



## Case study reports: Spain CS<sub>3</sub>



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

# 1. Background

Pistachio is a new emerging crop in arid and cold areas of Spain, since the end of the twentieth century various research and implementation projects have established an increasing number of farmers betting on their cultivation. This crop replaces traditional crops with very low economic yields such as cereals or other more profitable but not very sustainable due to high irrigation needs.

The cooperative at the base of this case study is formed by some of these pioneer farmers who perceive a need to associate and collaborate in transmitting to other farmers how to grow this suitable plant for its production and commercialization. The pistachio has the peculiarity of a very long exploitation cycle, from the plantation to crop, which makes it very important to avoid errors in its cultivation that would make the project unviable many years after planting.

The figure of the president of the cooperative, one of these pioneer farmers, who based on the documentation of first research centres, but in a self-taught way, invests a good part of his time in demonstrations to other partners and possible new members of the cooperative, is key in this case study.

The cooperative has abundant information for both consumers (including recipes) and potential new interested farmers on its website.

The website also has clear data to contact the cooperative and announcement that interested parties will receive information from the partners, in clear and simple language for farmers:

"The partners of the cooperative have access to the advice required to obtain these returns and enjoy the experience of the rest of the partners with older plantations, thus avoiding possible mistakes."

"To all those farmers who finally decide to invest in the pistachio plantation, you are welcome to this interesting and very special, pistachio world."

The demonstrations are integrated into the cooperative's current work so that the president and the member farmers with he the contact, voluntarily give their time and knowledge in visits to the fields. Generally the farmers who give their fields according to their time and the concrete aspect to show in each plot are present or not in the demonstration according to the indications / request of the president.

The actors are thus mainly the farmers of the cooperative management as point of contact and demonstrators, and the farmer partners as owners who bring their land for the demonstration and the participants in the demonstration. All of them are usually from the region where the SAT is located.

Event Date: 07/2018

## 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 Farm Level with the host farmer. 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. This data is sourced from 2 pre and post-demonstration participant surveys, 1 pre and 1 post-event interview with the demonstrator/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.

The Spanish workshop was held on November 14, 2018, in Coristanco, Coruña, Spain at the facilities of the partner EFA Fonteboa ([https://www.lavozdegalicia.es/noticia/carballo/2018/11/15/granja-puede-mejor-escuela/0003\\_201811C15C5997.htm](https://www.lavozdegalicia.es/noticia/carballo/2018/11/15/granja-puede-mejor-escuela/0003_201811C15C5997.htm)). The workshop held 11 people in total, mainly from Galicia region in Spain. The information collected in the case studies was represented through the interviewers of each case study.

### 3. Structural Characteristics

#### T1: Programme/network level

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

###### *The Cooperative*

This case study is articulated around the work of the cooperative of pistachio growers on one specific farm and, even more, of its president who has a central role, as a pioneer in the cultivation of pistachios, in the work of the cooperative and as a driving force of respective demos. The cooperative serves as a knowledge centre for members and a reference point for other farmers interested to engage into pistachio production. Organised demonstration events have a double objective, to share knowledge and to attract more members and strengthen the cooperative. Moreover, the cooperative organises demonstration for its own members as well, in which discussions and topics are more focused and detailed.

Interviewer: So, for now we can see that the different operations are connected, through your plc, at kind of knowledge do you share? Interviewee: We share everything, we also have a WhatsApp group just to share information. (Host farmer)

We have a group for sharing until, as a plc, we can afford a technician who can dedicate their time to this and other things, primarily manage our company but... (Host farmer)

People get in contact with us. Basically, people who are interested in the crop see our web page, or send us emails, and then we talk on the phone. (Host farmer)

We just want to do a good job. We would like a percentage of the producers, who get into the pistachio world, to become loyal members. In fact, a large part of current members joined after a visit. (Host farmer)

In the end I know, even though it is not compulsory, we do try to convince those who came that, if they decide to grow the crop, it is worth joining the plc. (Host farmer)

Do you have any plans of doing demonstrations on other things, for example, machinery?

