



AGRIDEMO

Case study reports: Denmark CS2



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

1. Background

Programme

In Denmark, we do not have any specific programmes for demonstration activities. The demonstration for case study 2 was organised and held by the organic department of a local extension service called LMO, a private advisory service that consists of different divisions in which professional employees are responsible for its functions. They organise several demonstrations and events each year as a service for their customers and to attract new customers. The demonstrations vary in size and theme. The last two years they have held a big demonstration/event called "Økotræf" (loosely translated to Organic Meeting). Their goal is to make this a yearly event and to make it the main event for organic farmers in Denmark.

Funding and Governance

The demonstrations are funded by LMO itself. The events are planned and organised by the employees at LMO.

Actors and networks

LMO works closely with Seges, a knowledge centre that builds bridges between research and practical farming. People from the farming industry are also invited to participate in the event Økotræf, where they exhibit products relevant to organic farmers.

How it works

Økotræf is held at the farm of one of LMO's employees. At the farm, there are several field trials coordinated by LMO and Seges. The event is planned and organised by the host farmer (employee at LMO) and the director at LMO. Exhibitioners (people from the farming industry) and consultants from Seges give input to the programme. LMO has the contact information of their clients (organic farmers) and they usually send them an email or text message with an invitation to the event.

Event Farm and location

Økotræf is held at the same farm – an organic arable farm owned by one of the employees at LMO.

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 2) to reveal how the Functional and Structural characteristics enable learning. Analysis is reported in Sections 3 and 4. Data is sourced from interviews with one Programme/Network member and one Programme/network member who is also the host farmer at this demonstration. The two interviews were performed in May 2018. 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 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. The main organisations and actors involved in the demonstration activities and their roles

LMO: the organisation, its advisors and extension services employees

The demonstration events are planned and organised by the employees of LMO Organic. The planning processes of LMO are quite flexible and they depend on what the organisation wants to demonstrate each time.

We design and plan the activity according to the specific case we want to demonstrate. So, we do not just use the same approach for all. We adapt it to the situation. (Programme interviewee)

LMO employees first agree on the demonstration event they want to make i.e. the topic and what exactly they want to show. In most cases demonstration topics are selected by them. In some cases, only a minimum set of interesting topics is defined by LMO and the topics/subjects are selected by other actors or in consultation with LMO. Finally, there are also cases in which topics may be entirely decided by interested farmers' groups and LMO facilitates the whole processes.

The employees at LMO organic have the roles of choosing the case we want to demonstrate. Then we find suitable host farmers and after this we make a programme together with the host farmer and ask him, what he think could be interesting to do, so he also has some influence on the event. Then we use our communication and marketing department to communicate the events to the farmers. (Programme interviewee)

The overall theme we decide here at LMO and then we involve the host farmer in the detail planning of the programme. For some of the events, as in the case with Økotræf, we set the frame and then the demonstrators/exhibitors decide what subject they want to demonstrate. (Programme interviewee).

We need a grassroots democracy here in LMO so that farmers can provide input to what they want to be demonstrated. In our ERFA-groups the farmers themselves decide what they want to see and then we facilitate it. (Programme interviewee).

Thereafter, a group of LMO's advisors (employees of LMO) selects a suitable host farmer from their customer database, in accordance with the topic selected. The demonstration programme is, then, planned in detail together with the host farmer. Finally, LMO has a special department with advisors who organise and design trials in the host farmer's field.

We sit down a group of advisers and discuss if we know some farmers with a farm that highlights the issue in question. We also consider how the farmer is as a person. Is he outgoing? All the hosts are selected from our own database of clients so it is all people we already know. (Programme interviewee)

The trial department at the extension service where I work helps us decide where we can have the different trials. The overall goal and setup is planned together with the manager of the extension service... We control what kind of trials that are possible to have at the farm. (Farmer)

LMO makes use of informal feedback and keeps engaging with participants when specific questions pop up after the events. However, this does not seem to be a formal and well-structured process.

We do not use surveys. We evaluate the atmosphere and usually some of the participants give feedback. (Programme interviewee)

We do not engage the people that attended at the demo, but we keep on working with new demos and we answer questions that farmers have after the demo. Sometimes they want to

make some changes at their farm because of a demo, and then we help them out. (Programme interviewee)

The organisers walked around throughout the day and asked the participants for feedback and tried to sell their services from the extension service. (Observation tool)

LMO uses its in-house facilities to disseminate information on planned events. The organisation has the contact information of its customers (organic farmers) and they usually send them an email or text message with an invitation to the event.

