



finalreport

KPI 2007 Survey – Executive Report

Project code: B. COM. 0078

Prepared by: John Logan

Axiom Research
ABN: 31 228 842 336
C/- PO Box 183
Artarmon NSW 1570 AUSTRALIA
Tel: 61 411 525 797
jhlogan@axiom.com.au

Date published: August 2007

ISBN: [MLA to provide]

PUBLISHED BY

Meat & Livestock Australia
Locked Bag 991
NORTH SYDNEY NSW 2059

Meat & Livestock Australia Awareness & Adoption KPI Evaluation 2007

July - August 2007

Executive Summary

A previous evaluation of the performance of the LPI communication programs was undertaken in 2005 using a comprehensive sampling approach and detailed questionnaire. The **KPI 2006 & 2007 Survey's** have been based on a revised methodology that concentrates on the assessment of LPI's Adoption & Capacity KPI's.

This involved quantifying the level of **awareness** that existed amongst livestock producers of MLA courses and programs, as well as the rate of **adoption** by producers of innovations and management practices being promoted within MLA learning activities.

MLA's annual On-Farm Adoption & Capacity KPI's were to:

1. Increase the uptake of MLA's tools and information by targeted producers by 5%
2. Increase the participation of targeted producers in MLA learning activities by 5%
3. Encourage increased adoption of at least one key management practice by 65% of producers that participated in MLA learning activities

The 2007 KPI survey stratifies responses from a sample of MLA's main producer segments of **Northern Beef Producers, Southern Beef Producers** and **Southern Sheep or Lamb Producers** to a 90% confidence interval for each segment based on an overall sample of **n=493**. This was split into two segments to address the KPI's:

Tier 1 was constructed to evaluate **program awareness** amongst the general livestock producer population, it included **n=206** producers randomly selected from FARMbase[®], a database of over 80,000 livestock producers across Australia.

Tier 2 provides a measure of the **level of adoption** of management practices amongst MLA's extension program participants. In **2007** a sample of **n=287** producers were obtained. This was a sample of producers who participated in extension programs since the last survey undertaken in July 2006 (including 3,418 attendees of EDGE, More Beef from Pastures, PIRDS, COP, Prime Time and Beef –Up courses). The Tier 2 sample in 2006 included a sample from the 3,080 course participants from July 2005 to June 2006, this survey also included a top-up sample from the 5,041 producers who participated in MLA programs prior to July 2005.

In 2007 the measure of producers adoption of, or changes to, management practice has been calculated using two sample sets – the first being from participants who attended MLA learning activities during the 2006-2007 financial year, and the second being an **aggregated sample** which included management change data obtained from the 2007 survey as well as the previous 2 survey intervals. This aggregated sample included data obtained from 3 separate samples, these included the 2007 and 2006 sample as well as the sample of course participants who participated in MLA courses and programs prior to July 2005.

This aggregated sample provides a cumulative picture¹ of management practice adoption amongst known course participants of the specified programs since 2001.

The contents of this report outlines the 2007 and combined 2005-2007 sample results, these are represented in detail in two data files provided separately from this report:

- ❑ **MLA_KPI_2007_Tables_07.doc**
- ❑ **MLA_KPI_2007_Combined_05-07.doc** (for cumulative adoption figures)

¹ The cumulative data has been weighted to the known population of course attendees based on the contacts available, other course participants not known have been excluded from the population and subsequent sampling calculations.

The Tier 1 sample evaluated the level of course and program awareness amongst the wider producer population and the Tier 2 sample concentrated on evaluating the effectiveness of courses and programs in influencing management change amongst actual course participants.

Awareness – 2007 (Tier 1 n=206)

Awareness of MLA extension programs was at **84%** of survey participants, down slightly (3%) since the 2006 KPI survey, however this represents an increase of **11%** since the 2005 LPI Survey.

The figures below represent the aided & unaided awareness of MLA extension programs as well as the overall aggregated awareness.

- **38%** of respondents indicated an **unprompted** or **unaided awareness** of MLA Program(s), this represented an increase of **10%** from 28% in 2006 and 15% from 23% in 2005.
- **78%** of respondents, when **prompted**, recalled one or more of MLA Courses or Program(s) mentioned, this represented an increase of **15%** from **63%** in 2005. However it is slightly down on 84% in 2006.
- **In total, 84%** of all respondents recalled one or more of the MLA Courses or Program(s) mentioned. This represented a total increase of **11%** from **73%** in 2005 and a slight fall of 3% from 87% in the 2006 survey.

Overall total awareness has remained consistent with the 2006 survey (statistical difference within 10% margin of error). Of interest is the significant increase in unaided awareness of MLA Courses or Programs.

- **16%** of respondents were **unaware** of any MLA Courses or Program(s), whilst this was significantly fewer than the levels in 2005 which were as high as 31% for Northern Beef, 27% for Southern Beef and 19% for Sheep it represented a slight increase on the 2006 result of 13%.
- **MLA Membership:** In 2007, **71%** of those respondents interviewed in the Tier 1 sample (*n=206*) indicated they received the **Feedback** publication (the 2007 Survey's measure of MLA Membership status). This is only slightly down on the 2006 result of **79%**, which was regarded as inaccurate due to respondent's assumption or perception of membership status.
- **93%** of members (71% of the sample) were aware of one or more MLA extension program(s), this represented an **increase of 3%** from **90%** in the **2006 survey**, and 13% since 2005, further indicating member communication was having an impact at the time of the survey.

In gathering this data, the survey's questionnaire² specifically mentioned Meat & Livestock Australia, informing the respondent that MLA organises and runs a range of programs for beef, sheep, lamb and goat producers. The question then asks 'Which MLA programs' is the respondent aware of, probing for any additional courses or programs.

Unaided or unprompted course awareness has increased significantly from the 2006 and 2005 surveys. Once prompted, producers recognise the individual program brands. This continuing increase in the level of unaided awareness indicates an improvement in the association of the courses and programs with MLA compared with the previous surveys. There is also scope to improve prompted recall with clearer course branding and promotion amongst members.

(refer to survey data tables MLA_KPI_2007_Tables_07.doc)

² Refer to appendix for questionnaire details.

