

II Questionnaire results summary

Pope, Waseca, Fillmore, and Benton Counties

Participation summary

<u>County</u>	<u>Group</u>	<u>Number of participants</u>	
Pope	Attenders	7	
	Non-Attenders	5	
Waseca	Attenders	7	
	Non-Attenders	4	
Fillmore	Attenders	7	
	Non-Attenders	7	
Benton	Attenders	6	
	Non-Attenders	8	
Total	Attenders	27	4 sessions
	Non-Attenders	24	4 sessions
Total number of participants		51	8 sessions

Each questionnaire item is treated in numerical sequence. The questionnaire item itself is followed by a presentation of the results in one or more tables. Each table is followed by a results summary.

Questionnaire item #1

1. What is the size of your operation in animal units? (1000 lbs/ AU)
 A. less than 100 B. 100-299 C. 300-999 D. 1000 or more (Circle one)

Table 1 Response choice counts for each participant group and combinations of groups, Item #1.

Location and group	Response choice counts by size of operation			
	A <100 AU	B 100-299 AU	C 300-999 AU	D >= 1000 AU
Pope Attenders	1	6	0	0
Pope Non-Attenders	1	1	3	0
Waseca Attenders	0	1	3	3
Waseca Non-Attenders	0	2	1	1
Fillmore Attenders	0	4	3	0
Fillmore Non-Attenders	0	2	5	0
Benton Attenders	1	4	1	0
Benton Non-Attenders	1	3	4	0
All Attenders	2	15	7	3
All Non-Attenders	2	8	13	1
Total, all participants	4	23	20	4

Summary

All participants

- There is an even distribution of participants in the two size ranges targeted for the sessions: B. 100-299 (23 participants) and C. 300-999 (20 participants).
- Eight of the participants did not meet the established selection criteria for size of operation. Four were too small—less than 100AUs; Four were too big—more than 1000 AUs.
(Note: it was deemed acceptable to have a few participants with more than 1000 AUs, if such was representative or characteristic of the county concerned. Such is characteristic of Waseca Co, the only county from where we had large operators as participants.)

Attendees versus Non-Attendees

- On average, Non-Attendees had somewhat larger operations (Exception: Waseca Co)

Counties

- Waseca Co. participants, on average, had larger operations
- Pope and Benton Co. participants, on average, had smaller operations

Questionnaire item #2.

2. What animals do you have in your feedlot operations? (Circle all that apply)

A. hogs B. beef C. dairy D. poultry E. other

Table 2 Response choice counts for each participant group and Combinations of groups, Item #2.

Location and group	Response choice counts by type of animal					No. of respondents with more than one type of animal
	A hogs	B beef	C dairy	D poultry	E other	
Pope Attendees	0	2	5	0	0	0
Pope Non-Attendees	1	4	3	0	0	2 ⁺⁺
Waseca Attendees	5	0	2	0	2 ⁺	2
Waseca Non-Attendees	2	1	2	0	0	1
Fillmore Attendees	2	5	3	0	0	3
Fillmore Non-Attendees	4	5	3	0	1 ⁺	5 ⁺⁺
Benton Attendees	2	1	4	2	0	2 ⁺⁺
Benton Non-Attendees	2	3	7	3	0	5 ⁺⁺
All Attendees (N=27)	9	8	14	2	2	7
All Non-Attendees (N=24)	9	13	15	3	1	13
Total, all participants (N=51)	18	21	29	5	3	20

⁺ Waseca Attendees, one-horses, one-sheep; Fillmore Non-Attendee, sheep

⁺⁺ There were five participants with three kinds of livestock: 1 Pope Non-A, 1 Fillmore Non-A, 1 Benton Attendee, and 2 Benton Non-As

Note: All of the participants with poultry, horses, or sheep, also raise hogs, beef, or dairy.