Then we use our communication and marketing department to communicate the events to the farmers. (Programme interviewee)

LMO collaboration with other organisations

LMO works closely with Seges, a knowledge centre that builds bridges between research and practical farming. Consultants from Seges give input to the programme (Background info). At the demonstration event farm, there were several field trials coordinated by LMO and Seges (Background info). LMO is also linked to projects of other organisations. Collaborating organisations are often invited to present their projects and results during the organised events.

...for some of the events there is a link to some of the projects in the other organisations and then they are invited to present their projects and results. (Programme interviewee)

Host farmer

In this specific case study, the distinction between the host farmer and the organisers was not very clear, as the event was held at the farm of one of LMO's employees. At the specific farm, there were several field trials coordinated by LMO and Seges. The event was planned and organised by the host farmer (employee at LMO) and the director of LMO Organic (background info).

In general, LMO argues that host farmers are involved in the planning and design of its demo events.

Then we find suitable host farmers and after this we make a programme together with the host farmer and ask him what he think could be interesting to do, so he also has some influence on the event. (Programme interviewee)

Q: How do you identify/select relevant topics that will interest farmers? R: The overall theme we decide here at LMO and then we involve the host farmer in the detail planning of the programme. (Programme interviewee)

Although host farmers are involved in the development of the individual demonstration activities, their role, in the development of the overall demonstration programme is marginal, if any at all (Programme interviewee). In this specific case study, though, the host farmer is involved in the overall development of demos at the programme network level as he is an advisor in organic plant production of LMO.

At my work in the extension service, I am involved in deciding which demonstration we want to have. (Farmer)

During the demonstration events, host farmers are expected to talk about their experience on their own farm, a parameter that influences positively the effectiveness of the event.

Q: What do you think is the most effective way to arrange/structure a demonstration activity? R: It depends on the situation but I think it is best to combine a presentation, to demonstrate it at the farm and to hear the host farmers experience with it. (Programme interviewee)

Demonstrators

In the specific event, demonstrators were the host farmer, agricultural advisors, machine sellers and people within agricultural science. Demonstrators are involved after each demonstration event by giving feedback through an informal evaluation process.

Q: Do you evaluate the demonstration activities overall? R: Yes. We also have an evaluation with the demonstrators/exhibitors after the demo. For example, at Økotræf, the demonstrators/exhibitors are invited to dinner after the event and then we have a talk about what worked and what did not work. (Programme interviewee)

At each presentation/demonstration the presenter guided the questions and discussions. The presenters were either the host farmer, agricultural advisors, machine sellers, or people within agricultural science. (Observation tool)

Researchers

As already noted, LMO is linked to projects of other organisations. In that way, sometimes during LMO events partner organisations are invited to present their projects and results.

Companies

Sometimes, commercial companies and supply chain actors/ exhibitors are actively involved in demonstration activities. These actors present their products at the demos. Moreover, they are involved in topic/subject selection and in the informal evaluation/feedback process of the demo event (Farmer).

We ask the machine companies for input and how they want to participate. The overall goal and setup is planned together with the manager of the extension service. (Farmer)

Q: How are demonstration topics selected? R: What we (at the extension service) think is interesting subjects and also what the exhibitors find interesting. (Farmer)

We also have an evaluation with the demonstrators/exhibitors after the demo. (Farmer)

During the specific event (Økotræf), people from the farming industry were invited to participate and they exhibited products relevant to organic farmers. In the case of Økotræf, LMO have set the framework of the event and then the demonstrators/exhibitors decided what subject they want to demonstrate (Background info + Programme interviewee).

Exhibitioners (people from the farming industry) and consultants from Seges give input to the programme. (Background info)

At each presentation/demonstration the presenter guided the questions and discussions. The presenters were either the host farmer, agricultural advisors, machine sellers, or people within agricultural science. (Observation tool)

The salesmen from the different companies gave presentations/ an introduction to the machines exhibited. After this some of the machines were presented, demonstrated, and compared in the field. (Observation tool)

Other actors i.e. Regulators

At the specific demo event two people from the Danish Agriculture and Food Council gave their views on the organic market, its future and the relevant policies.

