview)

Organisers

There are several actions undertaken by the Programme interviewee himself or the organisation he belongs to (Polish Union of Cereal Grain Producers (PZPRZ). The Programme interviewee is involved at the topic selection. He identifies relevant topics because his organisation has contacts and gets feedback from farmers, from the study tours and conferences. In that way they are aware of farmers' preferences and thereafter the topics are tested and demonstrated. He also assesses if participants have engaged with the lessons of the demonstrations through questions and discussion.

Q: How do you identify/select relevant topics that will interest farmers? R: We, board of Polish Union of Cereal Grain Producers (PZPRZ), know farmers preferences (Programme interviewee).

Q: How are demonstration topics selected? R: We set the subjects together, as members of board of Polish Union of Cereal Grain Producers (PZPRZ). (Programme interviewee).

Q: How do the overarching goals/objectives of the programme translate down to individual demo activities? A: During the study tours, conferences we get to know news, what are new seeds/technologies tested at farms of members of Polish Union of Cereal Grain Producers (PZPRZ) (Programme interviewee).

Q: Do you assess if participants have engaged with/acted on the lessons of the demonstrations? R: Yes. Questions, discussions held during and after demo event, Polish Union of Cereal Grain Producers formal and informal meetings, while taking part on various public meeting at national, regional and local level (e.g. conferences, trainings arranged by relevant research institutes. (Programme interviewee).

Experts

Experts and specialists are the main people involved in the demonstration activities jointly with the host farmer and his family. The experts' presentations, advices and consultation are strongly referred as important factors for good demos.

Q: Please explain why you have selected your number 1 ranked factor: A; Good quality of expert advice and tech presentations. On the certain level the best experts are required as participants of our demo event/s are leading producers in area of their specialization. (Programme interviewee).

Q: Who are the main people involved in the demonstration activities and what are their roles? R: Me, son, specialists/researchers, my wife (social parts) (Farmer).

Q: What are the most important characteristics of a demonstrator (host or facilitator)? 1. Specialist – expert's knowledge. 2. Good communicator, telling good stories 3. Introducing good atmosphere (Farmer).

Institutes

According to the post host farmer interview the demonstration events on the farm are organised in tight contact between the host farmer and institute among others. In his case this is the Plant Breeding and Acclimatization Institute, National Research Institute. Team of researchers of this institute carry out research activities funded by commercial company on part of host farmer land.

Q: How are most demonstration event on the farm organised? A: Tight contact with seed companies, institutes, local volunteers fire brigade (providing some technical and organisational support), self-governmental local office (i.e. dissemination information on demo event). (Post host farmer interview)

3. Networks

The programme is mainly connected to the network of firms providing agricultural production means. The host farmer of the specific event is member of the Polish Union of Cereal Grain Producers and of the social council of the Agricultural Advisory Center in Brwinów. He hold elected or appointed roles as a spokesman and member of the board of the Polish Union of Cereal Grain Producers. This association create an informal network of farms cooperating with providers of agricultural production means. So effectively there are two informal networks cooperating on long term basis – farmers, members of the Polish Union of Cereal Grain Producers and providers of agricultural production means

Q: To what extent is the network/programme connected to other networks/programmes in your country or even internationally? R: Connections to the informal network of firms presenting production of agricultural production means (Programme interviewee).

Q: To what extent is the demo farm connected to other demo farms and/or other knowledge exchange organisations? R: To other corm producers and trial fields. Relationship is based on long term informal network between leading cereal producers across Poland, partly formalized by the Polish Union of Cereal Grain Producers. (Farmer).

Q: Is your demonstration farm part of a programme or wider network? R: No, there in no formal network. (Farmer).

Q: What farming networks and/or programmes are you participating in? R: Polish Union of Cereal Grain Producers, a member of the social council of the Agricultural Advisory Centre in Brwinów (Post host farmer interview).

Q: Do you hold any elected or appointed roles on farming networks/boards? R: Yes. Spokesman, member of board (Post host farmer interview).

4. Resources, finances and incentives

The demonstration activities are funded by the members of the association who manages the programme (10%) and suppliers/providers of production means (90%). According to the Programme interviewee, incentives are offered to farmers in order to host demonstration activities, such as funds for social events during demos. However, there are no typical financial benefits concerning demo activities (Farmer).

