



Case study reports: Poland CS₃



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

1. Background

The agricultural advisory system in Poland currently consists of 16 provincial (voivodships) agricultural advisory centers (ODR) and the Agricultural Advisory Center in Brwinów (CDR). The Center is acting as a state legal entity and reports directly to the Minister of Agriculture. Currently, 4.2 thousand persons are employed in ODR, of whom approx. 3.5 thousand are agricultural advisors. In the municipality (the lowest unit of territorial division in Poland) usually one adviser works. The basic task of agricultural advisory services is to carry out mainly advisory activities and, in addition as a supplementary activity, activities in the field of education, information and dissemination.

In the Lubelskie voivodship there are around 290,000 farms covering an area of 1 584 643 ha of agricultural land. The Lublin Agricultural Advisory Centre employs 360 people in a network of 23 Poviats Agricultural Advisory Teams covering a cooperation of 213 communes in the province.

The Polish Society of Organic Farmers (PTRE) is a nationwide association associates agricultural producers holding certified organic farms. PTRE actively participates in popularizing the idea of organic farming, cooperates with organisations and competent authorities in terms of development of organic agricultural production, makes efforts to create favourable legal conditions for organic farming, represents its members and protects their professional needs.

Programme

In accordance with the assumptions of the program, trainings in the field of organic farming are conducted, covering: legal regulations, fundraising and economics, production technologies, processing and marketing of ecological products. Practical trainings takes place on organic farms and on the ODR experimental field.

Funding and governance

Funds for conducting trainings come mainly from hosting farms resources and commercial companies presenting results of their researches and products. For organising thematic events such as field's days, funds are obtained from producers of seeds, fertilisers and plant protection products which are allowed in organic farming. For Regional events, promoting organic farming, funds are also raised from local governments. The company is managed by a 3-person Board.

Agricultural advisory is financed from public funds. Directions of action are set in cooperation with Social Agricultural Advisory Councils, which consist mainly of social and professional organisations activists, trade unions and agricultural self-governments, however at least 80% of members should be farmers. Participation of farmers' representative organisations in the Council of agricultural advisory centres is aimed on including farmers in the process of identifying advisory needs, defining priorities of advisory tasks to be consistent with the expectations of the farming community.

Actors and networks

On PTRE farms, trainings are conducted by the owners with the assistance of PTRE Ekogwarancja, advisors and external experts. The Department of Organic Agriculture and Environmental Protection of the Lublin Agricultural Advisory Centre cooperates with over 50 agri-environmental advisors who work for organic farmers. In the database of ecological demonstration farms there are currently 5 farms. Thematic trainings are also takes place at other cooperating farms.

How it Works

The farm is presented in the CDR/AAC Base and Catalogue of ecological farms as an organic demonstration farm. As part of the CDR/AAC's cooperation with ecological farms, the Database of Demonstrative Ecological Farms was established, where 95 organic farms interested in demonstrating their activities are included. The farms catalogue contains characteristics of farms, photos and other information.

The Lublin Agricultural Advisory Center has within its structure Department of Organic Farming and Environmental Protection, which supervises network of environmental advisors an also cooperates directly with organic farms. The statutory tasks of the department include, among others, promotion of organic

farming and environmental protection through trainings, organisation and participation in fairs, exhibitions, competitions, disseminates knowledge in the field of organic farming, implements innovative solutions in organic production; draw up plans and applications for agri-environmental-climate programs, organic farming and provides assistance in completing other documents necessary to apply for financial aid or co-financing from EU funds and other domestic and foreign institutions.

Event Farm and location

- The farm is located in eastern part of Poland, in the Lublin voivodship. It is a farm with organic field vegetables production. The owner was awarded the title of the National Master of Organic Production before.
- On the demonstration farm, specializing in the production of organic vegetables, field trainings on organic vegetable production take place. Every year, in autumn, there is also an open day for 120-150 participants is organised.

Event date: as part of Case study, the training took place in September, 2018 (CS3)

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 13 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 a social council consisting of scientists working in the field of organic farming, both from research institutes and from agricultural universities, farmers, members of agricultural organisations – Chambers of agriculture, sectoral associations, like PTRE.

We will set up a social council consisted with scientists, farmers, members of agricultural organisations, which set a date (Programme level Interviewee).

Q: Who are the main people involved in the demonstration activities and what are their roles? R: Farmers, members of PTRE, representatives of commercial companies. They are main demonstrators during demo events. (Programme interviewee).