2. Networks

LMO keeps strong contacts and partnerships with supply chain companies, organic businesses, scientific programs, and other related organisations. However as already mentioned there is not a specific programme for the overall coordination and organisation of demonstration events managed by LMO. This is the case also

for the specific demo farm which is not directly connected to other demo farms, and it is not part of a specific demonstration programme and/or a wider network. However, the host farmer is linked with specific farming groups/networks.

We have a strong network with other companies in the organic business. There are not any overall programmes that coordinate the demonstrations but for some of the events there is a link to some of the projects in the other organisations and then they are invited to present their projects and results. For example, we have invited an organic dairy company to come and tell about their new concept of grass milk so they can inspire the organic farmers to do something new. (Programme interviewee)

It is not directly connected to other farms. But from my work as an adviser I have contact with other organic farmers and exchange experiences. ERFA-groups. (Farmer)

3. Funding arrangements

The demonstrations are funded by LMO itself. The funding of demonstration activities is a strategic choice of LMO in order to achieve its dissemination goals. LMO does not pay the host farmers for hosting demonstration events but offers them some kind of gifts. (Programme interviewee). However, the companies pay for their involvement (3500 kr) and LMO pays their employees for their working time at the demonstrations (Farmer).

They are funded by LMO's own funds. In LMO we have a certain amount for marketing and here in the organic department we have chosen to spend most of this on having these demonstrations instead of spending the money on ads in the newspaper or on social media. We rather want to make these activities where we can show the farmers different practices. (Programme interviewee)

No. We do not pay the host farmers but we usually give them some bottles of red wine. (Programme interviewee)

The companies that participate pay. The extension service pays by the hours the employees put in it. (Farmer)

4. The decision-making process in organising demonstrations

Both programme and farm interviewees stated that the general approach of LMO when providing demonstration activities is mostly top down. The starting point of the demo is to deliver deep knowledge that LMO owns as an organisation to participants. The LMO's employees as main organisers are responsible for crucial processes like topic selection, host farmers' recruitment, trials' design and presentations during events. Nevertheless, LMO also invests in dialogue, multilevel feedback and two-way communication with many other actors, before and after the organisation of a demonstration event.

We set the frame but we also invite people outside of our company to inform about the subject and we make room for the farmers to ask questions and debate. But we are the ones that have a deep knowledge of the subjects we have chosen. We need a grassroots democracy here in LMO so that farmers can provide input to what they want to be demonstrated. (Programme interviewee)

We attach great importance to dialogue, but our knowledge and the results from the trials is something we provide. (Farmer)

5. Organisation's goals and objectives

LMO sets the overall objectives of demonstrations. The overall LMO goal is the development of organic production and demonstrations are one of the activities organised toward this direction.

We define the overall objectives of our demonstration activities in our organisation together with the professional employees responsible for the different divisions. (Programme interviewee)

Our overall goal is to develop the organic production so many of our activities are showing new or adapted methods that can inspire the organic farmers. (Programme interviewee)

T2: Farm (event) level

1. Event farm location and layout

The demonstration event (Økotræf) was held on in June 2018 in an organic arable farm owned by one of LMO's employees working as a local adviser. It is a private farm focused on organic crop production for human consumption (i.e. wheat, oat and barley). The farmer also grows grass and clover for seed companies. In the last two years the host farmer has hosted demonstrations on organic plant production (Poster). The objectives of the specific demonstration event were the demonstration of field trials as well as the promotion of extension service offered by the organiser (Poster).

Both programme and farm level interviewees stated that the demos organised by their organisation fall in-between single focus and whole farm approach. However, during the specific event, the observation tool noted that no notion of whole farm approach was demonstrated but only isolated practices.

According to both the programme and the farm interviewees, LMO's demonstrations are a mixture of exemplary and experimental approaches. However, their points of view are different concerning the most preferable demo approach. The Programme interviewee believes that experimental approaches are more preferable since they support the finding demonstrated. On the other hand, the farm interviewee believes that a mixture of experimental and exemplary approach is more preferable, as each approach has its own benefits for the demonstration effectiveness.