Interviewee: There are people who ask about that, but that's when they're going to become members. In that case I show them the machinery. (Host farmer)

Interviewer: So, the idea is to discuss more general themes during the first visit, and then for members, or future members, something more professional. Interviewee: Exactly! (Host farmer)

The interviewee referred also to the Centre for Agro-environmental Research (El Chaparrillo). However, this seems to be more of a Centre of useful information on pistachio production and less of an organisation that is actively engaged in the case study's demos nor in demo events in general.

When there's a difficult problem the logical step is to call an expert. There's the vade mecum of pistachios, the book from the Chaparrillo, which is the bible for pistachio producers. When there's a problem that's in the book, you can call Pepe G., who is the Chaparrillo's director. (Host farmer)

When you're growing a new crop, a lot of people don't know what to do. The research carried out by the Chaparrillo gives a solid grounding, but most producers will find other producers' experience more trustworthy. Because most technical information is carried out on half plots, or even smaller. (Host farmer)

There are no experts in the pistachio world, well, there's the *Chaparrillo*, but the experts there are state officials and they don't do these kinds of things. (Host farmer)

The president of the cooperative holds an instrumental role in organised demonstrations. He takes care of the organisational aspects and coordinates work, and he is the host farmer, expert/adviser and demonstrator during demos.

I always let them call me, and then we organise a visit. Once we have established the time and day, we start the tour and I explain the different things people want to know. It's a bit like a tutorial, it's not a course, and basically they get more than they would on a course. (Host farmer)

I don't choose. Normally, as I'm the one who does the visit, they call me, and we arrange something. It's mainly in the afternoons, and if necessary on Saturday afternoons – whenever's best for them. I try to be as flexible as possible in the afternoons when I've finished my workday. So, we try to arrange it for the afternoons. (Host farmer)

The number of demonstrations delivered each year varies and depends on the interest farmers express in cultivating pistachios. Normally events could range between two and ten per year, with the average duration of the event being around an hour and a half.

So, how long would a demonstration last? Interviewee: [...] On average the visit lasts around an hour and half, without spending too much time on each plot, because the important thing is to see the crop's growing process; the first six to seven years. (Host farmer)

Interviewer: And what would be the timescale between different visits, and why? For example, one event a year... Host farmer: It depends on the demand. Some years there can be two or three, but in others there can be eight or ten. Interviewer: So, it's basically as they turn up... Interviewee: Maybe a year can go by without any...

The host farmer prefers to use its one pistachio trees during events. When needed he might engage other members of the cooperative in demonstrations. Finally, there does not seem to be any other experts/advisers involved in the preparation and/or delivery of demo events.

And so, do other producers do these visits, or is it just you? Interviewee: As I'm the only one who's got the grade, I decide. In our area I show my operation and those of others only if I must. To show the evolution from zero to seven years... (Host farmer)

Interviewer: So, it's not organised around a single operation or a mix of operations, it just depends on what you need for the visit, but you are the primary producer involved? Interviewee: I also know which operations I can go to, there are some I know I will never have any problems because I've already taken visitors there. Of course, we don't do anything there, it's just to see how things are done, the time of year, and talk about the produce. (Host farmer)

Interviewer: Right, so the main actors during the visit would be you and whoever's visiting? You don't normally have a third party, such as a technician or expert? Host farmer: No, because we are interested in how to manage the crop, and the person who knows how to do that is the producer. They have the experience and know-how with pistachios. Pistachios have been grown in Spain for thirty years, we've had them since 2004, and I've been involved since 2007. So, I've got ten to eleven years' experience.

The organised events are exemplary and have a whole farm approach. Depending on the season and the productive interventions the host farmer has engaged in before the event, technics, such as grafting, might be also presented and practical exposure of participants on those technics could be pursued. In general, though, such specialised technical sessions are not that often in organised demos.