Q: What are the funding arrangements for your demo activities? R: How do these impact on the lifespan of the farm demo? R: Own members funds, suppliers of production means. Different sources (Programme interviewee).

Q: Do you offer any incentives to farmers to host demonstration activities? R: Yes. Funds for socializing events (Programme interviewee).

Q: What are the funding arrangements for your demo activities? How do these impact on the lifespan of the farm demo? R: 90% - providers, 10% - me (Farmer).

Q: What are your motivations / reasons for coordinating / hosting / delivering demo activities? R: I like share my knowledge/ opinion. I have not (received any) financial benefits (some seeds) (Farmer).

5. Human Resources

There is no reference to whether host famers and/or other demonstrators have received any training to deliver demos. However, the case study demonstrator stated that he would not benefit from some extra training as a demonstrator (Post survey demonstrator).

6. Goal/ objectives

The overall goals/objectives of the demo programme is to test the new developments in production and the knowledge exchange between farmers (observation tool).

T2. Farm (event) level

The demo farm is a commercial, large sized farm (110 hectare) which is highly specialized in maize grain production (Post host farmer interview + Observation tool). Part of the farm is devoted to demonstration activities where various corn varieties (500-600 sq m each) are cultivated and compared in the field (Observation tool). The host farmer of the specific event is member of the Polish Union of Cereal Grain Producer as well as of the social council of the Agricultural Advisory Centre in Brwinów. The farmer hosts the maize field day (MFD) during the last 20 years (Post host farmer interview).

The demonstrations organised in the programme are a mixture of exemplary and experimental approaches according to the Programme interviewee. However, the farm level interviewee mentioned that the demonstrations organised in his farms are mainly exemplary. Both the farm and Programme interviewee, believe that a mixture of exemplary and experimental approaches are more preferable. The event's demonstrator has also classified the specific demo event as a mixture of exemplary and experimental approaches (Post survey demonstrator).

1. Practice/technology demonstrated

The overall topic of the demonstration event, was maize production and the decision support system concerning plant protection. Computer, GPS control of tractor, drone filming of the field, pest traps and agricultural machinery have been shown in the frame of the overall topic (Observation tool). Some oral presentations while showing the maize plants, cobs and techniques, have been given at the demonstration event (Observation tool).

2. Actors' roles

At the specific event, three high-class specialists of a major seed company acted as demonstrators. The host farmer was also demonstrator, presenting tractor's equipment. Machines controlled by a computer program and GPS have been demonstrated. At some point, the host walked beside the tractor with sprayer and the cabin was empty. There was not a facilitator to guide questions and/or discussions during the specific event (Observation tool).

Twenty-five participants attended the specific demonstration event, 12 of which were interviewed. Almost 75% of them, worked in the area where the event took place (Pre demonstration survey participant), and were farmers (mainly corn producers) and advisors (Pre demonstration survey participant + Observation tool). Over 90% of participants felt actively or very actively involved during the whole demonstration process (Post participant's survey). Participants asked questions related to the new machinery and the digital control techniques (Observation tool). According to one of the event's demonstrators, participants (farmers, advisers, researchers etc.) were involved in the overall development of the specific demonstration (Post survey demonstrator). However, their exact role is not clarified.

3. Frequency

Once per year, the Maize Field Days are organised on the farm once a year. It seems that in total two events are organised each year on the farm one during the vegetation period and one on harvesting stage when the overall effects can be estimated (Farmer). During the year many field visits take place on his farm (Post host farmer interview)

4. Other farms infrastructures or arrangements

During the specific demonstration event, a barbecue meeting took place (Observation tool).

5. Accessibility

Both the programme and farm level interviewees stated that the travel time is an important factor that would discourage people from attending a demonstration. The travel time of participants to reach the demo farm, ranged from 5 to 210 minutes, with an average time close to 50 minutes (Pre demonstration survey participant). Approximately 84 % of participants rated their travel effort to participate no effort or very little effort, with the rest rating their travel effort as little or quite some effort. It is not quite clear if the effort rate is related only to the travel distance, as the effort ratings were not proportional to the travel distance. Maybe other factors influence the effort rate i.e. participant's motivations, free time etc (Pre demonstration survey participant).