Q: How are demonstration topics selected? A: By board of PTRE and with consultation with scientists from research institutes cooperating with PTRE. (Farmer).

2. The main actors involved in the demonstration activities and their roles (each at program / farm/event level).

Farmers

Farmers are members of the social council of the Polish Society of Organic Farmers (PTRE). Moreover, according to the post host farmer interview, most demonstration events on his farm are organised in consultation with other organic farmers, mostly regionally based, from lubelskie and mazowieckie voivodships, specializing in organic vegetable producers. The meeting was also attended by many highly specialized farmers from all over Poland who are members or supporters of PTRE and companies producing seeds, seedlings, fertilisers and organic plant protection like Beyo Zaden.

Q: How is the programme/network managed? R: We will set up a social council consisted of scientists, farmers, members of agricultural organisations. (Programme level Interviewee).

Q: How are most demonstration event on the farm organised? A: Contacts with other farmers and companies like Beyo Zaden (Post host farmer interview).

Host farmer

The farm level interviewee (host farmer) mentioned that he is one of the main people involved in the demonstration activities. The demo activities on the farm are managed by him. He takes decision regarding scope of demo activities together with the board of PTRE. The host farmer does not request feedback nor does he evaluate the demo activities in a formal way. However, informally he gets some feedback during the event's day from participants through discussion.

Q: Are host farmers involved in the development of the individual demonstration activities? A: Yes, they are, as members of PTRE, some of them of as members of board of PTRE. (Programme interviewee).

Q: Are host farmers involved in the development of the overall demonstration programme? A: Only to some extent, at very general level, unless they are member of PTRE board (when they can have more influence of PTRE programme) (Programme level Interviewee.)

Q: How are the demo activities on the farm managed? A: By our own management – schools and high schools provide requests regarding arranging demo activities (Farm level Interviewee).

Q: Who are the main people involved in the demonstration activities and what are their roles? A: I am a farm manager, scientists and advisers conducting scientific experiments presents their results (Farm level Interviewee).

Q: Are you involved in the overall development of demos at the prog / network level? A: Only to some extent, as the member of PTRE board. (Farm level Interviewee).

Q: Are participants (farmers, advisers, researchers etc.) involved in the overall development of the demonstrations? A: No. First we , members of the PTRE association select topics then demo is organised (Farm level Interviewee).

Q: Do you request feedback on the event day from participants? A: No. This comes out during the discussion (Farm level Interviewee).

Q: Do you evaluate the demonstration activities overall? A: No. I know whether demo was effective (Farm level Interviewee).

Audience/type of participants

The intended audience of the demonstrations according to the programme and the farm level Interviewees are mainly farmers, advisers, students of agricultural universities and agricultural schools, while the farm level interviewee referred also to local government representatives. Finally, it seems that participants (farmers, advisers, researchers etc.) are not involved in the overall development of the demonstrations on the farm.

Q: Who is your intended audience? A: Advisers (mainly), farmers (Programme level Interviewee).

Q: Who is your intended audience? A: Farmers, students of agricultural universities and agricultural schools, advisers (Farm level Interviewee)

Q: Who typically attends your demonstrations activities? A: Different groups - farmers, students, pupils, advisers, local government representatives. (Farm level Interviewee)

Q: Are participants (farmers, advisers, researchers etc.) involved in the overall development of the demonstrations? A: No. First we select topics then demo is organised (Farmer)

Q: Could you describe the short history of the demonstrations held on the farm? A: I have been organising Organic vegetable Field Day for seven years, I have been organising visits of a group of farmers, advisors, universities and agricultural schools students for 20 years (Post host farmer interview).

Scientists

Scientists are involved in the demonstration activities, as they conduct and present the results of the scientific experiments that take place on the farm.

Q: How is the programme/network managed? A: We are considering establishment a social council consisted of scientists, farmers, members of agricultural organisations. (Programme level Interviewee).

Q: Who are the main people involved in the demonstration activities and what are their roles? A: I am a farm manager, scientists and advisers conducting scientific experiments presents their results (Farm level Interviewee).