Adoption or Management Change - 2007 (Tier 2 n=287, Cumulative n=636)

The participant lists provided by MLA for the 2007 KPI survey included **3,418 producers** who had attended one or more of the MLA courses/programs since July 2006. The previous 2006 KPI survey included 3,080 producers who had attended one or more of the MLA courses/programs since July 2005. (The 2005 EDGE/More Beef from Pastures survey sample was drawn from a database of 5,341 producer participants of those programs).

The 2007 KPI Survey and 2006 KPI Survey specifically addressed the cumulative level of adoption of management practices or change in management practices as a result of producers attending an MLA extension program. The Tier 2 sample includes only producers known to have attended MLA extension programs.

Based on the cumulative sample from 2005 to 2007 of **n=636**, of all those livestock producers surveyed who have **ever attended** an MLA extension program, **64%** have been motivated to adopt new (or change) management practices as a result of attending or participating in an MLA course or program (refer to MLA_KPI_2007_Combined_05-07 data tables representing course participants information obtained from the previous surveys or past 7 years of course activity). Whilst trending down, this finding shows little change in the adoption rate resulting from course attendance and represents a similar level of adoption to the **65%** of participants identified in the 2005 LPI Survey and is slightly below the **67%** of the 2006 KPI survey.

Of those producers surveyed who attended an MLA extension program in the 12 months leading up to the 2007 survey, **58%** indicated they had implemented a change in management practices as a result of participating in a MLA course or program, up by **8%** from **50%** recorded in the previous 2006 survey.

- ❑ **71%** of all **EDGE** workshop attendees surveyed to date (cumulative sample) have been motivated to change management practices as a result of attending. This represents a rise of **2%** from the **69%** adoption level recorded in the 2006 Survey. Of particular interest, **60%** of producers who participated in an **EDGE** course in the **12 months** leading up to the 2007 survey changed management practices, up **13%** from **47%** in the 12 months prior to the 2006 survey.
- ❑ **50%** of **More Beef from Pastures** event attendees to date (cumulative sample) changed management practices as a result of participating in the MBfP program. This represented an increase of **6%** from **44%** in **2006** and **13%** from the **37%** in the 2005 More Beef from Pastures survey. Fifty three percent of producers participating in the **More Beef from Pastures** program in the **12 months** leading up to the 2007 survey implemented a change. This represented an increase of **18%** from **35%** in the 12 months prior to the 2006 survey.
- ❑ **56%** of **PIRD's** participants changed management practices, down from 72% in 2006.
- ❑ **49%** of **Prime Time** participants changed management practices, up from 47%, a
- ❑ **46%** of **Cost of Production** workshop participants changed management practices, up from 30%.
- ❑ **46%** of **Beef Up Forum** participants changed management practices

The KPI 2007 survey has confirmed that the level of adoption of the management practices being promoted is being maintained (a cumulative result of **64%** in **2007**, **67%** in **2006** compared with **65%** in **2005**). Previous surveys indicated an upwards trend, this appears to have reached a plateau in 2007 however adoption during the 2006-2007 period has increased significantly in the key EDGE & MBfP programs.

Axiom believe recent **drought conditions** had a significant impact on preventing management change as **16%** of course participants cited this as the main reason they did not change management practices. More significant were the **27%** of participants who indicated they were **already** undertaking the management practices being promoted with the MLA programs they had attended³. Eighteen percent felt the proposed changes did **not suit** their operation.

(refer to survey data tables **MLA_KPI_2007_Tables_07.doc**)

MLA Course attendance outcomes

The **impact of management change** as a result of MLA course attendance and participation were mainly seen as **very positive**:

- ❑ **19%** of participants said the changes had a **very positive impact** and a further **52%** said they had a **positive** impact.
- ❑ **18%** felt they had **no impact** at all and only **1%** indicated the changes had a negative impact.

The survey also explored in an open question what the **positive and negative outcomes** were that resulted from attending any of the courses.

Positives:

- ❑ **12%** of participants indicated the main positive outcome was that '**feeding strategies were better** and stock were matched to pasture'.
- ❑ **15%** said that '**income or profit had increased**'.
- ❑ **21%** indicated that **pasture management and improvement** had led to being able to run more stock.

Negatives:

- ❑ **7%** felt that '**advice was not drought applicable**'.
- ❑ **13%** had made **no changes** to management as a result of attending and this was felt to be a negative.
- ❑ **6%** felt that they needed more time or too much time to implement changes.

Areas of most Impact from MLA Courses

The 2007 KPI survey also sought to identify which key areas of farm management the MLA extension programs had the most impact on.

- ❑ **54%** of participants clearly identified **profitability** as the area that MLA courses had influenced the most.
- ❑ **Cost of Production** was regarded by **53% of participants** as the second most important area that MLA courses impacted on.

³ Refer to Section 4.2.9. Why MLA course(s) did not influence management practice change.

Summary

It is clear from the 2007 KPI survey that the LPI extension and communication strategies aimed at reaching producers continues to have a significant impact on **maintaining the level of awareness** of the MLA extension program(s) amongst the target producer segments at **84%**, similar to previous levels of **87%** and **73%** in 2005.

At the time of the 2006 KPI Survey, improving on this level of overall awareness will be difficult, as it is likely to be close to saturation point amongst the broader population of targeted producers. However the 2007 survey has identified a significant increase in the unaided awareness of programs as well as the aided awareness of specific programs,.

This awareness evaluation would be made simpler if core course streams were the only brands promoted by MLA. Confusion among survey participants was common about course types and names that are similar with courses such as EDGENetwork and MBfP. Respondents were confused with other similarly named programs such as More Beef for Profit which is a non existent MLA program, but one regularly mentioned nonetheless.

Practice change resulting from course attendance remained relatively constant with **64%** of cumulative course participants choosing to **adopt** new management practices (or make changes to management practices) as a result of participating in an MLA extension program. This represented a slightly downward trend from 67% in 2006 and was likely to reflect the fact that many participants had already made the particular management changes or the drought has in some way prevented them from doing so.

