



AGRIDEMO

Case study reports: Sweden CS₁



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

1. Background

Funding and Governance

The two main organisations (SFO west, and SpmO) are responsible for the funding and the governance of the demonstration day.

Actors and networks

The organiser is responsible for the invitation to their members and network. The four farmers are very active in the planning of the demonstration and the logistic and to arrange coffee and lunch for all the participants.

How it works

Every year there are similar "growers day" organised in different places in Sweden. Local actors are involved to find out which farms that is most interesting to visit. There is more unusual that these two organisations are collaborating to arrange the growers day. There are more often that they are organising own meeting.

Event farm and location

The event was on a farm, which was situated in the West, not far from the lake Vänern. The meeting was held in June 2018.

The demo-day started with a presentation of the farm of three of the four farmers and a presentation of the Farming In Balance concept. Then there were four main subjects: Winter wheat, canola, biogas and slurry management, production of ley seed. After the field visit in four groups, there was a presentation of the market of canola, and some follow-up questions. There were also sellers presenting their products on the farm.



Photo; farmers are impressed of the strong and healthy Canola growth on the farms. (Photo, H. Elmquist). The photo is from the field visit when the group is divided in four looking at different crops and management systems in the fields.

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 interviews with 2 Programme/Network members after the demonstration and from an interview of the four farmers, father, mother and the two sons immediately after the demonstration, and from some of the participants after the demonstration day. The analysis followed 4 themes: (1) Coordinating effective recruitment of host farmers and participants, (2) Appropriate demonstration and interaction approaches (3) Enabling learning appropriate to purpose, audience, context, (4) 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 4 post demonstration surveys for participants 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 workshop for the Danish and Swedish case studies was held on the 17th of October, 2018.

3. Structural characteristics

T1: Programme/network level

1. Actors involved

“The growers day” was organised by two organisations: the Swedish cereal producers association (SpmO), and a Swedish local organisation for seed and oil seed producers (SFO) in west of Sweden. The Swedish farm demonstration network OiB (Odling I Balans, Farming In Balance) was also invited to present their work. The farm is one of the demonstration farms in the OiB network. Advisers from the Hushållningssällskapet (The Rural Economy and Agricultural Societies) were also engaged during the field visit, where they gave advices and discussed how to handle this year’s threat from pests. Finally, a person from the Swedish Board of Agriculture was also active in the event. A member of the SFO board acted as the facilitator of the event.

According to Programme interviewees, this is a typical format in demonstrations organised by these two organisations. In essence, the organisations select and approach the demo farm, and upon host farmers agreement they work with the farmers to organise the event as well as with other organisations to engage with experts and advisers.

[The events are] organised with the help of representatives from each organisation. (Programme interviewee 2)

Head of the two organisations or representatives and one or two representatives from the host farm. (Programme interviewee 1)

[Our role is] Planning and organising the structure and also, delegated the demonstration activities to experts and advisers. Their role is to organise the demonstration and impart knowledge. (Programme interviewee 1)

...Advisers and experts. Their role is to impart something and exchange knowledge. (Programme interviewee 2)

This was also the case in this specific event. The two organisations SFO and SpmO conceived the idea of a demonstration day at the farm. Then, they contacted the farm asking if they could host the event. Upon their approval, the organisations worked to activate the appropriate experts and advisers that would support as demonstrators along with the farmers. The manager of OiB was invited to give presentations on the demonstrations network and its projects different subjects. Advisers and experts on crops were invited to show crops in the field and to talk about actual issues concerning cultivations. Finally, representatives from commercial companies were invited to show their products during the event (observation tool; background info).

Both programme interviewees indicated that their intended demo audience are farmers. They also both stressed that although they select among their members/networks to organise demos those events are rather independent.

With reference to the funding arrangements of demonstration activities, the organisers rely on commercial companies which they approach to participate and cover the programme’s costs. In general, demonstration activities such as the “Growers day” are often free for farmers.

Sponsors are invited and they pay a certain fee. This should cover the costs of the programme. (Programme interviewee 1)

Sponsors. We ask relevant actors that would like to participate (Programme interviewee 2)

According to the programme interviewees, events may be organised annually but there are no follow-up activities to reach out to participants after each event. Moreover, there does not seem to be any formal evaluation process installed. Finally there are no dissemination materials shared with participants, during or after the events (Programme interviewees).

Q: Do you evaluate the demonstration activities overall? R: Just a little by listening among participants. (Programme interviewee 2)

The host farmer

As noted earlier, only one of the two programme interviewees referred to the active participation of host farmers in the organisation of the events. However, the farmer claims a quite advanced role in the organisation of the demonstration.