Experimental. The support for events with a whole-farm approach is not that big so we usually select two or three specific topics that are relevant. I would prefer an experimental approach since we then have repetitions and that supports the findings. (Programme interviewee)

A mixture. We would like it to primarily be exemplary so that we could demonstrate the methods that are most efficient but we also have the experimental trials. (Farmer)

According to observation tool, there was a mixture of test strips within the farmer's commercial fields. All the test plots showed experiments with new and innovative ways of organic plant production, i.e. new cultivars, new mixtures of species, new types of and use of fertiliser, new methods, new machinery (e.g. robots) (Observation tool).

2. Actors' roles during the specific event

The event was planned and organised by the host farmer (LMO employee) and the director of LMO Organic. Exhibitioners (people from the farming industry) and consultants from Seges have been given input to the programme. The topic selection of the specific event has been determined by the extension service in accordance to the field trials that already existed at the host farm. The exhibitioner interests have also had influence in the selection of the topic (poster). At the demonstration farm, there were several field trials coordinated by LMO and Seges (Background info). The host farmer led one of the field demonstrations on faba beans, introduced the demonstration of machinery and the walk around to the different companies who were presenting their machines (Observation tool).

During the event, different machines for weed control were exhibited and some of them were actually demonstrated and compared in the field. In addition, many different activities have occurred such as presentations of experiments and field walks. Finally, according to the observation tool the demonstration was a common area where participants could discuss, socialise and network (Observation tool +poster).

The presentations/demonstrations were held in the fields where participants could actually see the different crops. At each presentation/demonstration the presenter guided the questions and discussions. Presenters were either the host farmer, agricultural advisors, machine sellers, or people within agricultural science (Observation tool). Presentations have been held also in the field in four different stations where an expert gave a 20min presentation about the specific experiments occurred. People divided themselves into groups which resulted to a smooth flow within different stations (Observation tool).

3. Topic and group size

Organic plant production was demonstrated. According to the observation tool 100-130 participants (including demonstrators and organisers) were present at the demonstration event. The participants were mainly farmers (organic plant producers) and advisers. Many of them were well-known to each other (Observation tool+poster). It was noted that it was difficult to get enough participants because of the high competition from competing extension services, as a similar demo was held the same day by another extension service (poster).

4. Frequency, duration and timing

The timing of the announcement of a demonstration event is highlighted as an important issue. So, it is not only when a demonstration event is going to be occurred but also the timing of the announcement of the event. Moreover, the synchronisation of the demonstration event with other similar local extension initiatives/activities has been pointed out as an important issue.

Last year we were a bit late with the announcement at the social medias. This year we have tried to do it in better time to get the hard to reach. (Farmer)

It was difficult to get enough participants because of the high competition from competing extension services (a similar demo was held the same day by another extension service). (Poster).

LMO demonstrations can be one-off or, depending on the situation, a series of consecutive/follow up events.

Earlier I have arranged some meetings where we saw the effect of crop rotation on weed over several years. But at the event Økotræf at my farm, this is not how we do it. It is not long-term in the same way. (Farmer)

Sometimes we have a follow-up event in the autumn where people can see the same trials we have showed them at the demo in June. (Farmer)

5. Farm infrastructures or arrangements

The events organised by LMO are intentionally very well organised in order to attract participants as well as keep them satisfied.

To get some activities that attract the farmers. With car tires, barbecue sausages and good weather we come a long way. (Farmer)

More specifically the organisers of the event offered to participants parking and transportation facilities, gifts, the programme of the day, breakfast, lunch, drinks and refreshments. The farm has been marked with banners, so it was easy for attendees to find it. It was also easy to locate the organisers during the event, as they wore vests, caps and shirts with logos. Tables and shading tents were also available. (Observation tool+Poster)

When we arrived, people showed us to the parking and gave us a programme of the day. It was very easy to find, since they had put banners outside the farm. They had rented a nice party tent and toilets. When we arrived, we could sit at long tables in the tent and have breakfast, coffee and a chat with the other visitors. After the field walk there was a nice lunch and a beer in the tent where people could socialise. Furthermore, attendees could win a bottle of organic whiskey produced at the host farm for their participation at the event. (Observation tool)

After some presentations, the organisers have arranged a bus so participants went to see three different wetland projects in the local area. (Poster)

6. Farms accessibility and fees for participation

The analysis of this case study points out time issues as a crucial factor for demo effectiveness. The available time of participants to travel and the good organisation of the event in order to be considered as worth the time spent by them is very important. In that way, the farm's location and the travel time for attending a demo have been pointed out as important factors.