The process of attracting producers to actually participate in MLA courses must continue with a key strategy of ensuring course content and management practices being promoted relates directly to current management challenges giving relevance to potential participants. Attracting new producers (those that haven't participated in any courses to date) will serve to raise the level of change amongst the cumulative respondent population.

Effecting **higher rates of change** during the 2006 to 2007 year have been retarded by circumstances such as drought and financial hardship. MLA should also note that a significant proportion of course participants (27%) were already undertaking the practices promoted in MLA programs. This not only had the impact of lowering the actual adoption rate, it also highlighted the need to ensure that future surveys are able to link practice change with the particular year of course attendance so as to more effectively identify rate of change.

In terms of outcomes resulting from attendance at MLA courses/programs, participants generally rated these as very positive, particularly in the areas of feeding strategies, matching stock to pasture, pasture management and improvement, and profitability.

Contents

	Page
1 Background.....	8
2 Project Objectives	9
3 Methodology and Sample	10
3.1 Sample Overview	13
3.1.1 Sample Profile and Demographics	13
4 KPI 2007 Survey Results.....	16
4.1 MLA Program Awareness (KPI 2007 Tier 1 Sample n=206).....	16
4.1.1 MLA Program Awareness by Psychographic Profile.....	20
4.1.2 MLA Program Awareness by Producer Segment	22
4.1.3 Overall Awareness by MLA Membership Status.....	25
4.1.4 Attended any MLA Programs or Courses	26
4.2 Change in Management Practices (Tier 2 Sample n=287).....	27
4.2.1 Management Changes Overall (Adoption).....	27
4.2.2 Management Changes by Course/Program	28
4.2.3 Management Changes as a Result of Course Attendance	29
4.2.4 Management Changes Compared with 2005 EDGE/ More Beef from Pastures Survey.....	30
4.2.5 Management Changes of Course Attendees by Producer Segment	30
4.2.6 Management Changes by Psychographic Profile	31
4.2.7 Management Practice Changes after Attending MLA Courses or Programs	33
4.2.8 Why did the MLA course not influence management practice change?	34
4.2.9 More Beef from Pastures Course Influence	35
4.2.10 MLA Course attendance outcomes.....	37
4.2.11 Areas of most Impact from MLA Courses	38
5 Conclusions and Recommendations.....	39
5.1 Conclusions	39
5.2 Recommendations.....	40
6 Appendices	43
6.1 Appendix 1 Main data file(s) details	43
6.2 Appendix 2 Questionnaire	43

1 Background

Meat & Livestock Australia (MLA) is responsible for the communication and extension of its on-farm R&D results to improve the profitability and sustainability of the Australian red meat industry.

A previous evaluation of the performance of the LPI communication programs was undertaken in 2005 using a similar sample and questionnaire. The KPI 2007 survey aimed to undertake a revision of the top line findings using an efficient survey sample to assess progress of the level of **awareness** of MLA programs, **participation** in them as well as the rate of **adoption** of the innovations and management practices being promoted within established development programs.

MLA's KPI's for 2005-2007 are to:

1. Increase awareness of MLA's tools & information by 5% of targeted producers.
2. Increase the rate of trial of, or participation in, MLA's tools & information by 5% of targeted producers.
3. Encourage increased adoption of at least one key management practice by 5% of targeted producers.

MLA invited Axiom Research (Axiom) to undertake market research to measure progress against these key performance indicators. These KPIs apply across each of the industry segments which include, **Northern Beef**, **Southern Beef** and **Sheep/Lamb** producers.

Axiom's research in the rural sector is underpinned by FARMbase[®], Axiom's own well segmented database of Australia's primary industry participants.

Axiom conducted a **telephone survey** with **n=493** targeted producers, using a 2 tiered sample approach to satisfy overall industry **awareness** as well as the rate of participant **adoption** or change of management practice.

MLA specified the statistical validity of the survey and its findings must satisfy a 90% confidence interval. Axiom stratified the sample to provide statistically significant data for each of the three targeted producer segments, for the overall sample of producers as well as those who have actually participated in courses and programs.

The 2007 survey's **Tier 1** sample ($n=206$) was drawn randomly from FARMbase[®], to represent the overall livestock industry's awareness of the MLA courses and programs. The 2007 survey's **Tier 2** sample ($n=287$) was aggregated with previous years data to create a larger participants sample ($n=636$). This was made up entirely of previous participants from each extension program. These contacts were provided by MLA from a number of sources and compiled into a database for interviewing. The 2007 participants list contains **3,418** course participants from July 2006 to June 2007, in 2006 this was 3,080 participants in various workshops/programs from July 2005 to June 2006, and 5,361⁴ EDGE/More Beef from Pastures participants prior to July 2005.

⁴ These figures are based on the sum of the available course participant lists and do not represent all participants.

2 Project Objectives

The KPI 2006 and 2007 Surveys were undertaken with a brief to provide the current level of course awareness and management change/adoption of knowledge and practices using an efficient survey methodology.

The project specifically aimed to:

- Determine the overall level of awareness of MLA programs and courses being promoted by LPI compared with stated KPIs;
- Determine the level of adoption or subsequent uptake and implementation of the programs and courses as a ratio of the producers who have participated in MLA courses, compared with stated KPIs;
- Evaluate these findings using regional and demographic segmentation including a psychographic profile where producers are categorised from innovators to laggards⁵. Other segmentation included age, decision-making capacity and MLA membership status.

The underlying objective of the KPI Survey was to evaluate the impact of the extension programs on producer management change, and the effectiveness of the communication, delivery and extension processes employed by LPI to achieve this change.

⁵ Refer Table 1 for psychographic matrix.

3 Methodology and Sample

Axiom followed the sampling protocols established for the LPI 2005 survey to construct a segmented sample of target livestock producers, The survey was been undertaken from two separate data sources. The methodology addressed the collection of required information from two sources:

1. Tier One Sample (**n=206**): Evaluate **Awareness** of MLA course/program(s) using a random sample of the **targeted** population of **producers** segmented by region and enterprise into Northern beef, Southern beef and Southern Sheep/Lamb.
(*FARMBase random sample, target producers n=205*)
2. Tier Two Sample (**n=287**): Evaluate **Adoption** of management practices amongst a sample of producers from 3,418 participants from one or more of the MLA courses/programs since July 2006. These contacts were drawn from from MLA's own database of **known participants** from all five MLA programs or course groups from July 2006 to June 2007.