We are doing this together. Today the organisation (...) helps us. We did all the work on the farm. Planned everything and thought everything through. (Farmers)

The called us and arrange things, they said that they are doing everything, but it is so much more to be done. (Farmers)

Despite their, apparently intensive, engagement in organising and delivering the demo activities, according to the Programme interviewees host farmers do not receive any kind of compensation for their engagement. Thus, while one should rather trace into non-monetary incentives farmers' decision to host demonstrations, still there are indications that some sort of monetary incentives would be appreciated.

But we said yes, we can be the host farmer for this event, because we thought we will manage and take the extra work (Farmers).

We are having payment indirectly.... (Farmers)

One get knew knowledge and gets a broader view. I get new influences from others. (Farmers)

We don't get anything this time, but we are talking about requesting payment. (Farmers)

If we had been well paid and we could set up the agenda, then we could arrange a very suited demonstration that attracts those who not normally attend demonstrations (Farmers)

T2: Farm (event) level

The farm is a mixed farm with both arable and pig production, situated in Dalsland not far from Mellerud. The farm is a rather new member in the OiB demonstration network. The farm is run by four members of the family. The father in the family was active in the SFO organisation in the past. The demonstration focused mainly on the actual situation of the crop this year, but also on OiB's holistic perspective and the market for oilseed producers (observation tool).

The organisers felt that their target was not reached.

Since approximately 10% of all invited turned up on the event, not so good. (Programme Interviewee 1)

Nevertheless, the host farmers felt that it is not easy to handle bigger groups, in order to get a nice and effective demonstrations.

During the field visit there were divided in four groups with 15 in each. It was an appropriate size of group. No one can step aside and be inactive (Farmer)

If it is 40 in a group, it does not work. At this demonstration day it was to large group in the end. Then only few ask questions (Farmer)

The event took place on a day in June, from 9.00 to 4.00 pm (Farmers)

The president of the SFO (west) started the demonstration. He was also the facilitator of the day. Then three of the farmers from the host farm, were telling their Farm's story, their management strategy and their vision

for development of their farm. After that, the manager of OiB presented the basic concept of their demonstrations network and some of their on-going projects. Then, the whole group (some 60 people in total) was divided in four and attendants were driven to different stations in the field. There were four stations, one on wheat production, one on rape seed oil production, one on ley seed production and one station at the biogas station. After the tour in the four station, participants were offered lunch which was followed by a final presentation on the market for oil production. There was also a poster presentation from some sellers of pesticides, fertiliser, and different agricultural technique. Although, there were only a few questions when participants where in the whole group, during the field visits when it was smaller groups there were lively discussions and many questions (observation tool).

Participants were mainly farmers from the nearby and surrounding areas, along with a small number of advisers who were also attending the demonstration. (Farmers)

Host famers had organised coffee and sandwich to everyone when they arrived and later lunch for participants, which in both cases facilitated participants' interaction either as a welcomed ice breaker or as a meeting point to discuss on what famers have seen (observation tool).

4. Functional characteristics

T1: Coordinating effective recruitment of host farmers and participants

2. Incentives for host farmers

The host farm does not get any financial reward (although the farmer mentioned requesting payment), both Programme Interviewees confirmed that no incentive was offered to farmers.

However, the father and Son 1 said that they get indirect benefits like new knowledge, a broader view and positive influences from others. The father explained the benefits saying:

By increasing our knowledge makes us less [likely] to be stuck in only old ways on solving problem. It is also positive for the employed people on the farm to have others visiting our farm. (Father-farmer)

Son 1 and the father both commented that they have used the demonstrations to create a kind of a label or identity around the farm name. This provides new contacts for them that can be positive for example when they are selling cereals, or when they need to discuss finances with the bank. Indeed, they want to put more effort in developing this label. But they do not mean an ordinary label, they are talking about to develop a good farm reputation.

3. Motivations for host farmers

With respect to motivations for hosts participating in demonstrations, Son 1 and 2 explained that their farm had some specific forms of management that they think that other farmers are interested in. They demonstrate their cropping management which aims to avoid soil compaction.

In line with what was said about incentives, Son 2 said:

To be a demonstration farm gives ones also [the] possibility to integrate with other farmers. When [I] integrate and meet other farmers it gives me a possibility to learn much myself. (Son 1)

The Mother-farmer agreed that there are these rewards and more practically the farm gets tidied up and cleaned as well.

Son 1 explained that new knowledge as well as other farmers discuss and study their management, it is a kind of validation. He knew then that they were doing the right thing and that give motivation:

I get new thought[s] from others and it is fun. The fact that someone says it is good, is "a carrot". Often, I see only the things that is bad and everything that needs to be fixed. (Son 1)

They say that the demo events inspire them and that the demonstration day are enjoyable, being able to answer participants questions about what they have done.