6. Fees for participation

Participants did not have to pay a fee to attend the demonstration. Moreover, none of the participants had received any financial compensation for its attendance (Post participant's survey).

7. Time

Both the programme and farm level interviewees stated that participant's lack of time is an important factor that would discourage them from attending a demonstration

Q: What do you think discourages people from attending demonstrations? R: No time, wrong topic, distance (Programme interviewee).

Q: What do you think discourages people from attending demonstrations? R: To far, time. (Farmer).

4. Functional characteristics

T1: Coordinating effective recruitment of host farmers and participants

1. Incentives

Funding came from a variety of sources. The bulk of the funding came from providers and suppliers of production means, and the rest came from the farmers themselves.

90% - providers. 10% - me (Farmer)

Own members funds, suppliers of production means. Different sources (Programme)

2. Motivations for host farmers

Host Farmers were motivated by the desire to share their knowledge and learn about the newest trends. The Farmer also mentioned the financial benefit from selling some seeds at the events.

I like share my knowledge/ opinion. I haven't financed benefits (some seeds) (Farmer)

Interest, willingness to know the news trends, willingness to show off proficiency in production (Programme)

3. Motivations for participants

The main motivation for participants was the chance to learn from and talk to fellow farmers.

Opportunity to get to know the news presented by similar farmers. Conversation like a farmer with a farmer (Programme)

4. Target audience

The target audience was farmers, specifically specialists in the production of cereals, rape, beets or corn.

5. Advertising and recruitment

Both Farmer and Programme Interviewee felt the most successful way of advertising and recruitment was ensuring that the events were offering something interesting. The Programme Interviewee added that farmers learned about the events through the internet or through word of mouth.

Interesting topics, good atmosphere (Farmer)

Interesting topic, practical information in internet, grapevine (Programme)

T2: Appropriate demonstration and interaction approaches

1. The nature of interaction

Both the Farmer and Programme Interviewee described the nature of interaction as 'Mostly top-down'. The Farmer gave no further detail on this; however the Programme Interviewee explained that topics were selected at the programme level based on knowledge or news and missions.

We select topics based on knowledge of news, missions (Programme)

2. Involving farmers in the learning process and the demonstration programme

There was no evidence of farmers being involved in the learning process or the demonstration programme.

3. Focus

The Farmer described the network as 'In between' whole farm and single focused, while the Programme interviewee described it as 'Single focused'.

4. Design

- The Farmer described the network as 'Exemplary', while expressing a personal preference for 'A mixture'.
- The Programme Interviewee described the network as 'A mixture' and expressed a preference for 'A mixture' as this incorporated the latest news and farmers' profiles.

5. Group size

The Farmer and Programme interviewee had vastly different ideas of optimal group size. The Programme Interviewee felt that 10-20 participants was enough to make the event worthwhile, without being so large that communication became difficult. The Farmer, on the other hand, cited the much larger group size of 40-80 people as optimal.

T3: Enabling learning appropriate to purpose, audience, context

1. Facilitating interaction and learning: structure, content and techniques

The Programme Interviewee felt that presentations and practical demonstrations as important for the event, while the Farmer put greater emphasis on practical activities and on-farm demonstrations.

Practical activities on the field - between plants and machineries. Show actions (Farmer)

General farm presentation, presentation of topic by presenters. Practical demonstration (Programme)

There was no mention of additional materials provided to participants on the day.

The Farmer cited 'Participants ask questions & talk openly' as the most important tool for engaging participants, because 'it's the best way to hit consciousness.' (Farmer)

The Programme Interviewee cited 'Good quality expert advice & technical presentations' as the most important because there are certain cases where 'the best experts are required.' (Programme)

2. Taking into account variation in learning

There was no attempt to take into account variation in learning among participants.

T4: Effective follow-up activities

1. Follow-up activities and materials

Neither Farmer nor Programme Interviewee tried to engage with participants after the event; although the Programme Interviewee did mention that sometimes participants would contact the programme.

They sometimes contact themselves (Programme)

Company leaflets and descriptions from the host farmer were provided as follow-up material for participants.

Company's leaflets, own farmers description (Programme)

2. Assessing impact

The Farmer mentioned that they sometimes assess the impact of the event among participants by following up their activity; the Programme Interviewee expanded on this by explaining that this was done through questions and discussions.