This survey has resulted in a cumulative MLA course participant sample of **n=636**.
(*MLA course participant sample, target producers n=280*)

Based on this approach the project had two critical elements, the first is the detailed sample construction that mirrored the 2006 survey and satisfied the validity issues required. Secondly was the design of the questionnaire and implementation of the survey using telephone interviewing.

The survey instrument was designed using a master questionnaire and code-frame response mechanism that directed specific questions at each of the target segments. The actual survey was managed using CATI (Computer Assisted Telephone Interviewing) methodology. Telephone interviewing (field-work) was undertaken by Interviewing Australia (ekas) with their senior analyst also undertaking all data processing.

- Screeners were employed to ensure respondents qualified for the survey in terms of enterprise mix and type. Where respondents had less than 100 hectares the interview was terminated (refer to the questionnaire contained in the appendix).
- Those respondents who were course participants only completed those sections of the survey applicable to their situation.

The detailed data tables generated were collated to represent the findings by producer segment, age, decision-making capacity, psychographic segments, state, and for course participants, by courses/programs attended.

Segmentation of the sample and resulting data was a key driver in the design of the survey. Aspects of the industry that influenced the sample included:

- Producer segments – Northern Beef, Southern Beef and Southern Sheep
 - Included in the random sample quota were producer locations - High Rainfall, Wheat/Sheep, & Pastoral zones) representing the same production regions as the 2006 KPI survey and 2005 LPI Awareness & Adoption survey
- MLA membership
- Psychographic profile including, Innovator, Early Adopter, Early Majority, Late Majority and Laggards (Rogers, E.M. (2003), *Diffusion of Innovations*, Free Press, NY)

Applying the psychographic profile to the sample of producers involved evaluation of producer's responses to Q9.3 through to Q9.5. Respondents were asked to identify their sources of information, adoption of new technology, level of participation in research programs as well as their level of involvement in the decision making process.

Table 1: Matrix of Predicted Response by Psychographic Segment

	Innovator	Early Adopter	Early Majority	Late Majority	Laggard
Q9.3 Have you ever participated in collaborative research programs with Universities, State DPI, MLA, AWI, GRDC, or some other research body?	Yes	No	No	No	No
Q9.4 On average, approximately how many new technologies have you adopted or management practices have you changed per year across your business over the last 5-10 years? (eg 0-1, 1-2, 2-5, >5 NB not sure if this is an appropriate range)	top 25% tier	25%-50% tier	50-75% tier	75-100% tier	None
Q9.4 From what source do you generally first hear about most new technologies or management practices? (eg rural newspapers, farm magazines, ABC radio, DPI, stock & station agent, rural merchant, state farmer organization, MLA, AWI, family member, producer network or group, other individual producers, workshops or seminars, internet, other)	Technical farm publications Conferences	Colleagues Farmer organisation Producer network or group Workshops	Workshops or seminars MLA, AWI etc	Stock or Station Agent DPI, AWI, MLA	Where not elsewhere allocated
Q9.5 Who or what do you generally rely on when you need advice about how to use or apply most new technologies or management practices? (eg family member, DPI, stock & station agent, rural merchant, farm consultant, accountant, bank, state farmer organization, MLA, AWI, family member, producer network or group, other individual producers, workshops or seminars, internet, other)	Technical professionals (MLA or AWI)	Technical Professionals (MLA/AWI) Producer network or group	Workshop or seminars Farm consultant	Farm consultant Other	Where not elsewhere allocated

Note: Q9.4 was inadvertently excluded from the 2007 survey; the psychographic profile was created using the remaining three questions.

Respondents were included in the psychographic segment where they had the most matches based on the question response matrix.

After discussion with LPI the relevance and application of this data was questioned, it was agreed that it is interesting but difficult to act on in any practical sense as no producer is specifically identified as a member of any of these psychographic segments for any particular management practice.

3.1 Sample Overview

3.1.1 Sample Profile and Demographics

MLA defines the market into four distinct grazing enterprise types that encompass the targeted primary industries of beef, sheep and goats.

Table 2: Definition of Targeted Industry/Producer Segments

Northern Beef producers	All beef cattle producers in Queensland, Northern Territory, and the Kimberley/Pilbara regions of Western Australia
Southern Beef producers	All beef cattle producers in New South Wales, Victoria, South Australia, southern Western Australia and Tasmania
Southern Sheep & Lamb producers	All sheep producers in New South Wales, Victoria, South Australia, southern Western Australia and Tasmania that are producing sheep or lambs for the red meat industry.
Goat producers⁶	All goat producers in New South Wales, Victoria, South Australia, southern Western Australia and Tasmania that are producing goats for the red meat industry.

The previous samples for the 2005 LPI survey and 2006 KPI Survey were drawn only from these producer segments. This approach has been repeated for the **KPI 2007 Survey** to ensure the findings reflect changes for each producer segment directly.

Axiom constructed an overall sample of targeted producers from their database of livestock producers known as FARMbase[®], using the available contacts detailed below.

Table 3: FARMbase[®] Sample Profile (Available Contact Counts July 2007)

State:	Grain Sheep & Beef	Sheep & Beef	Sheep	Beef	Livestock (Equine, Pork, other)	TOTAL:
TOTALS:	24,569	6,942	10,598	27,971	2,185	72,265

This producer profile from FARMbase was based on ABS industry definitions. In order to qualify for one of the three MLA industry segments, respondents were screened on the basis of the significance of their key enterprise to their overall income. In the case of livestock operations the dominant enterprise was easily identified, however in mixed cereal farming situations respondents were segmented on the basis of respondents own ranking of their dominant livestock enterprise⁷.

⁶ A very small sample of goat producers was obtained, they appear in the Southern Sheep data and in the tables as a separate enterprise type.

⁷ Refer to the questionnaire Section 1: Q1.