Organisers (Programme interviewee- host farmer, president of PTRE

There are several actions undertaken by the Programme interviewee himself and the organisation he belongs to. He and his organisation are involved in the topic selection of the demonstration activities. The same applies to the farm level Interviewee who is also involved at the topic selection of the demonstration activities. The demo topics are identified during the sections meetings, and are based on the organisers knowledge of

the most recent/relevant topics as well as on new technologies from which some interesting elements are chosen. The organisers also request feedback from participants and carry out evaluations of the overall demo activities through evaluation sheets. They also keep contact with the demo participants in order to engage them after the demonstration event. This is also achieved through meetings during conferences.

Q: How do you identify/select relevant topics that will interest farmers? R: Set during the PTRE sections meetings (Programme level Interviewee).

Q: How are demonstration topics selected? A: We, society board members determine the most relevant topics. (Programme level Interviewee).

Q: How do the overarching goals/objectives of the programme translate down to individual demo activities? A: New technologies from which interesting elements are chosen (Programme level Interviewee).

Q: Do you request feedback from demo participants? R: Yes. Evaluation sheet (Programme level Interviewee).

Q: Do you evaluate the demonstration activities overall? R: Yes. Evaluation sheet (Programme level Interviewee).

Q: Do you - at the programme level - continue to engage participants after the demonstrations? R: Yes. We are staying in touch with the part of participants. They would like to know how demonstrations continue. Meetings are arranged during local and national organic conferences. (Programme level Interviewee).

Q: Are participants (farmers, advisers, researchers etc.) involved in the overall development of the demonstrations? No. First we, the PTRE board members, select topics then demo is organised (Farm level Interviewee).

Advisors

Advisors are involved in the demonstration activities along with the farm level interviewee's family and other scientists. Advisors and scientists conduct and present the results of the scientific experiments take place on the demo farm. Advisors have also an active contribution to the advertisement of the demo event. Finally, advisors contribute to the assessment of the extent of influence from the demonstration events organised to non-participants.

Q: In your experience, what is the most effective way of attracting participants and advertising events? R: Via agricultural advisors, public and private providing services to farmers at local level, internet (Programme interviewee).

Q: Who are the main people involved in the demonstration activities and what are their roles? R: I am a farm manager, scientists and advisers (e.g. advisors from Beyo or a company buying organic products conducting scientific experiments presenting their results (Farm level Interviewee).

Q: Do you try to assess the extent of influence (diffusion) from your demonstration to non-participants (those who have not attended demo events)? R: Yes. I talk to directors of schools and public and private agricultural advisors (Farm level Interviewee).

Specialists

There are the same specialist already indicated above - specialists presenting results of their researches, agricultural advisors specializing in organic production. These specialists have an active role as demonstrators during the event where they present the content of the scientific experiments.

Q: Please rank the following factors by their importance to effective demonstration activities; R: Good quality expert advice and tech presentations. Presentations by specialists help in the best way to understand the content of scientific experiments (Farmer).

Schools directors and schools

As already mentioned the demo activities on the farm are managed by the Farm level Interviewee. It seems also that schools' directors contribute to the assessment of the extent of influence from the demonstration events organised, to non-participants.

Q: Do you try to assess the extent of influence (diffusion) from your demonstration to non-participants (those who have not attended demo events)? R: Yes. I talk to directors of regional agricultural colleges and advisors. They base their opinions on their discussion with teachers, students (in case of directors) and farmers (as regards advisors). Moreover, we organise some thematic field trips, when we have opportunity to communicate with people who did not attend our events. (Farmer).

Q: How are the demo activities on the farm managed? A: By our own management - schools and high schools representatives are in contact with PTRE, myself and other organic farmers personally. (Farm level Interviewee).

Companies

According to the post host farmer interview, most demonstration events on his farm are jointly organised with other farmers and companies like Beyo Zaden, Symbio, .

Q: How are most demonstration event on the farm organised? (e.g.: field days) A: Contacts with other farmers and companies like Beyo Zaden. The involved companies suggest topics/new technologies/approaches to be presented during demo events. Subsequently board of PTRE take decision concerning topic for demo events and makes all appropriate organisational arrangements involving all relevant actors (i.e. host farmer, company in question, interested scientist, agricultural advisors). (Post host farmer interview).

3. Follow up material

According to the Programme interviewee, follow up materials such as thematic brochures, plans of scientific experiments and/or description of demonstrations are offered to participants after the demo event.