I think you already explained this, but, how do choose the topic of the visit? The main topic for you is the type of crop, isn't it? Interviewee: Type of crop, land. There's also a difference from one plot to another, to see if it adapts better or worse. [...] So, basically you want to show them the different stages, so the people can differentiate between one way of doing things and another. You give them different options of dealing with the same problem... Interviewee: Covering the whole the area. (Host farmer)

Interviewer: Ok, and before you make an appointment, do you plan anything? Such as this year, we're going to talk more about the land, or more towards grafting, or something else? Host farmer: The thing with grafting is, well, today for example if we did a visit, the plots have all been

grafted and so you could do a graft. But normally we don't do the technical stuff, we could but we don't.

#### *Other actors involved in the demonstration activities*

The intended audience of the demonstration events are farmers in the region, interested in investing into an alternative crop production (pistachios). In most of the times there are only small groups that attend those demonstrations. Finally, participants are not involved in any way in the preparation of the demonstrations.

So, it's mainly farmers from the local area? Interviewee: Yes. (Host farmer)

Interviewee: They come alone or in groups. Sometimes a couple of farmers or more come, sometimes just the one. (Host farmer)

Interviewer: And would they be producers that already have a certain crop, or would they be new to the area? Interviewee: Well, normally they are new to pistachio production, because what they want to know is if it is profitable, then what are the requirements, and above all what the annual benefits are. (Host farmer)

Interviewer: Do the participants get involved, do they bring anything to the table? I'll bring the sandwiches, or I can show you this property... Interviewee: Nothing, nothing at all. That's the second step which I'm really interested in. When they're really interested some of them do say "do you mind visiting my property to see if..." (Host farmer)

The organiser/host farmer is not actively engaged into recruiting participants. Word of mouth appears to be the main marketing channel they rely on in order to attract farmers interested in cultivating pistachios.

It's mainly by word of mouth, it works better than anything else. Posters for example for this kind of visit don't work. (Host farmer)

Interviewee: Normally I don't try to find participants. They call us, and what I do is organise the day. If there's more than one, I try and find a day that suits everyone. I don't look for them, they come to me with questions. (Host farmer)

## 2. Networks

The only network indicated in this case study is the one of members of the pistachio growers' cooperative.

## 3. Resources, finances and incentives

There is no funding available for the demo events. The whole approach is based on voluntary efforts of the host farmer and of member of the cooperative. While in the organiser mind the need for additional experts is quite evident, it appears that this is to be postponed to the future when the coop will be in the position to afford this kind of expenses and support. Still, this does not seem to threaten the feasibility of organised demo event, although it definitely affects its depth and scope.

So as I was saying before, do you get any funding or is it all pro bono? Interviewee: We have never, and we don't charge anything, and the plc. doesn't have any money to pay for them. I tend to do it on a personal basis. My work and my rent have a price, but for now... (Host farmer)

Interviewer: And how does that influence the administration, by which I mean when you get tired or you don't have time... Interviewee: No, it's because we're only just starting. Most of the producers are members but as it takes between five and seven years to start producing, and most have just planted, we can't afford the help of a technician right now. When the different producers are up and running decently we will employ someone to help, but for now it's only our experience as producers that we share with each other. If someone has a problem someone else

had before, well instead of hiring a technician, we have a member with certain experience and skills that can help. (Host farmer)

#### 4. Goal/ objectives

The overall goal of the demo events is to expose farmers to the production of pistachios as a promising, needed but demanding alternative. In addition, when farmers-attendees confirm their willingness to engage a secondary objective is to link them to the cooperative and increase its membership, and thereby the coop impact.