Table 4: Sample Profile by Target Industry Segment

The table below represents details of producer segments and *targeted* sample sizes to statistically evaluate variations within segments. The actual sample sizes obtained are also included in bold.

	Tier 1: FARMbase Contacts		Tier 2: MLA Course Contacts	
Producer Segment:	Awareness		Adoption/Management Change	
Northern Beef	<i>n=50</i>	<i>n=49</i>	<i>n=15⁸</i>	<i>n=97</i>
Southern Beef	<i>n=70</i>	<i>n=79</i>	<i>n=130</i>	<i>n=81</i>
Southern Sheep/Lamb	<i>n=70</i>	<i>n=74</i>	<i>n=120</i>	<i>n=102</i>
Goats	<i>n=15</i>	<i>n=10</i>	<i>n=15</i>	<i>n=7</i>
	<i>n=205</i>	<i>n=206</i>	<i>n=280</i>	<i>n=287</i>

The **Tier 1** (Awareness) sample of *n=205* and **Tier 2** (Adoption) sample target of *n=280* has been determined using a minimum sample requirement of *n=50* within each industry segment (this sample base has also been applied to each course segment within the overall quota construct), this is a minimum sample size that will satisfy a 90% confidence interval where response mean distribution (margin of error) is likely to be relatively small or narrow (within 10%).

Note that in Tier 1 some producers were also running goats, these respondents have been counted once in the total but have been included under goats and their other livestock enterprise, however it appears that in 2007 at least *n=2* respondents are involved only in goat production.

The Tier 2 sample aimed to include a representative sample of producers who have participated in PIRDS *n=50*, EDGENetwork *n=50*, More Beef from Pastures *n=50*, Prime Time *n=50*, Cost of Production workshops *n=50* and Beef Up forums *n=30*. **Note: these minimum target sample bases were subject to availability from contact lists**, in most cases these targets have been exceeded however with PIRD's and COP a small sample frame has meant a lower sample was obtained.

Table 5: Available Course Participant Contacts (Source MLA)

MLA Course/Program classifications:	Course Participants List Pre July 2005 (N=5,361)	Course Participants List July 2005 – June 2006 (N=3,080)	2006 Weighted Sample as % of Course Participants	Course Participants List July 2006 – June 2007 (N=3,418)	2007 Weighted Sample as % of Course Participants
More Beef from Pastures	N=1,259	N=819	25%	N=2,231	65%
Prime Time		N=665	8%	N=142	4%
PIRD's		N=109	1%	N=356	10%
EDGENetwork	N=4,102	N=1,447	66%	N=399	12%
COP		N=40	-	N=131	4%
Beef Up Forums	-	-	-	N=159	5%

⁸ Northern Beef producer contacts exceeded initial expectations List which were based on lower than usual participant lists.

The percentage distribution shown here was based on weighted course participants, the actual sample of course participants was structured to provide a representative sample by course that was then weighted to represent the number of course participants. This meant that where participant numbers were low, a valid sample was obtained from which the weighted findings were calculated (i.e. whilst EDGenetwork participants represent 12% of all MLA course participants overall, the sample obtained is $n=95$, this equates to 33% of the total Tier 2 sample).

Note: It is again apparent that the aggregation of course participation lists for the purpose of undertaking the survey may not have included all participants from all courses (refer to recommendations for comments on this situation).

Livestock producers ($n=493$) as presented in table 6 participated in the **KPI 2007 Survey**. These respondents made up the 2 sample tiers to accurately represent awareness and adoption.

Table 6: Actual Sample Segmentation

		NSW/ ACT	VIC	QLD	SA/NT	WA	TAS	North Beef	South Beef	South Sheep	Goats
Total Sample:	$n=493$	105	64	135	102	62	25	146	160	185	2
Tier 1 (Awareness)	$n=206$	45	20	41	40	40	20	49	79	76	10
Tier 2 (Adoption)	$n=287$	60	44	94	62	22	5	97	81	109	7

The Tier 2 sample is larger than the 2006 sample⁹ to adequately represent the increasing number of program groups and sub groups of interest. Sample segments below $n=30$ should be treated with caution.

Note: The KPI 2006 survey process involved collecting separate samples from the pre July 2005 and post July 2005 course participants. That data was weighted to each of the known sample frame groups before being combined and included in the tables. This means that any variation in sample size does not bias the final results.

The sample of course participants from July 2006 to June 2007 has also been weighted to the total known number of participants.

⁹ No top-up sample of pre July 2005 course participants was included in the 2007 survey, instead cumulative adoption figures have been derived by aggregating results from all samples and creating a weighted average.

4 KPI 2007 Survey Results

4.1 MLA Program Awareness (KPI 2007 Tier 1 Sample n=206)

This aspect of the KPI project follows on closely from previous KPI and LPI surveys designed to determine producers unaided and aided awareness of the MLA programs as a means of evaluating the effectiveness of the overall communication strategy by LPI.

The KPI 2007 Survey evaluated course awareness from an independent random sample of **n=206** livestock producers, where producers with all levels of exposure to MLA had an equal chance of participation.

- Overall, **84%** of all respondents recalled one or more of the MLA Courses or Program(s) mentioned This represented a total increase of **11%** from **73%** in 2005 and a slight fall of 3% from the KPI 2006 survey.
- **38%** of respondents indicated an unprompted or **unaided awareness** of MLA Program(s), this represented an increase of **10%** from the 28% in 2006 and 15% from 23% in 2005.
- **78%** of respondents, when prompted, recalled one or more of the MLA Courses or Program(s) mentioned, this represented an increase of **15%** from **63%** in 2005 however it was slightly down on 84% in 2006.
- **16%** of respondents were unaware of any MLA Courses or Program(s), whilst this is significantly fewer than the levels in 2005 which were as high as 31% for Northern Beef, 27% for Southern Beef and 19% for Southern Sheep it represented a slight increase on the 2006 level of 13%.

The percentages represented below will not add to overall awareness, as nett¹⁰ prompted or aided responses will include producers recognising other programs not previously mentioned.