Summary

All participants

- Hogs, beef, and dairy were all well represented in the sessions, with dairy being the most prevalent livestock raised (29 out of 51 participants). [Note however, that there were only six participants who raised only beef. See Table 7]
- About 40% of the participants (20 out of 51) raise more than one type of animal

Attenders versus Non-Attenders

- Attenders and Non-Attenders are similar in the animals they raise, except that Non-Attenders are more likely to have beef (13 Attenders vs. 8 Non-A) and more diverse operations (13 Non-A vs. 7 Attenders have more than one type of animal).

Counties

- Fillmore and Benton county participants tend to have more diverse operations—with two or more types of animals (15 out of 28 vs. 5 out of 23 from Pope and Waseca counties).
- Waseca is the only county where a majority of the participants raised hogs.
- Most of the beef producers are from Pope and Fillmore Counties; only five of the 21 beef producers are from Waseca and Benton Counties.

Questionnaire item #3

3. What type of manure do you apply? (Circle one)

A. liquid B. solid C. both

Table 3 Response choice counts for each participant group and combinations of groups, Item #3.

Location and group	Response choice by type of manure		
	A liquid	B solid	C both
Pope Attenders	0	3	4
Pope Non-Attenders	0	2	3
Waseca Attenders	4	1	2
Waseca Non-Attenders	2	1	1
Fillmore Attenders	0	1	6
Fillmore Non-Attenders	0	2	5
Benton Attenders	0	3	3
Benton Non-Attenders	0	3	5
All Attenders (N = 27)	4	8	15
All Non-Attenders (N = 24)	2	8	14
Total, all participants (N= 51)	6	16	29

Summary

All participants

- Most of the participants (29 of 51) are applying both liquid and solid manure. Most of the rest (16), apply only solid manure. (Only six participants apply only liquid manure.)

Attenders vs. Non-Attenders

- The distribution of response choices is very similar for Attenders and Non-Attenders.

Counties

- All of the six of the participants who apply just liquid manure are from Waseca Co.
- Compared to Pope and Benton County, relatively few of the Waseca and Fillmore county participants apply only solid manure.

Questionnaire items 4-13

Instructions: "For items 4 - 13, circle 'yes' or 'no' for each time period."

This series of questions was designed to measure changes in practices over time.

Each of the ten items asked about a desirable practice. For example:

4. If you apply your own manure, do you calibrate your manure spreaders?

That is, do you measure the weight of solids or volume of liquid applied per acre?

Prior to year 2000? yes no

Currently? yes no

Plan to by 2004? yes no

[All of the questions can be seen in Table 4]

Table 4 Adoption rates for ten manure management practices averaged across groups.

Item no.	Topic or 'practice'	Combination of groups	Percent 'Yes' answers		
			Adopted prior to 2000	Currently adopted (2002)	Plan to adopt by 2004
Average for all ten practices Non-Attendees, N = 24 Attendees, N = 27		Total / All participants	55**	72**	88**
		Attendees	52**	71**	91**
		Non-Attendees	60**	74**	83**
4	Do you calibrate your manure spreaders?	Total	32*	53**	81**
		Attendees	32	48*	80**
		Non-Attendees	32	59	82**
5	Do you have your manure tested for nutrient content?	Total	55	63**	88**
		Attendees	56	63**	93**
		Non-Attendees	54	63	83*
6	Do you have most of your fields soil tested every four years or more frequently?	Total	86	94	98*
		Attendees	93	96	96
		Non-Attendees	79	92	100*
7	Do you account for nitrogen available from prior manure applications and previous legume crops when calculating manure and fertilizer rates?	Total	86	96	96
		Attendees	89	96	96
		Non-Attendees	83	96	96
8	Do you follow UM Extension recommended nitrogen rates when calculating manure and fertilizer applications?	Total	69	86	91*
		Attendees	61	83	92*
		Non-Attendees	79	89	89
9	Do you adjust the amount of manure you apply according to soil phosphorus test results?	Total	38*	62*	80**
		Attendees	37*	63*	89**
		Non-Attendees	39	61	68*
10	Do you keep records of manure application amounts for each field?	Total	44*	64*	86**
		Attendees	41	65*	89**
		Non-Attendees	48	63	83*
11	Have you located the sensitive areas in your fields where there are special requirements regarding manure incorporation and phosphorus management?	Total	53*	75	89**
		Attendees	44*	74	93**
		Non-Attendees	64	76	85
12	Near water and open tile intakes, do you inject or incorporate manure within 24 hours or maintain a 50-100 foot vegetated buffer?	Total	60*	83	91**
		Attendees	44*	78	93**
		Non-Attendees	80	90	90
13	Do you or does your consultant develop or update a manure management plan each year?	Total	31	46**	78**
		Attendees	19	38**	85**
		Non-Attendees	43	54	70