Q: Are follow-up materials made available to participants after demos? R: Yes. Thematic brochures, sometimes description of demonstrations (Programme level Interviewee)

Q: What materials are provided during demonstrations? R: Brochures printed and provided by i.e. companies, scientists - about new technology, varieties, seeds and seedlings, cultivation methods , a plan of scientific experiments in the PTRE members farms (Farm level Interviewee)

4. Networks

According to the Programme interviewee the specific network/programme is mainly connected to regional advisory centres and chambers of agriculture. The farm level interviewee, seems to be connected to an advisory network and schools, and participates in the Polish Organic Board and the Polish Society of Organic Farming networks. He also holds elected or appointed roles as a chairman at Polish Society of Organic Farming (PSOF), network (Post host farmer interview).

Q: To what extent is the network/programme connected to other networks/programmes in your country or even internationally? R: Connections to the voivodship agricultural advisory centres, chamber of agriculture. Voivodship agricultural advisory centres and chambers of agriculture are directly involved in dissemination of results demo events throughout their training and dissemination activities. (Programme level Interviewee).

Q: To what extent is the demo farm connected to other demo farms and/or other knowledge exchange organisations? R: Through network of 16 voivodship agricultural advisory centres, agricultural schools and agricultural universities(Farm level Interviewee).

Q: Is your demonstration farm part of a programme or wider network (e.g. LEAF)? R: No (Farm level Interviewee).

Q: What farming networks and/or programmes are you participating in? R: Polish Organic Board; Polish Society of Organic Farming (Post host farmer interview).

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

5. Resources, finances and incentives

The demonstration activities are funded by:

- a) the Programme interviewee's own funds. He invests his own resources to carry out his own research useful for his farm activity and members of PTRE,
- b) Commercial companies presenting results of their researches,
- c) Apart of that host farmer and members of PTRE occasionally make use of European project's funds such as H2020 and Interreg for the demo activities. These type of projects cover the expenses of agricultural production means to for participating host farmers. However, according to the farm level Interviewee demo activities are mainly funded by his own funds as well as by some companies which produce plant protection products.

Q: What are the funding arrangements for your demo activities? How do these impact on the lifespan of the farm demo? R: Host farmers own funds. International projects (H2020, Interreg). The driving force behind demo activities is personal involvement of host farmer, This is the best guarantee for long term impact of demo activities for host farmer and member of PTRE, having the same strong personal incentives. (Programme level Interviewee).

Q: Do you offer any incentives to farmers to host demonstration activities? R:

Yes. Funding of agricultural production means, scope of funding depends on rule of cooperation with company in question. (Programme level Interviewee).

Q: What are the funding arrangements for your demo activities? How do these impact on the lifespan of the farm demo? R: Mostly own funds, sometimes companies producing plant protection products (Farm level Interviewee)

6. Human Resources

The case study demonstrator stated that he would not benefit from some extra training as a demonstrator (Post survey demonstrator). No reference is made to whether demonstrators have received any training to improve demo organisation and delivery.

7. Goal/ objectives

According to the Programme interviewee, the main goal of the demo activities is the promotion of new technologies and approaches on agriculture to demo participants. Moreover according to the farm level interviewee, the demo activities goal is to apply scientific research and experiments on his working farm.

Q: What are the overall goals/objectives of the demo farm? How are these decided? R: Promotion of the new technologies and approaches on agriculture (Programme level Interviewee)

Q: What are the overall goals/objectives of the demo farm? How are these decided? R: Modern farm with the scientific research, scientific experiments are conducted in the conditions of a functioning farm (Farm level Interviewee).

T2. Farm (event) level

1. Event's farm and layout

The host farmer is member of the Polish Organic Board and chairman of the Polish Society of Organic Farming (PSOF) network (Post host farmer interview). He owns a commercial, large sized farm with over 60 hectares of organic vegetable production. On the farm there are over 100 varieties of 18 vegetable species cultivated and presented to demo attendees (Observation tool + Post host farmer interview). Several comparisons of varieties and methods of vegetable cultivations take place in multiple fields on the specific farm (Observation tool).

The demonstrations organised in the programme are a mixture of exemplary and experimental approaches according to Programme interviewee. However, the farm level interviewee mentioned that the demonstrations organised in his farms are mainly experimental. Both 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 mixture of exemplary and experimental approaches (Post survey demonstrator).

2. Practice/technology demonstrated-Topic

The overall topic of the specific demonstration event was specialized organic vegetable production (Observation tool). The event was a classical field day. At the beginning of the demo event, a presentation with multimedia shows, lectures and films was given concerning the cultivation and technologies used on the specific farm. Thereafter participants visited the field (Observation tool).