The 2 programme interviewees supported these views, for example saying:

First of all, interest. They [the farm family] have something special that the want to show and share. Then it's fun to show others and it motivates them to host activities. (Programme interviewee 1)

4. Motivations for participants

The family had a range of views about what motivates participants but Son 1 and 2 agreed that farmers come for high quality specialist knowledge:

It is important that it is a narrow and interesting topic. Then ones attend the demonstrations. (Son 1)

They agreed that farmers don't come to see cute animals, nor as the mother argued for the food anymore.

Both programme interviewees agreed that participants come to acquire specialist knowledge, but that the social aspect is important:

They want to learn something new and specific for that year. Also, for the social content. (Programme interviewee 2)

5. Target audience

The father suggested that other farmers were the main target, so that they could talk business to business. The farmers who come, according to Son 2, are more interested in the biogas production and in the crop production aspects.

The mother and Son 2 referred to consumers as one sort of audience and they enjoyed talking to them, the mother said:

I think it is fun to talk with consumers. I want to show the consumer that we have a good status on the animal welfare. I speak directly to the consumers, telling them how I save piglets using the mouth to mouth-method. My story is to tell what my heart feels. The consumers that comes to the farm are mostly interested to look at the pigs. (Mother-farmer)

The programme interviewee (1) said that farmers who are members in the two organisations that organised the event are the target audience.

6. Advertising and recruitment

The farm almost always has targeted events where participants are invited only, i.e. there is not open house event. The father explained that they had had one "open farm-day" before, when a new pig house was finished, but there were few participants, and there were mostly neighbours that came.

Son 1 and mother agreed that It is important that the invitations come from a well know organisation. As the mother said it is good to have a "heavy organisation behind us".

They both explained if they send the invitation themselves only neighbours would come.

If the invitations come from us, we would get visitors with a common interest and not specific in the crop and biogas production. (Son 1)

With respect to successful ways of advertising and recruitment, the programme interviewee (P2) suggested finding topical issues, as well as those that are not usually shown (such as biogas facility in this matter) as this will help recruit and target certain participants.

T2: Appropriate demonstration and interaction approaches

7. The nature of interaction

With respect to how topics are selected, according to the programme interviewee (P1) this is steered by several things, he explained that selection is:

Steered by current times. Time of the year and how the crops have developed on the fields. Also, what interests the participants. Since they are invited due to their membership in these two organisations they probably expect to hear about related subjects within growing cereals, ley and

oilseed crops. Also, the hosts are involved, in topic selection, since the topic is based on what they want and what there is to show. (Programme interviewee 1)

When asked about the nature of interaction, the farmer described it as Mostly bottom-up as did the Programme Interviewee 2 saying this way

You are responsive, which can encourage people to come and they feel that they are involved. (Programme interviewee 2)

However, the Programme interviewee 1 described it as mostly top-down, saying

We expect big groups and therefore it is most suitable. Also, the participants probably expect advisers and expert to give them some kind of "lecture". It is also about time and logistics. (Programme interviewee 1)

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

According to the Programme interviewee 1 the host farmers are involved in the network programme as the demos are based on what there are to show. They are also involved in individual demonstrations by providing the location, the organisation and practicalities - for an example buses, food and so on, and the different plots depending on what there are to show. There was no answer to questions about the extent of participating farmers' involvement in the network programme and event.

9. Focus

With respect to the focus of the demo the farmer and the Programme interviewee 2 described it as neither Whole farm nor Single focussed but In between, while the Programme interviewee 1 described it as Whole farm.

10. Design

The Farmer described the demo approach as a mixture of Experimental and Exemplary. The Farmer explained that he is:

Interested to produce and to do it as best as possible from several views. We have had research on the farm before. (Father farmer)

However, the Programme interviewee 1 described the demo approach as Exemplary, but and explained that it has to be suitable for the set-up/arrangement. Interestingly the Programme interviewee 2 described the demo as a mixture' of both but expressed a preference for ... Experimental because, as he said:

You are trying something new that you can learn from. Development moving forward. Innovation. (Programme interviewee 2).

11. Ideal group size

With respect to optimal group size the family and the programmer interviewees agreed that 10-15 is best, as Programme interviewee 2 explained

Then most people dare to come up with questions and points of views and it is also easier to see and hear the demonstrator. It also invites to more interaction. (Programme interviewee 2)

Son 1 and the mother had experienced large demonstration days where the group was 40 and no one asked questions, although if they are divided in four groups with 15 in each (as was done in the field trip) this is appropriate size.