* Significant at P< 0.05

** Significant at P< 0.01, comparing 2000 with 2002 (column 1), 2002 with 2004 (column 2), and 2000 with 2004 (column 3). Percentages and tests of significance were adjusted for non-responses to individual questions. Comparisons were made using a 2x2 contingency table with Pearson's Chi-square test.

Notes: For most items, there are one or more participants who were not included in calculating the percentages shown for an individual item-timeframe combination. The reasons for non-inclusion can generally be characterized as ‘no answer given’, ‘not applicable’, ‘answer difficult to interpret’, and similarly. In these cases the denominators—51, 27, and 24, for Total, Attenders, and Non-Attenders, respectively—of the ratios, were reduced or deducted accordingly.

For items 5, 6, and 7, the denominators used in calculating the percent figures were the same as the number of participants in each grouping—there were no ‘denominator deductions’.

Item 8 There were several respondents who answered ‘Don’t know’ or ‘Use another source for rate recommendations’. Their answers were not used in calculating the figures shown. If their responses had been treated as ‘No’, then the percent figures shown would decrease by 8-14 points (depending on the timeframe and session grouping).

For items 11 and 12, the figures for Non-Attenders might be considered artificially high, as there were four participants from Fillmore Co. who indicated that they did not have sensitive areas. Their answers were treated as ‘not applicable’.

Summary

All participants, overview

For a group of ten practices examined, the overall rate of adoption as indicated in the pre-discussion questionnaire had increased from year 2000 (prior to the rules revision) to 2002 when the focus groups were held. Participants expressed the intention to further increase adoption by 2004, as indicated in Table 4. The intended adoption rate was higher for Attenders than for Non-Attenders by 2004 for 7 of 10 practices, but because of low sample numbers, was only statistically significant when data was pooled across practices. Participants expressed the intention to implement all of the individual practices at rates exceeding 80 percent by 2004, except for developing/updating manure management plans. A more detailed discussion of results follows:

Adoption of Specific Manure Management Practices

A review of Table 4 indicates that reported or intended adoption of specific practices can be grouped into four classes: 1. reported adoption rates were high (at or above 80%) before rules revision, 2. reported adoption rates became high following rules revision and the producer information sessions, 3. intended adoption rates are high for two years after the focus group meetings, and 4. intended adoption rates do not reach 80%.

1. Practices for which reported adoption rates were high before rules revision:

- Soil testing
- Nitrogen crediting for prior manure applications and legume crops

2. Practices for which reported adoption rates became high following rules revision and the producer information sessions:

- Follow UM recommended nitrogen rates
- Inject or incorporate manure near water and open tile intakes

3. Practices for which intended adoption rates are high two years after the focus group meetings:

- Calibration of manure spreaders
- Testing manure for nutrient content
- Adjust manure application rates for soil phosphorus (Attenders)
- Keep records of manure application
- Identify sensitive areas in fields for protective measures
- Develop or maintain a manure management plan (Attenders)

4. Practices for which intended adoption rates do not reach 80%:

- Adjust manure application rates for soil phosphorus (Non-Attenders)
- Develop or maintain a manure management plan (Non-Attenders)

The reported 2002 and expected 2004 rates of adoption of some practices by these producers exceeds actual rates found in previous on-farm surveys (FANMAP, Minnesota Department of Agriculture).