The Farmer did not feel there was any attempt to assess the impact among the wider farming community. The Programme interviewee felt that there was, although did not detail how this was done.

5. Event analysis: effective peer learning characteristics

Event details

The group consisted of about 25 participants, of which 12 filled in the pre and the post survey.

local area - gender - age	Farmer	Adviser	Farmer/Adviser	Other	total
works in local area					
	3	2	3	1	9
male	3	1	2	1	7
29			1		1
32			1		1
42	1				1
46	1				1
50	1				1
58		1			1
67				1	1
female		1	1		2
59		1			1
62			1		1
doesn't work in local area					
	1	1		1	3
male	1			1	2
51	1				1
59				1	1
female		1			1
46		1			1
total	4	3	3	2	12

T1: Learning processes

1. Communication initiation by participants

Between 10% and 50% of the participants (+/- 5) had no problem sharing their knowledge and/or experiences related to the topic. They mainly asked for technological details. Participants were never placed in smaller groups. A little time was made for questions, about 5-10 percent during the first part, and at the barbecue. Some questions were asked. There were a few participants trying to formulate their own points of view regarding the topic, especially in assessing the costs of digital techniques and resistance of corn against drought.

	participant answers				
	strongly disagreed	disagreed	agreed	strongly agreed	not applicable
I had the feeling that I could share my own knowledge as relevant information.	0	5/12	2/12	5/12	0
I asked at least one question during the demonstration .	10/12 yes				
I shared my own point of view at least once during the demonstration.	11/12 yes				
I felt encouraged to ask questions during the demonstration.	0	1/12	7/12	4/12	0
When there were any discussions, I felt comfortable sharing my opinion.	1/10	2/10	4/10	3/10	0

	demonstrator answers				
	strongly disagreed	disagreed	agreed	strongly agreed	not applicable
I asked participants to share some of their own background knowledge during the demo.	0	0	1	0	0
I encouraged the participants to formulate their own point of view during the demonstration.	0	0	0	0	0
I encouraged the participants to formulate questions during the demonstration.	1	0	0	0	0

2. Interactive knowledge creation

Hands-on opportunities and other multi-sensorial experiences

A hands-on activity was demonstrated, but only very shortly. Participants could take part in a hands-on activity, but didn't get any feedback on their doing. More specifically, participants examined the condition of corn plants and they determined the number of seeds in the corn cob.

Discussion opportunities and negotiating conflicting points of view

There was no facilitator. Open discussions between a few participants were stimulated and took up about 10 percent of the time. Participants really wanted to discuss and were very interested. There was however no elaboration/further explanation on shared critical points of view.

	participant answers				
	strongly disagreed	disagreed	agreed	strongly agreed	not applicable
In my opinion, there were interesting discussions during the demonstration.	1/11	2/11	6/11	2/11	0
If participants didn't agree with each other during discussions, somebody (demonstrator/other participant) tried to reach a consensus between them.	4/6	2/6	0	0	0

	demonstrator answers				
	strongly disagreed	disagreed	agreed	strongly agreed	not applicable
In my opinion, there were interesting discussions during the demonstration.	0	0	1	0	0
If participants didn't agree with each other during discussions, somebody (me or somebody else) tried to reach consensus between them.	1	0	0	0	0

3. Engagement during the event

Participants all seemed to know each other well, but are not close friends. A barbecue meeting took place at the end. The demonstrator acted more distant than open.

	participant answers						demonstrator answers				
	strongly disagreed	disagreed	agreed	strongly agreed	not applicable		strongly disagreed	disagreed	agreed	strongly agreed	not applicable
I felt actively involved during the whole demonstration process.	0	1/12	5/12	6/12	0	Were participants (farmers, advisers, researchers etc.) involved in the overall development of this demonstration?	Yes (no elaboration)				
I felt like the demonstration increased my ability to rely on myself as a farmer.	1/9	2/9	1/9	5/9	0						
I could relate well to other participants (because they have an agricultural background similar to mine).	0	0	5/11	6/11	0	Most of the participants were well known to me.	0	1	0	0	0
A lot of the other participants are part of the same farmer network as me.	1/6	0	1/6	4/6	0	A lot of the participants are part of the same network as me.	0	1	0	0	0
I felt like I could trust the knowledge of (most of) the other participants.	0	4/12	4/12	4/12	0						
The demonstration felt like an informal activity to me.	7/12	2/12	2/12	1/12	0	The demonstration felt like an informal activity to me.	0	0	1	0	0
I thought the host farm was comparable enough to my own farm.	2/8	2/8	4/8	0	0	I think the host farm was well suited for this demo.	0	0	0	1	0
I had the feeling the demonstrator was like one of us.	0	6/11	3/11	2/11	0						
I had the feeling I could trust the demonstrators knowledge.	0	1/12	7/12	4/12	0						
I got along very well with the demonstrator.	0	2/12	7/12	3/12	0	I got along well with the participants.	0	0	1	0	0