Note: The Total Awareness analysis counts each producer only once no matter how many programs they recall either aided or unaided

Table 7: Course/Program Awareness by Target Industry Segment (LPI 2005 and KPI 2006 & 2007)

	2005 Awareness (n=907)			2006 Awareness (n=204)			2007 Awareness (n=206)		
	Unaided	Aided	Total	Unaided	Aided	Total	Unaided	Aided	Total
Northern Beef Producers (2005 n=297, 2006 n=50, 2007 n=49)	19%	62%	67%	22%	74%	78%	33%	76%	84%
Southern Beef Producers (2005 n=321, 2006 n=73, 2007 n=79)	26%	60%	73%	29%	85%	86%	41%	80%	82%
Southern Sheep/Lamb Producers (2005 n=279, 2006 n=78, 2007 n=76)	26%	64%	80%	28%	90%	92%	39%	78%	86%
Total:	23%	62%	73%	28%	84%	87%	38%	78%	84%

¹⁰ Where courses recalled are from the same course group, eg EDGE, the nett result will remain the same however recall for those specific courses will increase.

The overall nett effect, was that **84%** of livestock producers surveyed were aware of one or more MLA program(s), awareness appears to have fallen slightly in the southern regions. Overall, awareness rose significantly from 2005, especially amongst Northern Beef producers, and remains high across all segments both aided and unaided.

There was a noticeable increase in unaided or unprompted awareness of MLA programs indicating that the language 'MLA programs' used in the 2007 questionnaire was more widely recognised or associated with MLA than in previous surveys. However, some confusion continued to exist regarding program names as the high aided or prompted results attest to.

Overall awareness by course/program was found to be as follows (NB expressed as a percentage of all producers, not just those for which each program is targeted).

Table 8: Unaided and Aided Course/Program Awareness Overall

MLA Course/Program classifications:	Unaided Awareness		Aided Awareness		Total Awareness	
	2006	2007	2006	2007	2006	2007
More Beef from Pastures	6%	14%	46%	35%	54%	46%
Prime Time (or Making More from Merino's)	3%	2%	36%	33%	38%	34%
PIRD's (or Producer Research Support)	2%	4%	36%	29%	38%	33%
EDGEnetwork (any EDGE or EDGEnetwork course)	8%	13%	60%	47%	62%	50%
COP (Cost of Production Workshops)	1%	3%	36%	36%	37%	39%
Non MLA Events (Courses conducted by organisations other than MLA where MLA contributed either course content or sponsorship)	1%	5%	27%	14%	28%	19%
Beef Up Forums	-	3%	-	18%	-	22%
MLA Publications	-	14%	-	44%	-	56%
Total:	28%	38%	84%	78%	87%	84%

(KPI 2006 Tier 1 Sample Base **n=204**, KPI 2007 Tier 1 Sample Base **n=206**)

Total awareness of each program by target industry segment was as follows (NB expressed as a percentage of those producers for which each program is targeted).

Table 9: Course/Program Awareness by Target Industry Segment

MLA Course/Program classifications:	Northern Beef		Southern Beef		Sheep/Lamb	
	2006	2007	2006	2007	2006	2007
More Beef from Pastures	44%	39%	60%	65%	54%	33%
Prime Time (or Making More from Merino's)	8%	8%	26%	32%	68%	55%
PIRD's (or Producer Research Support)	38%	33%	32%	37%	43%	29%
EDGEnetwork (any EDGE or EDGEnetwork course)	56%	53%	58%	51%	72%	49%
Cost of Production workshops	42%	29%	29%	42%	42%	43%
Non MLA Events (Courses conducted by organisations other than MLA where MLA contributed either course content or sponsorship)	14%	16%	32%	18%	33%	21%
Beef Up Forums	-	37%	-	25%	-	9%
MLA Publications	-	47%	-	67%	-	50%
Total:	78%	84%	86%	82%	92%	86%

(KPI 2006 Tier 1 Sample Base n=204, KPI 2007 Tier 1 Sample Base n=206)

Table 10: Course/Program Awareness by Target Industry Segment (Survey 2005 and Survey 2006)

MLA Course/Program classifications:	Northern Beef			Southern Beef			Sheep/Lamb			Total (n=907)	Total (n=204)	Total (n=206)
	2005	2006	2007	2005	2006	2007	2005	2006	2007	2005	2006	2007
More Beef from Pastures	-	44%	39%	61%	60%	65%	39%	54%	33%	-	54%	46%
Prime Time (or Making More from Merino's)	-	8%	8%	21%	26%	32%	65%	68%	55%	-	38%	34%
PIRD's (or Producer Research Support)	31%	32%	33%	32%	32%	37%	41%	43%	29%	35%	38%	33%
EDGE (any EDGE or EDGENetwork course)	49%	56%	53%	26%	58%	51%	31%	72%	49%	36%	62%	50%
Cost of Production workshops	-	42%	29%	-	29%	42%	-	42%	43%	-	37%	39%
Non MLA Events (Courses conducted by organisations other than MLA where MLA contributed either course content or sponsorship)	-	14%	16%	-	32%	18%	-	33%	21%	-	28%	19%
Beef Up Forums	-	-	37%	-	-	25%	-	-	9%	-	-	22%
MLA Publications	-	-	47%	-	-	67%	-	-	50%	-	-	56%
Total:	69%	78%	84%	73%	86%	82%	81%	92%	86%	73%	87%	84%

(KPI 2006 Tier 1 Sample Base n=204, KPI 2007 Tier 1 Sample Base n=206)

(refer data tables 6-8)

This year the KPI Survey included direct reference to MLA Publications as a source of information and inspiration for management change. The scope of this additional code frame included Tips & Tools / The variety of on-farm booklets such as Water Medication Manual, etc. Prograzier (southern producers), Feedback & Frontier magazine (northern producers only).

Clearly producers are very aware of these initiatives with **56%** overall recalling an MLA Publication and **47%** able to recall an MA Publication unprompted.

4.1.1 MLA Program Awareness by Psychographic Profile

Those producers in the **Early Majority** segment made up **38%** of the sample (compared with 33% in 2006), these coupled with the Innovators and Early Adopters were more aware of the MLA courses and program(s), however the level of course awareness amongst this segment had dropped since 2006.