Several factors may be contributing to the differences, including:

- A statement of adoption on the questionnaire may have indicated partial implementation of the practice, such as partial crediting for nitrogen in prior manure applications and legume crops.
- Producers may not fully understand the practice, such as protective measures for environmentally sensitive areas, resulting in an indication of adoption when compliance was not complete.

Table 5 **Items 4-13, combined results: Implementation of desirable practices by county.**

Focus Groups: various combinations of individual sessions	Items 4-13 combined, percent 'Yes' answers		
	Prior to 2000	Currently (2002)	Plan to by 2004
Pope Co. Attendees and Non-Attendees	52	58	85
Waseca Co. Attendees and Non-Attendees	61	80	91
Fillmore Co. Attendees and Non-Attendees	57	79	91
Benton Co. Attendees and Non-Attendees	53	71	85

Counties

- The four counties had similar beginning levels of implementation ('Prior to 2000'), ranging from 52 % (Pope) to 61 % (Waseca).
- For the intermediate time or 'Currently', three counties report similar rates of implementation, ranging from 71 to 80 %, but Pope Co. lags at 58%.
- In Pope Co., little change occurred between 'Prior to 2000' (52%) and 'Currently' (58%); but, considerable change is planned between 'Currently' and 'By 2004' (85%). In all other counties, more of the total percent increase in implementation occurred between the first two timeframes ('Prior to 2000' and 'Currently/2002'), than is planned to occur between the last two timeframes ('Currently/2002' and 'By 2004').

Table 6 **Items 4-13, combined results:
Implementation of desirable practices over time.
Percent rate of implementation by size of operation.**

Timeframe	Size of operation in animal units (AU)		All participants ⁺⁺ (N = 51)
	B. 100 - 299 AU (N = 24) ⁺	C. 300 - 999 AU (N = 19) ⁺	
Prior to 2000	48	62	55
Currently (2002)	68	79	72
Plan to by 2004	89	88	88

⁺ B) 16 Attendees, 8 Non-Attendees; C) 6 Attendees, 13 Non-Attendees

Note: Because there were only four participants each in the size classes A) <100 AU and D) >1000 AU, they are omitted from the table and summary.

⁺⁺ From Table 4

Size of Operation

- For both the beginning and intermediate timeframes, smaller operators had an overall lower rate of implementation than larger operators (48 vs. 62% and 68 vs. 79%, respectively).
- However, for the ending time frame (By 2004) the predicted rates of implementation for the two groups are the same (89 and 88%).

Table 7 **Items 4-13, combined results:**
Implementation of desirable practices over time.
Percent rate of implementation by type of animal raised⁺.

Timeframe	Animal raised						All ⁺⁺ participants (N = 51)
	A. Hogs		B. Beef		C. Dairy		
	Hogs only (N = 10)	All hog producers (N = 18)	Beef only (N = 6)	All beef producers (N = 21)	Dairy only (N = 20)	All dairy producers (N = 29)	
Prior to 2000	68	70	48	52	49	49	55
Currently	82	83	58	67	69	69	72
Plan to by 2004	92	90	83	84	85	85	88

⁺ For each animal, two sets of figures are given. One is for those producers who raise only one type of livestock, for example, 'Hogs only'. The other figure is for all producers who raise that type of livestock, including those that raise other types of livestock, for example 'All hog producers'.

⁺⁺ From Table 4

Note: Those producers of hogs, beef, or dairy who in addition, also produce only poultry or 'other' (sheep, horses), were treated as 'hogs only', 'beef only', or 'dairy only', respectively. There were five such producers.