T3: Enabling learning appropriate to purpose, audience, context

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

The Mother-farmer and Son mentioned how they had enjoyed a demonstration farm in the Netherlands where a farmer had built a conference centre where you looked at the milk production with cows grazing outside through during the meeting.

For structure of the day, food again appeared as important. In terms of delivery, they all mentioned how important it is to connect to the audience, to tell stories, not only to be superior and to also explain about mistakes. As the father said:

There is also important to tell about the mistakes I have done. It is not a way to act as I am better than I am, like a snob, though it is a way to tell real stories from the farm, what have worked and what have not worked. (Father-farmer)

The mother agreed saying how important it is to describe feelings, both positive and negative as this gets people listening. The programme interviewees both referred to the mix of learning needed saying you need a good mix of "lecturing" and interactions and practical activities and that it should be:

Pedagogic. Not only standing there and lecture but want to get the audience involved. Catch the audience in a good way. (Programme interviewee 2)

Regarding materials such as brochures, they do not provide any materials except for some leaflets used in a previous project about energy-efficiency.

Regarding what is an important outcome in a demo event, the father Farmer cited 'Problem solving - farmers feel they know how to solve a problem' as the most important because he said listening to other problems is what he is most interested in when he visits another farm demonstration. The Programme interviewee 2 cited 'Participants ask questions & talk openly', 'as the most important ... because he said it encourages dialogue explaining:

There is a lot of knowledge among those who attend the meetings. You learn a lot. (Programme interviewee 2)

Whereas the Programme interviewee 1 cited 'Good quality expert advice & technical presentations' as the most important because the demo it is based on the advisers/experts sharing their knowledge.

13. Taking into account variation in learning

The farmer said they do take into account variation in learning style of participants.

T4: Effective follow-up activities

14. Follow-up activities and materials

Both Programme interviewees 1 and 2 said they do not engage with participants after the event nor provide any materials, saying that there are webpages with information.

15. Assessing impact

When asked if they assess the impact of the event amongst participants, the farmers said yes while the Programme interviewee 1 said sometimes by talking with colleagues and members, whereas Programme interviewee 2 said no.

Regarding assessing the impact in the wider farming community, the farmer said he does not assess impact, but referred to an organisation called "Landshypotek" which aim is to get more consumers to engage with farmers and hosts a Facebook page providing a lot of information. Neither programme interviewee assesses the wider impact, but they do rely on the ripple effect, relying on participants who attend demos to talk to those who were not.

5. Event analysis: effective peer learning characteristics

Event details

The group consisted of about 60 participants divided in 4 groups of 15. 4 of them filled in the post survey.

T1: Learning processes

16. Communication initiation by participants

When in the whole group or in smaller groups, between 10% and 50% of the participants had no problem sharing their knowledge and/or experiences related to the topic. Some of those who asked question, also shared some knowledge at the same time. After and during the walk towards, in between and from the demonstration plots, the participants discussed a lot and it sounded like they willingly shared knowledge. The participants were told at the beginning of the demonstrations that questions were welcome. It felt like the participants had opportunities/given time during the demonstration to ask questions and so they did. Percentage of the time is difficult to say, but the demonstrator and/or the leader asked the participants in average three times per 20 minutes. The ambience in the group and between demonstrators and participants made the atmosphere welcoming to ask questions, which probably contributed to the fact that many questions were asked. Few participants were pointing out their thoughts. For example, at the biogas facility some participants talked about the benefits of the facility but at the same time they pointed out that it was not suitable on their farms due to other conditions.

At the fields, some participants talked about their own experiences and explained why they managed things as they did.

| | 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 | 2/4 | 2/4 | 0 |
| I asked at least one question during the demonstration . | 3/4 yes | | | | |
| I shared my own point of view at least once during the demonstration. | 3/4 yes | | | | |
| I felt encouraged to ask questions during the demonstration. | 0 | 0 | 2/4 | 1/4 | 1/4 |
| When there were any discussions, I felt comfortable sharing my opinion. | 0 | 0 | 2/4 | 1/4 | 1/4 |

17. Interactive knowledge creation

Hands-on opportunities and other multi-sensorial experiences

As multi-sensorial experience, the canola was cut vertically through the stem to enable participants to study larvae inside the stem. Participants were encouraged to pick up a wheat plant to study its health and to touch the pipes in the biogas facility, where manure travels through, which was warm. The participants also took some own initiative through picking up plants to study them.