Well we do it for the farmers that don't have pistachios. Normally a producer that has pistachios does a demonstration to those that don't, so they can see the technique involved in growing the crop, and to try and get them to join *the cooperative*. (Host farmer)

Interviewer: So, it also works well for recruiting new members? Interviewee: Exactly! (Host farmer)

#### 5. Follow-up material and evaluation procedures

The host farmer indicated that there are not any dissemination material shared with participants, during or after the event. Follow-up information and a comprehensive set of technical and economic details are share with those that decide to join the cooperative.

And do you distribute materials or equipment after? Nothing. (Host farmer)

There are people who ask, I have a cost calculation sheet, and if I think they'll become a member, I'll give it them, but otherwise no. (Host farmer)

I don't give them a paper with different parameters. I do that after, and only if they need it. (Host farmer)

There is not any structured assessment process in place on both the event's structure and content or of the impact the event had to participants. Indirectly though, and always informally, the host farmer tries to keep an eye on both participants post-demo actions as well as of the impact his farming choices have into non-participants.

How do you monitor those that participate in your visits? Interviewee: [...] Of course, the crop is increasing in the area. For those that come, it may be because of that [...] (Host farmer)

After a visit do you try and find out if a year later these visits have been successful? Interviewee: No, I don't but... in the end I know [...] (Host farmer)

Right, for example, the different participants that come to visit you, do you follow them over time? For example, someone came to visit, we'll get back in contact in a years' time to see what's what... Interviewee: Not normally no, unless they say they're interested in keeping contact and want to join the plc. In that case I do keep in contact, but because we don't charge anything, even though we should, I can't do any follow up as it costs me time. (Host farmer)

Do you know how much influence these visits have (to non-participants)? Interviewee: Well I haven't thought about it. I do know of some producers in the area who have planted pistachio, not necessarily for me personally, but because of my plantations. Even though they don't admit it. (Host farmer)

As far as I know, of the people who have visited 70-80% have planted, and of those about 30% are pistachios. But we have no type of control or register on the subject, but most of the people who come end up planting pistachios, and some of them are now producing. (Host farmer)

## T2: Farm (event) level

The demonstration event was held in July, 2018, as a guided tour on different farms, close to the seats of the cooperative. Along with his own farm, the host farmer drove participants to cooperative members' farms to showcase different plots and development phases of pistachios. (Observation tool)

The host farmer organises one-off events, unless participants are interested in joining the cooperative (Farmer + observation tool). Dissemination material was not shared with participants. Moreover, no structured follow-up activities were envisaged, unless participants ask for an informal communication to take place, mainly through phone calls. (Observation tool). Feedback is not requested in a structured way (Host farmer + observation tool).

### 1. Topic

Pistachios crop (Observation tool).

### 2. Structure of the event

The host farmer used an all-terrain vehicle to guide participants to a field trip, visiting different fields both his own ones and of his colleagues/members of the cooperative cultivating pistachios in the area. He compared differences in growing phases of fruits and health of trees/production. The farmer stopped in different fields and offered hands-on activities mainly with soils and fruits. In each stop, the whole field and its surrounding area was analysed. Common methods or ways of thinking on farming were questioned and alternatives were shortly elaborated. The host farmer continuously offered examples to cereals crops, which are the dominant crop in the region. (Observation tool)

The demonstration felt like a continuous conversation among participants and the farmer, as following each field stop, they have engaged into Q&A and discussion until they reached the next field (Observation tool).

### 3. Group size

The farmer and 2 participants; both of them were interviewed (pre/post demo participant surveys & Observation tool).

### 4. Actors' roles

#### *Host farmer - demonstrator*

The host farmer was the demonstrator of the event. He guided participants to different fields, explained different development phases of the crop and offered participants, when convenient or necessary, hands-on opportunities to touch the soil (humid or dry) and the fruits (consistency and development). Finally, he used all available time to share information on production and reply to questions posed by participants (Observation tool).