Type of Animal

- For each timeframe, hog producers' rates of implementation are higher than those of beef and dairy producers. The largest differences are for the earlier two timeframes.
- With one exception, there is little or no difference in the two values for each type of animal—the value for producers who produce only that animal and the value for all producers of that animal (including those who produce only that animal and those who produce that animal, as well as one or more other animals.) The exception was for Beef, Currently, with rates of 58% and 67%.
- Thus, based on the preceding, the rates of implementation must also be similar in the case of each animal, for those producers who raised only that animal and those producers who raised that animal, as well as another animal (results not shown). Again, the exception is for the middle timeframe (Currently, 2002), where beef producers who also raise hogs or dairy, have higher rates of implementation than beef producers who do not raise other livestock.
- Rates of implementation were very similar for beef and dairy producers (with the exception of the somewhat lower rates for the 'Currently' timeframe for 'Beef only').
- A majority of hog producers (10 of 18) and a majority of dairy producers (20 of 29) have only hogs or dairy, respectively; whereas only a minority of beef producers (5 of 21) raises only beef.

Question 14

14. Do you have UM Extension, MPCA, and/or MDA publications on the following topics?

(See topics listed in table below)

(Check all that apply)

Table 8 Number of participants in each session who have relevant publications.

Focus group session or combination of groups (no. of respondents)											Publication topics
Attendees					Non-Attendees					TOTAL, all eight groups (51)	
County				All Attendees (27)	County				All Non-Attendees (24)		
Pope (7)	Waseca (7)	Fillmore (7)	Benton (6)		Pope (5)	Waseca (4)	Fillmore (7)	Benton (8)			
Number of participants in each group who have publications a – h											
6	4	7	6	23	2	0	3	2	7	30	a. manure spreader calibration
5	6	7	6	24	1	2	5	4	12	36	b. manure sampling and testing
4	4	6	6	20	2	3	4	5	15	35	c. soil sampling and testing
5	4	4	6	21	2	1	2	2	7	28	d. calculation of manure and fertilizer rates for each field
6	7	5	6	24	1	1	5	2	9	33	e. manure application records
6	5	6	5	22	1	1	2	4	8	30	f. application of manure in sensitive areas
6	6	7	6	25	4	1	5	7	17	42	g. feedlot rules
4	4	4	5	17	1	1	3	3	8	25	h. directory of feedlot resources
42	40	46	46	176	14	10	29	29	83	259	Total
6	5.7	6.6	7.7	6.5	2.8	2.5	4.1	3.6	3.5	5.1	Average number of publications per participant

Additional statistic: average no. of publications per participant, by county

Pope: $(42 + 14) / 12 = 4.7$

Waseca: $(40 + 10) / 11 = 4.5$

Fillmore: $(46 + 29) / 14 = 5.4$

Benton: $(46 + 29) / 14 = 5.4$

Summary

All participants

- Each of the publications is 'owned' by a simple majority of participants, except for 'h' (49%, 25/51; see 'TOTAL' column).
- The average rate of 'ownership' is 5.1 publications per participant (259 publications owned/51 participants).
- Only one publication, is owned by more than 80% (42 of 51) of the participants, 'g', 'feedlot rules'.

Attenders vs. Non-Attenders

- Attenders have many more of the publications than do Non-Attenders.
 - The average rate of ownership for Attenders is 6.5 (176/27); for Non-Attenders, 3.5 (83/24).
 - The number of participants who have each publication, ranges from 17 to 25 (63-93%) for Attenders (out of 27 total) versus 7 to 17 (29-71%) Non-Attenders (out of 24 total).
- Publications ‘b’, ‘c’, and ‘g’ are the only publications that half or more (12) of the Non-Attenders have (highest percent: 71% for h. directory of feedlot resources).
- All of the publications are owned by 20 or more out of the 27 Attenders (74%), except for ‘h’, which only 17 have.

Counties

- Among Non-Attenders, Fillmore and Benton Co. participants have more of the publications than do Pope and Waseca Co. participants (4.1 and 3.6 books per participant vs. 2.8 and 2.5).
- Among Attenders, Benton Co. participants have the most publications (7.7 publications per participant, versus 6.6, 6.0, 5.7).
- Combining the figures for Attenders and Non-Attenders in each county (see calculations just below Table 6), rates of ownership are higher in Benton and Fillmore Counties (both at 5.4 documents/participant) than in Pope and Waseca Counties (4.7 and 4.5, respectively).