3. Actor's role

Eight-teen participants attended at the specific demonstration event. Of which 13 were interviewed. Almost 77% of participants did not work in the area where the event took place (Pre demonstration survey participant). Ten of them were farmers, while the remaining three interviewed did not disclose their occupation. (Pre demonstration survey participant). Approximately 85% of respondents felt actively or very actively involved during the whole demonstration process (Post participant's survey). According to one of the event's demonstrators, participants (farmers, advisers, researchers etc.) were not involved in the overall development of the specific demonstration (Post survey demonstrator).

At the specific event there was a representative of the farmer's family, who acted as a facilitator (Observation tool). The host farmer was also demonstrator, presenting the farm's background, machinery and buildings (Observation tool).

There were also a group of demonstrators with different styles who discussed with farmer attendees at the multimedia room and on the farm. Demonstrators are fully professionally trained representative of different companies. While all of them are well trained professional in area of their specializations, they differ in level of

ability of open, direct communication skills and capacity of initiating dialogue with farmers. (Observation tool). Only one demonstrator who was an advisor/company representative has been interviewed.

4. Frequency & Duration

According to the post host farmer interviewee one annual "Organic vegetable field day" and some field trips are organised each year on s/his farm.

Q: What is a typical time span for the demonstration activities and why? (e.g. one event a year over 3 years) R: Several times a year (Farm level Interviewee)

Q: How often? R: One, yearly "Organic vegetable field day" and some field trips (Post host farmer interview)

The post host farmer interviewee organises the Organic vegetable Field Day for the last seven years. Furthermore, visits of groups of farmers, advisors, university students and students are organised on his farm the last 20 years (Post host farmer interview). As far as the events duration and time allocation is concerned the lecture part was 3 hours, the field visit 1.5 hours and an additional 1.5 hours were devoted to refreshments and discussion (Observation tool).

5. Farm's infrastructures or arrangements

The farmer has made several arrangements and preparations in order to host the specific demonstration event. More specifically, he arranged a lecture room in the farm's storage room and he ordered a toilet for guests. Moreover he prepared a meal with farm's sausage products, vegetable dishes, local dishes, cakes, etc (Post host farmer interview + Observation tool)

6. Accessibility

Both programme and farm level interviewee 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 40 to 870 minutes, with an average time close to 255 minutes (Pre demonstration survey participant). Approximately half of the participants (46 %) rated their travel effort to participate as no effort or very little effort and 31 % rated their travel effort to participate as little effort. Finally 23% of participants rated their travel effort to participate as quite some effort or great effort. It is not quite clear if the effort rate is only related to the travel distance, as the effort ratings were not always proportional to the travel distance. Maybe other factors influence the effort rate i.e participants' motivations, free time etc (Pre demonstration survey participant).

Q: What do you think discourages people from attending demonstrations? R: Devotion to the farm, distance, dates (Programme interviewee)

Q: What do you think discourages people from attending demonstrations? R: No time, badly conducted presentations, distance (Farmer)

7. 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).

8. Time

The farm level interviewee 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, badly conducted presentations, distance (Farm level Interviewee)

4. Functional characteristics

T1: Coordinating effective recruitment of host farmers and participants

1. Incentives

The Farmer cited 'own funds' as the main source of finance for the project, although it is unclear whether this was referring to farmers' own funds or to the 'national budget', as described by the Programme Interviewee. Other funding sources included industry sponsors and international projects, such as horizon 2020 and Interreg.

Mostly own funds, sometimes companies producing plant protection products (Farmer)

Own funds (national budget). International projects (H2020, Interreg) (Programme)

2. Motivations for host farmers

The Farmer was motivated by a sense of duty to put scientific research into practice, while the Programme interviewee felt that host farmers were motivated by the chance to develop their farm and have access to the latest information.

In my opinion results of scientific research should be transferred into practice (Farmer)

Willingness to know news, farm development (Programme)

3. Motivations for participants

Participants were motivated by the latest news, farm development, finding solutions to their problems and having questions answered.

Desire to farm development, interest in news, answering the questions, problems solution (Farmer)

4. Target audience

The target audience was advisors, farmers and agricultural students.

5. Advertising and recruitment

The events were advertised on the internet as well as through farm advisors and high schools.