#### *Participants*

The first attendee was a farmer and the second a factory employee, both interested into pistachio production (pre participant's survey). Both participants agreed or strongly agreed that they have actively been involved during the whole demonstration process (Post participant's survey).

### 5. Frequency

The frequency of the organised events depends on the interest/demand showed by farmers. They range from 2 to some 10 events per year, although there were years in which no event was scheduled (Host farmer).

## 6. Duration

There is no reference to the duration of the specific event. The host farmer has indicated that usually events last for about an hour and a half (Host farmer).

## 7. Accessibility

According to the pre demonstration participant survey, the farmer had indicated that it had to place substantial effort to attend as she had to travel for some 2 hours in order to reach the demonstration. On the contrary, the factory employee was a local resident and reached the demo fairly easy within 10 minutes' drive.

## 8. Fees for participation

At the specific demonstration event, there were no attendance/participation fees charged (Post demonstration participants). Moreover, none of the participants was in any way compensated for attending the event (Post demonstration participants).

## 4. Functional characteristics

### T1: Coordinating effective recruitment of host farmers and participants

#### 1. Incentives

It appeared that host farmers were not paid for demonstrations as the programme had no money to pay them and events, being free, did not generate income. The Farmer added that events were generally done on a personal basis.

We don't charge anything, and the plc. doesn't have any money to pay for them. I tend to do it on a personal basis. My work and my rent have a price, but for now... (Host farmer)

#### 2. Motivations for host farmers

The motivation for farmers was predominantly an interest in the crop itself.

People get in contact with us. Basically, people who are interested in the crop see our web page, or send us emails, and then we talk on the phone. (Host farmer)

#### 3. Motivations for participants

The Farmer was clear that people were not motivated by economic or social gain, but purely out of a desire to do a good job.

Interviewer: For example, what motivates people, or what are the reasons for doing this activity? Are they economic, to gain social status, or our produce is better than others'...

Interviewee: No, we're not interested in being the biggest or the best. We just want to do a good job. (Host farmer)

#### 4. Target audience

The target audience were farmers that were not currently growing pistachios but had the potential to invest in the crop.

Interviewee: Well we do it for the farmers that don't have pistachios. Normally a producer that has pistachios does a demonstration to those that don't, so they can see the technique involved in growing the crop, and to try and get them to join the cooperative. (Host farmer)

#### 5. Advertising and recruitment

The Farmer found that word of mouth was the most successful way to recruit participants, adding that poster and other forms of advertising did not work.

It's mainly by word of mouth, it works better than anything else. Posters for example for this kind of visit don't work. (Host farmer)

### T2: Appropriate demonstration and interaction approaches

#### 1. The nature of interaction

The Farmer described the nature of interaction as Mostly top-down, as the tour and the technical information were delivered by the host.

I always let them call me, and then we organise a visit. Once we have established the time and day, we start the tour and I explain the different things people want to know. It's a bit like a tutorial, it's not a course, and basically they get more than they would on a course. (Host farmer)

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

It was unclear to what extent, if any, host farmers were involved in individual demonstrations or the network programme

Participating farmers were not involved in individual demonstrations, although the Farmer was keen to explore how this could be addressed in the future.

Nothing, nothing at all. That's the second step which I'm really interested in. (Host farmer)

## 3. Focus

The Farmer described the network as 'Whole farm', as opposed to 'Single focused'.

## 4. Design

The Farmer described the network as 'Exemplary', and expressed a preference for this approach, however gave no justification as to why.

## 5. Group size

The tour involved driving between plots; as such, the Farmer felt it was best to keep the group small enough to all fit in one car so that conversation could continue with consistency throughout the day.

For me it's best when we all fit into one car or vehicle. Since we'll be moving from plot to plot, if there's more than one vehicle then you'll end up talking with some of them and not all of them. If people change car at one plot, then the conversation stops half way or starts half way. If there's more than one car, people should stay in the same one for the whole visit. (Host farmer)

### T3: Enabling learning appropriate to purpose, audience, context

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

The Farmer's preferred structure of the day consisted of conversation with participants, and working from what they wanted to know.