- **54%** of the Early Majority segment was aware of EDGENetwork courses, this was down from 72% in 2006. High awareness of EDGE was consistent in each psychographic segment.
- **Innovators** are most aware (71%) of EDGE & MBfP courses, these had relatively high awareness across all psychographic segments.

Table 11: Course/Program Awareness by Psychographic Segment

MLA Course/Program classifications:	Total 100%	Innovators 12%	Early Adopters 13%	Early Majority 38%	Late Majority 34%	Laggards 3%
More Beef from Pastures	54% <i>n=110</i>	71% 20%	50% 7%	55% 34%	54% 32%	32% 7%
Prime Time (or Making More from Merino's)	34% <i>n=71</i>	29% 10%	62% 23%	35% 39%	27% 27%	17% 1%
PIRD's (or Producer Research Support)	33% <i>n=68</i>	33% 12%	42% 16%	33% 38%	31% 32%	17% 1%
EDGENetwork (any EDGE or EDGENetwork course)	50% <i>n=104</i>	71% 16%	52% 13%	54% 39%	41% 28%	50% 3%
Cost of Production workshops	39% <i>n=81</i>	54% 16%	42% 14%	39% 38%	32% 28%	50% 4%
Non MLA Events (Courses conducted by organisations other than MLA where MLA contributed either course content or sponsorship)	19% <i>n=39</i>	29% 18%	35% 23%	11% 23%	17% 31%	33% 5%
Beef Up Forums	22% <i>n=45</i>	38% 20%	15% 9%	22% 38%	21% 33%	- -
MLA Publications	56% <i>n=116</i>	75% 16%	69% 16%	56% 38%	46% 28%	50% 3%
Total:	84% (87%)*	87% (93%)	92% (94%)	85% (91%)	80% (86%)	67% (64%)

(Tier 1 Sample Base *n=206*)

**represents KPI 2006 results*

All figures at the top of each row are vertical percentages representing the proportion of the total percentage. Figures below these are horizontal percentages representing the proportion of the sample base.

(refer data table 8)

It is apparent from this analysis that communication strategies are reaching each of the profiles with the Laggard producers (low base 3%, *n=6*) least aware of some of MLA's key course and program streams.

Table 12: Course/Program Awareness by Psychographic Segment in Northern Beef Producers

MLA Course/Program classifications:	Total 100%	Innovators 12%	Early Adopters 8%	Early Majority 43%	Late Majority 35%	Laggards 2%
More Beef from Pastures	39% <i>n=19*</i>	67% 21%	25% 5%	38% 42%	35% 32%	-
PIRD's	33% <i>n=16*</i>	17% 6%	25% 6%	43% 56%	29% 31%	-
EDGE	53% <i>n=26</i>	83% 19%	50% 8%	48% 38%	53% 35%	-
Cost of Production workshops	29% <i>n=14*</i>	67% 29%	25% 7%	33% 50%	12% 14%	-
Beef Up Forums	37% <i>n=18*</i>	83% 28%	50% 11%	33% 39%	24% 22%	- -
MLA Publications	47% <i>n=23</i>	83% 22%	50% 9%	52% 48%	29% 22%	-
Total:	84%	100%	75%	86%	76%	-

(Tier 1 Northern Beef Sample Base *n=49*)

**Low sample base.*

Table 13: Course/Program Awareness by Psychographic Segment in Southern Beef Producers

MLA Course/Program classifications:	Total 100%	Innovators 10%	Early Adopters 10%	Early Majority 35%	Late Majority 38%	Laggards 6%
More Beef from Pastures	65% <i>n=51</i>	63% 10%	75% 12%	75% 41%	53% 31%	60% 6%
Prime Time	32% <i>n=25</i>	25% 8%	88% 28%	32% 36%	20% 24%	20% 4%
PIRD's	30% <i>n=29</i>	25% 7%	75% 21%	32% 31%	37% 38%	20% 3%
EDGE	51% <i>n=40</i>	50% 10%	75% 15%	46% 33%	60% 36%	15% 5%
Cost of Production workshops	42% <i>n=33</i>	50% 12%	63% 15%	32% 27%	40% 36%	60% 9%
Non MLA Events	18% <i>n=14*</i>	-	38% 21%	4% 7%	30% 64%	20% 7%
Beef Up Forums	25% <i>n=20*</i>	38% 15%	25% 10%	18% 25%	33% 50%	- -
MLA Publications	67% <i>n=53</i>	75% 11%	100% 15%	64% 34%	60% 34%	60% 6%
Total:	82%	75%	100%	86%	80%	60%

(Tier 1 Southern Beef Sample Base *n=79*)

**Low sample base.*

Table 14: Course/Program Awareness by Psychographic Segment in Southern Sheep/Lamb Producers

MLA Course/Program classifications:	Total 100%	Innovators 14%	Early Adopters 16%	Early Majority 41%	Late Majority 30%	Laggards -
More Beef from Pastures	32% <i>n=24*</i>	40% 17%	25% 13%	40% 50%	23% 21%	-
Prime Time	57% <i>n=42</i>	50% 12%	75% 21%	57% 40%	50% 26%	-
PIRD's	27% <i>n=20</i>	50% 25%	25% 15%	27% 40%	18% 20%	-
EDGE	49% <i>n=36</i>	80% 22%	42% 14%	60% 50%	23% 14%	-
Cost of Production workshops	45% <i>n=33</i>	50% 15%	42% 15%	50% 45%	36% 24%	-
Non MLA Events	22% <i>n=16*</i>	30% 19%	33% 25%	27% 50%	5% 6%	-
Beef Up Forums	9% <i>n=7*</i>	10% 14%	-	17% 71%	5% 14%	-
MLA Publications	51% <i>n=38</i>	70% 18%	58% 18%	50% 39%	41% 24%	-
Total:	86%	90%	92%	83%	82%	-

(Tier 1 Southern Sheep/Lamb Sample Base *n=76*)

(refer data tables 9-13)

4.1.2

4.1.3 MLA Program Awareness by Producer Segment

Previous MLA surveys tracked the changing level of awareness for its various courses and programs by target industry segment. However, variations in each of the surveys objectives, methodology and course focus has meant that not all courses conducted by MLA can be tracked longitudinally (denoted by *na* in the following tables).