T2: Learning outcomes

Explained knowledge was sufficiently understandable. There was a lot of specialized information about corn production shared. Practical skills were not sufficiently addressed to foster maximum uptake by participants, mainly due to a lack of time. Common methods or ways of thinking on farming were questioned and alternatives were extensively elaborated on in group. Especially about digital techniques: they commented that digitalization is the future of agriculture. Common methods or ways of thinking on learning were not questioned.

	participant answers				
What would you ideally like to learn today?	corn protection; corn and technologies; interest of the market; how to better earn money; eradication of the corn tree.				
	strongly disagreed	disagreed	agreed	strongly agreed	not applicable
The demonstration met my expectations regarding what I wanted to learn.	0	4/12	5/12	3/12	0
The demonstration exceeded my expectations.	4/8	4/8	0	0	0
I felt surprised at some point(s) during the demonstration.	1/10	3/10	2/10	4/10	0
I obtained a clearer understanding of the topic(s) demonstrated.	0	1/12	8/12	3/12	0
I have the feeling I learned something new (knowledge, skill, practice, etc.).	0	1/11	5/11	5/11	0
I thought about how I could implement some of the ideas and practices on my own farm.	0	1/7	1/7	5/7	0
I reflected on my own point of view at some point during the demonstration.	1/9	1/9	1/9	6/9	0
I learnt about the principles underlying a practice.	2/10	0	3/10	5/10	0
I thought about how we learn something new on demonstrations (e.g.: teaching methods).	0	0	0	0	12/12 (error)
I thought about why I want to learn about the topic(s) of this demonstration.	0	0	0	0	12/12 (error)

	demonstrator answers				
what do you intend for the participants to learn today?					
	strongly disagreed	disagreed	agreed	strongly agreed	not applicable
I think participants have learnt what I intended them to learn.	0	0	1	0	0
I tried to surprise participants with uncommon/new knowledge/new skill.	0	0	1	0	0
I felt surprised at some point(s) myself during the demonstration (e.g. by a question or discussion).	0	1	0	0	0
I obtained a clearer understanding of the topic(s) myself.	0	0	1	0	0
I have the feeling I learned something new during this demo (from participants, discussion...).	0	0	1	0	0
I reflected on my own point of view myself at some point during the demo.	0	0	1	0	0
I encouraged participants to reflect on their own point of view during this demo.	0	0	1	0	0
I encouraged participants to reflect on their own situation sometime during this demo.	0	0	0	0	0
I encouraged participants to reflect on how we learn something new on demonstrations.	0	1	0	0	0
I encouraged participants to reflect on why we are trying to learn about the topic of this demonstration	0	0	1	0	0

T3: Overall comments on the effectiveness of the event

Participants:

With an average of 4,1 on 5, participants rated the event overall as very effective. 12 on 12 participants who answered the question would recommend the demonstration.

Demonstrator:

As main effective characteristics of the demo, the demonstrators listed: the possibility to compare varieties and technologies; the high knowledge of all demonstrators; the good atmosphere.

As suggestion for improvement the demonstrator mentioned: more practical tasks.

General summary:

It was a surprisingly interesting presentation of machines controlled by a computer program and GPS. At some point, the host walked beside the tractor with sprayer, and the cabin was empty! The host had was very comfortable with transferring knowledge. The demonstrators were high-class specialists of a major seed company. Participants were mainly larger corn producers.

The main problem aspect that could be improved was the timing: good for maize observation, but not too much participants because it was harvest time.