Three hands-on activities were noticed that have been demonstrated very clearly. Once the participants were asked to look at a canola plant that was cut in two through the stem to observe larvae. The other time the demonstrator talked about the pipes in the biogas facility, where manure travels through. It is warm, and the demonstrator said that we could hold our hands on it to feel the heat. The demonstrator picked up a wheat plant and talked about how to study the status of a wheat plant, some of the participants did the same. So, participants could take part in hands-on activities, and got some sort of feedback on their doing. The feedback was more or less just a comment, such as: 'Can you feel the heat, or can you see the larvae?'

Discussion opportunities and negotiating conflicting points of view

There was a facilitator. This person was representing the organisation that arranged this event. The leader was mostly focused on keeping track on time. The leader was also encouraging the participants to ask questions by asking them if they had any questions now and then, and he was also contributing with some questions of his own.

Actually, no open discussion was noticed. There was time for open discussions, but nobody really engaged. There were a few times when more than one question and one answer were posed, but then it was more like an additional question or a clarification. There was also no elaboration/further explanation on shared critical points of view. A few points of views were shared, but there was no elaboration/further explanation.

| | participant answers | | | | |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------|-----------|--------|-----------------|----------------|
| | strongly disagreed | disagreed | agreed | strongly agreed | not applicable |
| In my opinion, there were interesting discussions during the demonstration. | 0 | 0 | 3/4 | 1/4 | 0 |
| If participants didn't agree with each other during discussions, somebody (demonstrator/other participant) tried to reach a consensus between them. | 0 | 0 | 1/4 | 0 | 3/4 |

18. Engagement during the event

Many of the participant have met before and seemed to know each other to a varying extent. Some may have been there without knowing any other participant before this event. Some seemed to have known each other several years and acted more closely related. While demonstrating, the demonstrator acted open and friendly,

but not as close friends with the participants. After and during the walk towards, in between and from the demonstration plots, the demonstrator acts as a close friend to some of the participants.

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

T2: Learning outcomes

The demonstrator(s) was explaining the knowledge in a clear manner and understandable for the participants. There was no need for explaining the knowledge in different ways since the participants seemed to follow. With these (few) practical activities encouraged, there was a small interest among the participants. The skills were not sufficiently addressed to promote the maximum uptake by the participants. Perhaps most of the participants felt that they already had "practiced" these activities several times before. For an example,

picking up a wheat plant and studying it's health was something in principle all participants had done before and therefore did not feel the need of doing that at this moment. There was some questioning regarding intensified systems: 'Why do we use this kind of crop rotation? If we use ley in the crop rotation, we can get a crop rotation that is better.' There was also a brief discussion about what kind of crops that is good to incorporate in the crop rotation. Common methods or ways of thinking on learning were not questioned.

| | participant answers | | | | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------|-----------|--------|-----------------|----------------|
| | strongly disagreed | disagreed | agreed | strongly agreed | not applicable |
| The demonstration met my expectations regarding what I wanted to learn. | 0 | 0 | 3/4 | 1/4 | 0 |
| The demonstration exceeded my expectations. | 0 | 0 | 3/3 | 0 | 0 |
| I felt surprised at some point(s) during the demonstration. | 0 | 1/3 | 2/3 | 0 | 0 |
| I obtained a clearer understanding of the topic(s) demonstrated. | 0 | 0 | 4/4 | 0 | 0 |
| I have the feeling I learned something new (knowledge, skill, practice, etc.). | 0 | 0 | 4/4 | 0 | 0 |
| I thought about how I could implement some of the ideas and practices on my own farm. | 0 | 0 | 4/4 | 0 | 0 |
| I reflected on my own point of view at some point during the demonstration. | 0 | 0 | 4/4 | 0 | 0 |
| I learnt about the principles underlying a practice. | 0 | 1/4 | 2/4 | 0 | 1/4 |
| I thought about how we learn something new on demonstrations (e.g.: teaching methods). | 0 | 3/3 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| I thought about why I want to learn about the topic(s) of this demonstration. | 0 | 1/3 | 2/3 | 0 | 0 |

T3: Overall comments on the effectiveness of the event

Participants

With an average of 3,5 on 5, participants rated the event overall effective. 4 on 4 of the participants who answered the questions would recommend the demonstration.

As effective characteristics of the event, participants mentioned: Farming in Balance raised issues that concerns both conventional and ecological farming in a good way, which unites these two forms instead of splitting them in a politically correct attitude; the farm, the farmers and the demonstrators. Also, the oil seed fields; Well-planned arrangement with a variety of questions. But, no time for going into depth within a subject; the field visit that was combined with discussion about the market.

One participant mentioned as a suggestion to improve the demonstration: Always good to have plots for comparisons, and to easily start discussions about different topics, and fields with different field inputs beside each other.