Just conversation. First establish what they want, which takes five minutes, and then on the road you listen to what they have to say, you answer questions, you ask questions, because everyone has specific questions which I try to answer. (Host farmer)

The Farmer had a cost calculation sheet available to those he felt were likely to become members of the cooperative.

No, that's all I need! There are people who ask, I have a cost calculation sheet, and if I think they'll become a member, I'll give it them, but otherwise no. (Host farmer)

The Farmer cited 'Participants ask questions & talk openly' as the most important technique for engaging participants, expressing again a preference for a day structured around open conversation around different plantations.

Interviewee: For me the best, is for it to be like a conversation, with a visit to the plots so they can see the plantations. They ask questions and I answer. This plot is like this because it has had a problem, this one is better because there's been no problem... (Host farmer)

#### 2. Taking into account variation in learning

When asked about variations in learning, the Farmer seems only to consider participants' attitude towards farming rather than their learning styles or prior knowledge. The Farmer felt strongly that the most important element of pistachio farming was patience, but gave no indication that those who did not understand this concept were accommodated.

Interviewee: For me, the basis of these visits is so that the pistachio producer internalises that the best way to grow this crop is with patience. So, if you understand that it takes seven years before it starts to produce, you'll be a good pistachio producer, no problem. On the other hand, if you think you are smarter than everyone else, and that instead of taking seven years it will take five, you are going to commit imprudent errors which will affect you in the long run.

Interviewer: So, more important than technique is for people to understand this idea, to be patient.

## T4: Effective follow-up activities

### 1. Follow-up activities and materials

There was no attempt to engage with participants after the event, either with follow-up activities or materials.

### 2. Assessing impact

The Farmer supposedly assessed the impact of events among participants and among the wider farming community, however gave no further details regarding this.

## 5. Event analysis: effective peer learning characteristics

### Event details

2 out of 2 participants completed the pre and post-test. One was a 29 year old man who is a factory employee and works in the local area. The other one was a 47 year old women who is a farmer and doesn't work in the local area. They were not related.

### T1: Learning processes

#### 1. Communication initiation by participants

In a group of 2 participants (not related) and the demonstrator, it's easy for the whole 'group' to share their knowledge, so they had no problem doing that. There was a lot of time for questions, about 30-40% of the time, and a lot of questions were asked. Most of the time, the demonstration was a continuous conversation between participants and demonstrator. After each big explanation in the field, all the way to the next field, or on the road, the time was used for questions and discussion. Both participants tried to formulate their own points of view regarding the topic.

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

#### 2. Interactive knowledge creation

##### *Hands-on opportunities and other multisensorial experiences*

A hands-on activity was demonstrated taking enough time, so it was clear to every participant. Participants could take part in a hands-on activity, and got some sort of feedback on their doing. This mainly with touching soils (humid or dries) and fruits (consistency and development) if they were available and in a field with explicit permission (4-5 times for soils and 2-3 for fruits). They could also smell and taste the fruits if it is the right period.

### Discussion opportunities and negotiating conflicting points of view

The demonstrator acted as facilitator. He is the leader and expert farmer of the cooperative and he conducted the demo. Open discussions are stimulated and given a lot of time, about 40%. With the most local participant, they discussed every field and techniques that every farmer is using and why. There was no elaboration/further explanation on shared critical points of view.

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

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

### 3. Engagement during the event

Participants all seem to know each other well, but are not close friends. But as farmers in a small group, they quickly start to talk about their farms, and to share experiences. The demonstrator acts as friends with the participants. E.g. He starts offering hats to protect about sun, and he make jokes about those with white skin not being real farmers.