If they have to travel far. Then they spend some time on that and get behind with the tasks at their farm. If it is very far away they have to pay someone else to do the work at their farm. If there is a fee for attendance it can also discourage people from attending but I think the main factor is finding time. (Programme interviewee)

At the specific demonstration event, there were no entry-fees for farmer's participation. The participation fee is mentioned as a reason for not attending a demo.

If there is a fee for attendance it can also discourage people from attending but I think the main factor is finding time. (Programme interviewee)

4. Functional characteristics

T1: Coordinating effective recruitment of host farmers and participants

1. Incentives

Funding for the demonstration event came from LMO's own funds. The Programme interviewee outlined how the organic department chose to spend their money on organising demonstration events – choosing demonstrations above less interactive techniques.

They are funded by LMO's own funds. In LMO we have a certain amount for marketing and here in the organic department we have chosen to spend most of this on having these demonstrations instead of spending the money on ads in the newspaper or on social media. We rather want to make these activities where we can show the farmers different practices. (Programme interviewee)

2. Motivations for host farmers

The Programme interviewee noted how farmers were not typically paid, but they do receive gifts by way of thanks.

We do not pay the host farmers but we usually give them some bottles of red wine. (Programme interviewee)

It is primarily pride in what they are working on at their farm. Most of the farmers like to be evaluated on what they do and show their work and get some feedback. (Programme interviewee)

3. Motivations for participants

Interviews revealed a range of motivations for participants, including the social element, as well as more 'academic' motivations.

I hope it is the programme and the wide palette of activities. There is also a social part. Good presentations but also demonstrations of new things that point forward. (Farmer)

The Programme interviewee talked about the importance of 'problem solving' as a motivational factor for farmers – offering a solution to an issue they are facing. There is also an element of curiosity driving farmers. The Programme interviewee reiterated the importance of the opportunity to engage with other farmers and colleagues.

They want to see if there is something relevant for them. Typically we address different issues and then the farmers want to come and see if it is something they could use at their own farm. That is the main motivating factor. Some people also come out of curiosity and also for the social part, to get out and meet other people over a cup of coffee. They appreciate to come out and meet their colleagues. (Programme interviewee)

4. Target audience

According to the Programme interviewee suggested that the target audience was largely farmers – in particular organic farmers. It sometimes extends to conventional farmers. The Farmer suggested the target

audience also extended to supply chain stakeholders. He highlighted that you need to invite guests that would be appealing to other participants, as well as providing the appropriate setting.

Always organic farmers. 99% of our clients are organic farmers. Of course, it will make us happy if we can inspire conventional farmers to come to the demonstrations and see that we are going in a right direction. But basically, it's the organic farmers we are addressing to show what we think they should consider doing better or new ways of doing things on their farm we think they should pick up on. (Programme interviewee)

The organic farmers. But to get their attention it is important to invite people to attract the farmers. For example, interesting people from the supply chain. To get some activities that attract the farmers. With car tires, barbecue sausages and good weather we come a long way. (Farmer)

Primarily farmers and some advisers and a few researchers. Sometimes curious neighbours also show up. (Farmer)

5. Advertising and recruitment

The Programme interviewee and Farmer described a wide range of approaches to advertising the demonstration event. The importance of personal touches (personally addressed messages or a phone call), is most efficient. The Programme interviewee also noted the success of Facebook as a way of advertising, alongside more traditional methods. He described a broad brush approach, including advertising through different networks, followed by more targeted recruitment. The Programme interviewee talked about advertising the event via 'banners' on their website, as well as in their email signatures – this demonstrates the extent of their advertising.

We advertise widely to try to get some people we do not know but also to advertise for our company. But in addition, we always send a personal message to our clients so they receive an email with a detailed programme for the day. We have an ambition to call to some of our clients so they feel more as VIP clients. (Programme interviewee)

I have been pleasantly surprised by how effective it is that the farmers themselves share the events on Facebook. Then the event is advertised through the different networks of farmers. Then it is a more targeted recruitment. The more traditional way with ads in magazines and newspapers is more as a documentation for the event. Advertising banners on our homepage is also working. Ads for the demo as an add on to your email signature is also a way. Then the advertising gets out more widely. (Programme interviewee)

The Farmer felt that simply word of mouth was the best way to approach advertising and recruitment.

The best way is word of mouth and if the participants at one demo had a good experience and want to come again the next time. (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'. Whilst there was an emphasis on the involvement of host farmers, the point of the demonstration programme was ultimately to translate the results of the work at LMO.