Question 15

15. Did you attend one or more education meetings in the winter of 2001 - 2002 where topics (such as those above) on land application of manure were presented? (Check one)

- Yes, I attended one meeting
 Yes, I attended two or more meetings
 No, I did not attend

Results and summary

- One Attender group participant (Waseca) reported that he had not attend a meeting.
- At least four Non-Attender group participants (Pope, Fillmore, Benton) reported that they had attended a meeting.

(Because of inconsistencies in or the nature of their responses for other items, the answers for two additional Benton Co. Non-Attenders are difficult to interpret or trust.)

The results reported elsewhere in this document and companion documents, have not been adjusted to reflect these presumed, ‘mistaken’ group assignments.

Question 16A

Please help Extension to plan future educational programming.

16A. First, in the table below, tell us which **topics** you would likely attend or participate in.

Use the following rating system

- Yes** I would probably attend.
Maybe I might attend; I might not.
No I would probably not attend.

For each lettered topic on the left, circle one of the choices on the right.

Table 9 Gauging overall interest in attending Extension programs on manure management topics⁺.

Results for all 10 topics, a – j, combined			
Combination of Focus Group sessions	Response choice rate, per cent		
	'Yes'	'Maybe'	'No'
Total, All participants	31	50	19
Pope Co.	39	45	16
Waseca Co.	30	45	25
Fillmore Co.	24	59	16
Benton Co.	33	47	20
Attenders, all four counties	32	53	15
Non-Attenders, all four counties	30	46	23

⁺See Table 8 for results for individual topics

Summary

All groups

- By far, the most likely response choice was 'Maybe'. It accounted for half of the responses.
- Respondents were more likely to choose 'Yes' than 'No' (31 vs. 19%).

Attenders vs. Non-Attenders

- Responses for the two groups were similar, with Attenders somewhat more likely than Non-Attenders to choose 'Maybe' (53 vs. 46%) and Non-Attenders somewhat more likely than Attenders to choose 'No' (23 vs. 15%).

Counties

- Pope Co. participants were the most likely to choose 'Yes' (39%), Fillmore participants were least likely (24%), and Waseca and Benton were at similar, intermediate levels (30%, 33%).
- Fillmore Co. participants were most likely to choose 'Maybe' (59%), while the other three groups were at very similar levels (45-47%).
- Waseca participants had the highest level of 'No' responses (25), with the other groups in the 16-20% range.

Question 16B

16B. Now, which of the above topics is your top choice for a workshop, field day, or other education event—the one(s) you would be **most likely to attend**? (1 to 3 letters)

_____, _____, _____

Table 8 Item 16A, Likelihood of attending or participating in educational programming: analysis by topic for Attenders, Non-Attenders, and all Focus Group participants combined (percent).
Item 16B, Top choices for topics (counts).

Lettered topic/ questionnaire item	Percent 'Yes', 'Maybe', and 'No' responses for each lettered topic											
	Attenders (4 counties)				Non-Attenders (4 cos.)				All participants			
	Top ⁺ 16B	Yes	Maybe	No	Top ⁺ 16B	Yes	Maybe	No	Top ⁺ 16B	Yes	Maybe	No
A. Calibrating my manure spreader	5	19	48	33	4	17	46	37	9	18	47	35
B. Manure sampling and nutrient content analysis	11	33	52	15	6	25	46	29	17	29	49	22
C. Soil sampling and testing	4	11	33	56	6	29	25	46	10	20	29	51
D. Manure application record keeping	6	37	59	4	5	25	42	33	11	31	51	18
E. Using UM Extension tables to calculate application rates	3	19	74	7	4	29	58	13	7	24	67	10
F. Field selection: soil P levels and manure application rates	9	37	59	4	7	29	63	8	16	33	61	6
G. Managing sensitive areas	9	48	41	11	7	33	46	21	16	41	43	16
H. Written nutrient management plan	4	30	67	4	8	42	46	12	12	35	57	8
I. Applying and incorporating manure	10	38	54	8	7	29	63	8	17	34	58	8
J. Determining total acres needed for all of my manure	7	48	41	11	7	46	29	25	7	47	35	18
	Top	Yes	Maybe	No	Top	Yes	Maybe	No	Top	Yes	Maybe	No