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

	demonstrator answers				
	strongly disagreed	disagreed	agreed	strongly agreed	not applicable
Were <b>participants</b> (farmers, advisers, researchers etc.) involved in the overall development of this demonstration?	Yes: We explain more on topics about which they previously asked				
Most of the <b>participants</b> were well known to me.	0	1	0	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 <b>host farm</b> 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

The explained knowledge was very clearly understandable. Skills were very clearly and effectively addressed to foster maximum uptake by participants. Common methods or ways of thinking on farming were questioned and alternatives were shortly elaborated on in group.

	participant answers				
What would you <b>ideally like to learn</b> today?	More experience, to improve skills; Has this crop real options for succes?				
	strongly disagreed	disagreed	agreed	strongly agreed	not applicable
The <b>demonstration met my expectations</b> regarding what I wanted to learn.	0	0	1/2	1/2	0
The <b>demonstration exceeded my expectations.</b>	0	0	1/2	1/2	0
I <b>felt surprised</b> at some point(s) during the demonstration.	0	0	1/2	1/2	0
I <b>obtained a clearer understanding</b> of the topic(s) demonstrated.	0	0	2/2	0	0
I have the feeling I <b>learned something new</b> (knowledge, skill, practice, etc.).	0	0	0	2/2	0
I <b>thought about how I could implement</b> some of the ideas and practices on my own farm.	0	1/2	0	1/2	0
I <b>reflected on my own point of view</b> at some point during the demonstration.	0	0	1/2	1/2	0
I learnt about the <b>principles underlying a practice.</b>	0	0	1/2	1/2	0
I thought about <b>how we learn something new</b> on demonstrations (e.g.: teaching methods).	0	2/2	0	0	0
I thought about <b>why</b> I want to learn about <b>the topic(s) of this demonstration.</b>	0	1/2	1/2	0	0

	demonstrator answers				
what do you <b>intend for the participants to learn</b> today?	How to cultivate pistachios in my region.				
	strongly disagreed	disagreed	agreed	strongly agreed	not applicable
I think <b>participants have learnt what I intended them to learn.</b>	0	0	1	0	0
I tried to <b>surprise</b> participants with uncommon/new knowledge/new skill.	0	0	0	1	0
I <b>felt surprised</b> at some point(s) <b>myself</b> during the demonstration (e.g. by a question or discussion).	0	0	1	0	0
I <b>obtained a clearer understanding</b> of the topic(s) myself.	0	0	1	0	0
I have the feeling I <b>learned something new</b> during this demo (from participants, discussion...).	0	1	0	0	0
I <b>reflected on my own point of view</b> myself at some point during the demo.	0	0	0	1	0
I encouraged participants <b>to reflect on their own point of view</b> during this demo.	0	0	1	0	0
I encouraged participants <b>to reflect on their own situation</b> sometime during this demo.	0	0	0	1	0
I encouraged participants to <b>reflect on how we learn something new</b> on demonstrations.	1	0	0	0	0
I encouraged participants <b>to reflect on why we are trying to learn</b> 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 5 on 5, participants rated the event overall as very effective. 2/2 would recommend the demonstration. They stated as most effective characteristics of the event: A lot of fields with diverse situations (examples) and very experienced demonstrator (Host farmer). The demonstrator is a real farmer with real aims to share knowledge and he has a lot of experience and field access (from other farmers). There were no suggestions for improvement.

#### *Demonstrator:*

The demonstrator reported on what made it effective: to touch real plants, a lot of cases (fields) and our experience. He had no suggestions for improvement.

#### *Observed main strong points of the event:*

A farmer very committed with the promotion of a new crop, he is a passionate “believer” and transmits that he truly believes in this crop. He has a long and profound experience with difficult techniques like ‘grafting’.

#### *Observed main points that could be improved:*

Targeting, and planning for a little bit bigger groups. Also, the self-recognition of his value as demonstrator, and the importance of communication about the demonstration. It seems that only people extremely interested in this crop who were using word of mouth could find the demo.