Via agricultural advisors, internet (Programme)

Information directed to schools, high schools. Internet (Farmer)

T2: Appropriate demonstration and interaction approaches

1. The nature of interaction

Both the Farmer and the Programme Interviewee described the nature of interaction as 'Mostly top-down', as event topics were determined by the programme.

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

Host farmers were involved in the planning stages of the demonstrations. Other than this, it seems that host and participating farmers had no involvement in the programme.

First we select topics then demo is organised (Farmer)

3. Focus

Both the Farmer and the Programme Interviewee described the network as 'in between' whole farm and single focused.

4. Design

- The Farmer described the network as 'Experimental', however expressed a preference for 'a mixture', explaining that the approach should be diversified.
- The Programme Interviewee described the network as 'A mixture' and expressed a preference for this approach based on personal opinion that there should be both theory and practice.

5. Group size

Both Farmer and Programme interviewee had a similar view on the optimal group size. The Farmer felt that the best group size was 10, but that this was not very economical. As such 15-20 participants were cited as optimal. The Programme interviewee felt that anything between 10 and 20 allowed for a communicative yet economical group size.

15-20 persons. However the best is group of 10 persons but this is not very economical (Farmer)

10 - 20 - communicative and economical (Programme)

T3: Enabling learning appropriate to purpose, audience, context

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

Both Farmer and Programme Interviewee recommended a mixture between presenting the scientific information and presenting the farm as a whole. The Programme Interviewee also mentioned the use of practical demonstrations.

Introduction of farm as a whole, short walk, presentation of machinery, buildings and then go to the scientific experiences (Farmer)

Showing farm, presentation specific information, practical demonstration (Programme)

There was no mention of particular materials used on the day. Nor was there any mention of the preferred techniques for engaging participants.

2. Taking into account variation in learning

The Farmer mentioned brochures and a plan of scientific experiments as a means to accommodate variations in learning, presumably as this allows participants to read through the information at their own pace. Other than this it appears there was no consideration of different learning styles.

T4: Effective follow-up activities

1. Follow-up activities and materials

The Farmer had no contact with participants after the event; however the Programme interviewee did stay in touch with some participants, informing them of other demonstrations and conferences.

The Programme offered thematic brochures and a description of demonstrations for participants to take away.

2. Assessing impact

The Farmer did not assess the impact of the event among participants, but did talk to directors of schools and advisors in order to gauge the impact among the wider farming community.

The Programme Interviewee did assess impact among both participants and the wider farming community through the 'number and nature of questions' asked by third parties and participants.

5. Event analysis: effective peer learning characteristics

Event details

The group consisted of about 18 participants, of which 13 filled in the pre and the post survey.

local area - gender - age	unknown	farmer	Total
works in local area		3	3
female		3	3
25		1	1
28		1	1
unknown		1	1
doesn't work in local area	3	7	10
male		2	2
38		1	1
47		1	1
female	3	5	8
27		1	1
29		1	1
43	1	1	2
49		1	1
53	1		1
60	1		1
61		1	1
total	3	10	13

T1: Learning processes

1. Communication initiation by participants

When in the whole group About 20% of the participants hesitated but shared their knowledge and/or experiences related to the topic. They asked questions about specialist production, product quality, and sales problems. When in small groups during the last part of the trip, more than 50% of the participants had no problem sharing knowledge related to the topic. A little time was made for questions, about 15 percent of the time during the first part, and again at the end. Some questions were asked. There were a lot of participants formulating their points of view regarding the topic, especially on organic vegetable production technology.

	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	7/13	4/13	1/13	1/13
I asked at least one question during the demonstration .	5/13 yes				
I shared my own point of view at least once during the demonstration.	4/13 yes				
I felt encouraged to ask questions during the demonstration.	1/13	5/13	5/13	2/13	0
When there were any discussions, I felt comfortable sharing my opinion.	0	7/13	4/13	1/13	1/13

	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	1	0	0	0
I encouraged the participants to formulate their own point of view during the demonstration.	0	1	0	0	0
I encouraged the participants to formulate questions during the demonstration.	0	1	0	0	0

2. Interactive knowledge creation

Hands-on opportunities and other multi-sensorial experiences

The participants could try the vegetables and examine the organoleptic. Furthermore, there were no hands-on activities.