We attach great importance to dialogue, but our knowledge and the results from the trials is something we (LMO) provide. (Farmer)

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

As above, the demonstration programme is fundamentally routed in the work of LMO, involving farmers in the specific details of how to deliver the sessions. LMO 'set the frame', and host farmers have the ability to shape delivery within this 'frame'.

The overall theme we decide here at LMO and then we involve the host farmer in the detail planning of the programme. For some of the events, as in the case with Økotræf, we set the frame and then the demonstrators/exhibitors decide what subject they want to demonstrate. (Programme interviewee)

We set the frame but we also invite people outside of our company to inform about the subject and we make room for the farmers to ask questions and debate. But we are the ones that have a deep knowledge of the subjects we have chosen. We need a grassroots democracy here in LMO so that farmers can provide input to what they want to be demonstrated. In our ERFA-groups the farmers themselves decide what they want to see and then we facilitate it. (Programme interviewee)

3. Focus and Design

Both the Farmer and Programme interviewees described the network as 'in between' a 'Whole farm' and 'Single focus' approach. They also both described the network approach as 'A mixture' of 'Experimental' and 'Exemplary'. Whilst the Farmer felt this mixed approach was preferable, the Programme interviewee expressed a preference for a more experimental approach to provide data to support the network's research findings.

The Programme interviewees differed in their opinion of the network approach; Programme interviewee 1 felt it was 'Exemplary' in nature, where as Programme interviewee 2 felt it was 'Experimental' in nature. They both expressed a preference for a more 'Exemplary approach', although Programme interviewee 1 recognised the value of an 'Experimental' approach, he was concerned this was often costly.

4. Ideal group size

The Programme interviewee claimed that the size of the group depends on the topic or the type of demonstration. He recognised that smaller groups allow more scope for discussion.

It is very different. I prefer a larger group, but I know that most farmers want smaller groups. For ERFA groups we are only 10 people. With more people, we can sometimes have a bigger discussion but then there is a risk that some in the group doesn't want to talk. (Programme interviewee)

T3: Enabling learning appropriate to purpose, audience, context

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

In terms of the structure, both the Farmer and Programme interviewee felt that a mixture of elements was important to a demonstration day. Inclusion of something practical, was also essential.

We try to mix short presentations, talks and activities. With time and space for people to walk around and talk to each other. (Farmer)

Practical demonstration. Something they can see and feel and then we have the discussion. (Farmer)

It depends on the situation but I think it is best to combine a presentation, to demonstrate it at the farm and to hear the host farmer's experience with it. (Programme interviewee)

In addition, the Programme interviewee felt that the most important characteristic of a demonstration day is that the context is accessible and relatable for participants.

It is a mixture of many things. But an important thing is that the host farm has a production that people want to identify with. It does not have to be the size of the farm they identify with. (Programme interviewee)

Because LMO projects provided the foundation for the demonstrations, 'results and recommendations' made up most of the content and materials on the day.

The Farmer suggested 'Problem solving' was the most important characteristic of farm demonstration. He claimed, 'if they get the feeling of how to solve a problem then it is very efficient'.

By contrast, the Programme interviewee suggested 'Visualisation techniques and other sensorial experiences' were the most important facets. He highlighted the virtues of doing and seeing things above more traditional formats:

It is good to ask questions or to read something, but being able to feel something, see something, evaluate it and put it into your own context is the most important thing to stimulate and inspire. (Programme interviewee)

2. Taking into account variation in learning

The Farmer involved claimed to take into account variation in learning, but this was generally concerned about the prior knowledge of participants.

I know the background of some of the farmers and know what they are asking for. There is a very huge difference between people. (Farmer)

The Programme interviewee had a more nuanced understanding of how different people learn and was confident in implementing this. He claimed to have different ways of demonstrating, which accommodate different learning styles.

By having different ways of demonstrating the subjects, for example by giving a presentation, having something the farmer can feel or see. We alternate between different ways of demonstrating. (Programme interviewee)

T4: Effective follow-up activities

1. Follow-up activities and materials

In terms of follow-up activities and continual engagement, the Farmer suggested there were sometimes further events, open to participants, where they could see the progress of the trials.