⁺ For 'Top' choice in part 16B, respondents were allowed to list up to three choices. Most gave three. Results are given as counts or number of times listed or named, rather than percent

Summary

All groups combined

- The topics for which there is the highest likelihood of participation based on 'top choice' results are B, F, G, and I, with counts of 16-17 out of 51 respondents. (The next highest was 12)
- The topics for which there is the highest likelihood of participation based on 'yes' answers, are G and J with 41 and 47%, respectively. (The next highest was 35%)
- The topics for which there is the highest likelihood of participation based on the combination of 'yes' and 'maybe' responses, are F, H, and I at 94, 92, and 92%, respectively
- The topics that came out on top on two of the preceding three methods of comparison are:
 - F. Field selection: soil P levels and manure application rates
 - G. Managing sensitive areas
 - I. Applying and incorporating manure

Table 9, Notes cont. 1) Rounded to 3 significant digits; '5' in 4th place, dropped (rounded downward). 2) Because of the nature of this statistic, relatively small differences have relatively large import. 3) Not adjusted for: the number of participants in each group (varied from 4 to 7); the highest rank given in a given group; etc.

Summary

All groups

- 'Publications' is the item or opportunity for which there is the most interest. Nineteen of 51 participants gave it a rank of '1' (with the next highest item with '14'). It had the second lowest number of 'last' rankings at 5' (Workshops and Farm tours had '4' each). Publications also had the lowest, 'average of the median rank' at 1.81.
- There is relatively low interest in 'Comprehensive website' and 'Nutrient management computer software'. These items had the highest number of 'last' rankings (17, 22), the lowest number of 'first' rankings (4, 6), and the highest 'average of the median rank' values (3.37, 3.81).
- Farm visit or one-on-one assistance had somewhat dichotomous results, receiving high to intermediate numbers of both 'first' (13; range: 4-19) and 'last' (14; range: 4-22) rankings and a high to intermediate value for 'average of the median rank' (2.69; range: 1.81-3.81).

Attendees vs. Non-Attendees

Results for these two groups are generally similar, with two exceptions, 'Workshops' and Farm visit/one-on-one assistance.

- *Farm visit / one-on-one assistance*
Based on the average of the median statistic, Attendees are much more interested than Non-Attendees in 'Farm visit / one-on-one assistance' (2.12 vs. 3.25). For Attendees, this item tied with two other items for the second lowest value (2nd highest rank); whereas for Non-Attendees, this item tied with one other item for the second highest (lowest rank) value. The differences are not apparent, using the counts for 'first' and 'last' rank, which are similar (8 and 7 vs. 5 and 7). Note that the number of Non-Attendee assignments of 'first' is heavily influenced by the Benton Co. contingent—their eight members account for three of the total of five.
- *Workshops*
Attendees are relatively more interested than Non-Attendees in workshops. For Attendees, this is one of the items, along with 'publications', for which there is the highest interest. It tied with 'publications' for the highest number first rank assignments (9). It had the least number of 'lasts' (1). And, it tied with two other items for the second best (lowest) value for 'mean of the median rank' (2.12). For Non-Attendees, this is an item of intermediate interest, with low numbers of both high and low rank assignments (3, 3) and an intermediate value for 'average of the median rank' (2.75; range: 1.87-3.62).

Note: Non-Attendees are somewhat more interested than Attendees in 'Newsletter', but the difference is small compared to the two preceding items.