Discussion opportunities and negotiating conflicting points of view

There was a facilitator who was a representative of the family. Open discussions between a few participants were stimulated, during the last part for more than 15 percent of the time. Almost no critical points of view on the topic were shared.

	participant answers				
	strongly disagreed	disagreed	agreed	strongly agreed	not applicable
In my opinion, there were interesting discussions during the demonstration.	0	2/13	8/13	3/13	0
If participants didn't agree with each other during discussions, somebody (demonstrator/other participant) tried to reach a consensus between them.	3/13	1/13	3/13	0	6/13

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

3. Engagement during the event

Participants acted more distant then open. The production on the demonstration farm was carried out at the highest level, usually better than on the farms of the farmers. They saw a model that is beneficial to pursue. The demonstrators acted more distant than open. However, there were several demonstrators with different styles, including a farmer from the Netherlands.

	participant answers				
	strongly disagreed	disagreed	agreed	strongly agreed	not applicable
I felt actively involved during the whole demonstration process.	0	2/13	4/13	6/13	1/13
I felt like the demonstration increased my ability to rely on myself as a farmer.	0	1/13	6/13	2/13	4/13
I could relate well to other participants (because they have an agricultural background similar to mine).	0	3/13	6/13	2/13	2/13
A lot of the other participants are part of the same farmer network as me.	0	2/13	4/13	3/13	4/13
I felt like I could trust the knowledge of (most of) the other participants.	0	3/13	5/13	2/13	3/13
The demonstration felt like an informal activity to me.	3/13	4/13	5/13	0	1/13
I thought the host farm was comparable enough to my own farm.	3/13	4/13	2/13	0	4/13
I had the feeling the demonstrator was like one of us.	0	7/13	5/13	0	1/13
I had the feeling I could trust the demonstrators knowledge.	0	1/13	8/13	3/13	1/13
I got along very well with the demonstrator.	0	1/13	8/13	3/13	1/13

	demonstrator answers				
	strongly disagreed	disagreed	agreed	strongly agreed	not applicable
Were participants (farmers, advisers, researchers etc.) involved in the overall development of this demonstration?	no				
Most of the participants were well known to me.	0	0	1	0	0
A lot of the participants are part of the same network as me.	0	0	1	0	0
The demonstration felt like an informal activity to me.	0	0	1	0	0
I think the host farm was well suited for this demo.	0	0	0	1	0
I got along well with the participants.	0	0	1	0	0

T2: Learning outcomes

Explained knowledge was sufficiently understandable. However over 100 varieties of 18 vegetable species were presented. Practical skills were not addressed. Common methods or ways of thinking on farming and/or on learning were not questioned.

	participant answers				
What would you ideally like to learn today?	Fertilizing in organic farming; (organic) plant protection; technology (in other region); innovation in organic farming; organic vegetable technology; how to work with an organic method; new varieties.				
	strongly disagreed	disagreed	agreed	strongly agreed	not applicable
The demonstration met my expectations regarding what I wanted to learn.	0	2/13	5/13	6/13	0
The demonstration exceeded my expectations.	0	5/13	3/13	5/13	0
I felt surprised at some point(s) during the demonstration.	1/13	5/13	3/13	4/13	0
I obtained a clearer understanding of the topic(s) demonstrated.	0	2/13	6/13	5/13	0
I have the feeling I learned something new (knowledge, skill, practice, etc.).	0	0	7/13	6/13	0
I thought about how I could implement some of the ideas and practices on my own farm.	0	1/13	5/13	2/13	5/13
I reflected on my own point of view at some point during the demonstration.	1/13	2/13	7/13	2/13	1/13
I learnt about the principles underlying a practice.	0	3/13	8/13	2/13	0
I thought about how we learn something new on demonstrations (e.g.: teaching methods).	0	0	0	0	13/13 (error)
I thought about why I want to learn about the topic(s) of this demonstration.	0	0	0	0	13/13 (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	1	0	0
I encouraged participants to reflect on how we learn something new on demonstrations.	0	0	0	1	0
I encouraged participants to reflect on why we are trying to learn about the topic of this demonstration	0	0	0	1	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 effective. 13 on 13 participants who answered the question would recommend the demonstration.

Demonstrator:

As main effective characteristics of the demo, the demonstrators listed: purely practical methods of communication; indication of problems and their solutions.

As suggestion for improvement the demonstrator mentioned: better conditions for multimedia presentation, e.g. sound in both the lecture hall and the field.

General summary:

It was a big event and it was not the first time being held in this farm. The host farmer is respected because of his production at the highest level. Less participants would be better, some didn't have the chance to talk or ask a question right now.