Sometimes we have a follow-up event in the autumn where people can see the same trials we have showed them at the demo in June. (Farmer)

At neither the farm nor programme level was there effort to continue to engage with participants after the event.

We do not engage the people that attended at the demo, but we keep on working with new demos and we answer questions that farmers have after the demo. Sometimes they want to make some changes at their farm because of a demo, and then we help them out. (Programme interviewee)

At the Programme level, they would typically approach farmers at the demonstration (participants) if they want to take on/implement their project ideas on their farms.

We usually ask the farmers at the demo if this is something they can use and implement at their own farm. (Programme interviewee)

2. Assessing impact

Whilst there was no formal process in place to assess the impact of demonstration events, it was nonetheless something both the Farmer and the Programme interviewee were engaging with on a more informal basis. The Farmer recalled how he would discuss impacts with participants if/when he saw them.

The ones I meet afterwards I ask if they have acted on the lessons and if they haven't I ask them why. (Farmer)

When we meet our clients that participated at the demo, we ask them why they participated and if it has triggered a change. (Programme interviewee)

5. Event analysis: effective peer learning characteristics

There were between 100 and 130 participants approximately.

T1: Learning processes

1. Communication initiation by participants

When in the whole group, about 5% of the participants hesitated but shared their knowledge and/or experiences related to the topic. Just a few participants asked questions when everyone was gathered in the beginning of the event. When in small groups about 20% of the participants had no problem sharing their knowledge and/or experiences related to the topic. When they were separated into smaller groups, participants were often asking clarifying questions. There was some time available for questions, about 20% of the total time, and a lot of questions were asked.

There were a lot of participants formulating their points of view regarding the topic since there were lots of opportunities for discussion.

2. Interactive knowledge creation

Hands-on opportunities and other multi-sensorial experiences

A hands-on activity was demonstrated, but only very shortly, involving two machines for weed hoeing. No hands-on activity was carried out by participants.

The presentations/demonstrations were held in the fields where you could see and feel the different crops. Some of the crops were dug up so you could see their roots. You could see and touch the different machines at the exhibition and demonstrated in the field. Smaller companies were showcasing their products in the farmers' barn, where people could touch, smell, feel and talk about the products.

Discussion opportunities and negotiating conflicting points of view

At each presentation/demonstration the presenter guided the questions and discussions. The presenters were either the host farmer, agricultural advisors, machine sellers, or people within agricultural science.

Open discussions between a few participants were stimulated. Shared critical points of view were clarified so more people could understand. There were for example critical questions about the layout of the experiments which were discussed and elaborated on.

3. Engagement during the event

Many of the organic plant producers know each other and the advisers who participated. There were many opportunities for the participants to talk, discuss and socialise. Most of the demonstrators are well known to the network so they act open and friendly, but not as close friends with the participants.

T2: Learning outcomes

Most of the presentations required a high level of prior knowledge since they explained new methods that are not traditionally used in Danish farming. It was explained very detailed and people could ask questions during and after the presentations. Practical skills were not addressed.

Since all presentations concerned alternative ways of organic plant production and discussions took place, common methods or ways of thinking on farming were clearly questioned and alternatives were extensively elaborated on in group.

Common methods or ways of thinking on learning were not questioned.

T3: Overall comments on the effectiveness of the event

The event was very well structured. Upon arrival, people were shown the parking and given the programme of the day. It was very easy to find, since there were banners outside the farm. They had rented a nice party tent and toilets. Participants could sit at long tables in the tent and have breakfast, coffee and a chat with the other visitors. While having the coffee, the organisers gave a presentation of the event and two people from the Danish Agriculture and Food Council gave their views of the organic market, the future and the politic strategies.

After this, participants went to the field which had four different stations where expert gave a 20 min presentation about the specific experiments in the field. People divided themselves into groups which went smoothly.

After the field walk there was a nice lunch and a beer in the tent where people could socialise.

Next, the whole group went on a tour around to see the machines exhibited where salesmen from the different companies introduced the machines. Some of the machines were then presented, demonstrated, and compared in the field. The day ended with coffee and cake in the tent. Afterwards, those that came late were taken through the field walk with the former mentioned experts. During breaks, lunch and after the demonstrations people were circulating through the small fair in the farmers' barn, where smaller companies were showcasing their products.

Overall, the demonstration day was very well planned, with free participation, nice food/soft drinks and easy to recognise the organisers (they wore vests, caps and shirts with logos).