- In **2007, 84%** of Northern Beef Producers were **aware** of MLA programs and courses, this represented an increase of 6% from 78% awareness in 2006, and 17% from 67% in 2005.
- This level of awareness was largely due to the continuing program activities, achieving 53% awareness, in addition to the Beef Up Forums which have recorded 37% awareness in this producer segment.
- The MLA Publications code was also widely recognised amongst Beef producers with **47%** of them indicating they were aware of one or more of the publications, eg. Feedback etc.

EDGENetwork course awareness was the result of obtaining a nett EDGE awareness from a random sample of producers. In 2005 the questionnaire prompted respondents to identify

levels of awareness for specific EDGE courses in the target regions. This process was repeated in 2006 and 2007 to support the validity of the nett EDGE results comparison.

Table 15: Northern Beef Producers

Awareness - Northern Beef Producers	2003/2004 survey	2005 survey (n=297)	2006 survey (n=50)	2007 survey (n=49)
Total Awareness:	na	69%	78%	84%
PIRDS	35%	31%	38%	33%
<i>BeefPlan</i>	55%	46%	na	na
Nett EDGE:	na	49%	56%	53%
<i>EDGEnetwork</i>	26%	21%	14%	29%
<i>Breeding EDGE</i>	21%	19%	na	22%
<i>Nutrition EDGE// Northern Nutrition</i>	40%	31%	48%	27%
<i>Grazing Land Management</i>	50%	26%	42%	35%
<i>Selling EDGE</i>	14%	14%	na	na
<i>Marketing EDGE</i>	35%	26%	na	na
Non MLA Events	na	na	14%	16%
Beef Up Forum	na	na	na	37%
None (No Awareness of Programs at all)	na	31%	22%	16%

□ **82%** of Southern Beef producers were aware of MLA programs in 2007, this is down slightly on 2006 when 86% of Southern Beef producers were aware of MLA programs. This represented an increase of 9% from 73% in 2005 for all programs promoted to this target segment.

Table 16: Southern Beef Producers

Awareness - Southern Beef Producers	2003/2004 survey	2005 survey	2006 survey	2007 survey
	Southern Sheep & Beef	Southern Beef (n=321)	Southern Beef (n=73)	Southern Beef (n=79)
Total Awareness:	<i>na</i>	73%	86%	82%
PIRDS	33%	32%	32%	37%
Prime Time or Making More from Merinos	<i>na</i>	27%	26%	32%
More Beef from Pastures	<i>na</i>	61%	60%	65%
MLA Publications	-	-	-	67%
Nett EDGE:	<i>na</i>	26%	58%	51%
<i>EDGEnetwork</i>	29%	25%	32%	25%
<i>Prograze</i>	65%	<i>na</i>	40%	32%
<i>Effective Breeding</i>	27%	<i>na</i>	<i>na</i>	<i>na</i>
<i>Bizcheck for Meat</i>	31%	<i>na</i>	<i>na</i>	<i>na</i>
<i>Enterprise Health Check</i>	12%	<i>na</i>	<i>na</i>	<i>na</i>
<i>Beef Cheque Yr2</i>	<i>na</i>	<i>na</i>	18%	1%
<i>Beef Cheque Yr3</i>	<i>na</i>	<i>na</i>	<i>na</i>	3%
<i>Lamb Cheque</i>	<i>na</i>	<i>na</i>	8%	1%
Cost of Production	<i>na</i>	<i>na</i>	29%	42%
Non MLA Events	<i>na</i>	<i>na</i>	32%	18%
Beef Up Forums	-	-	-	25%
None (No Awareness of Programs at all)	<i>na</i>	27%	14%	18%

The **2007** KPI survey revealed that **85%** of Sheep/Lamb producers were aware of MLA programs. This was slightly down on the 2006 result where 92% of Sheep/Lamb producers were aware of MLA programs and courses. The 2007 result represents a 5% increase on the 80% result in 2005.

Table 17: Sheep/Lamb Producers

Awareness - Sheep/Lamb Producers	2003/2004 survey	2005 survey (n=279)	2006 survey (n=78)	2007 survey (n=76)
Total Awareness:	<i>na</i>	80%	92%	86%
PIRDS	<i>na</i>	41%	42%	29%
Prime Time or Making More from Merinos	38%	65%	68%	55%
MLA Publications	<i>na</i>	<i>na</i>	<i>na</i>	50%
Nett EDGE:	<i>na</i>	31%	72%	49%
<i>EDGEnetwork</i>	<i>na</i>	30%	33%	30%
<i>Prograze</i>	<i>na</i>	<i>na</i>	49%	26%
<i>Effective Breeding</i>	<i>na</i>	<i>na</i>	<i>na</i>	<i>na</i>
<i>Lamb Cheque</i>	<i>na</i>	<i>na</i>	17%	4%
<i>Wean More Lambs</i>	<i>na</i>	<i>na</i>	54%	26%
Cost of Production	<i>na</i>	<i>na</i>	43%	43%
Non MLA Events	<i>na</i>	<i>na</i>	33%	21%
None (No Awareness of Programs at all)	<i>na</i>	19%	8%	16%

Overall Awareness by MLA Membership Status

The KPI 2007 & 2006 surveys did not set out to gather a representative sample of members versus non-members. However, the survey has randomly recorded the membership status of the sample.

- **71%** of those respondents interviewed in the 2007 Tier 1 sample (*n*=206) indicated they were MLA Members (received Feedback magazine), this figure is likely to be more accurate than the 2006 result of 79% which was regarded as overstating the actual level of membership, representing producers perception of their membership status.
- **93%** of members were aware of one or more MLA courses or program(s), this is minor an increase of 3% on 90% in 2006 and represented an increase of 13% since the 2005 survey.
- **61%** of members were aware of the EDGEnetwork courses and **54%** were aware of More Beef from Pastures, **68%** of members were also aware of MLA Publications, this is now the most widely recognised MLA initiative by members.

- ❑ Awareness amongst non-members also increased with **63%** of non-members indicating awareness of one or more MLA courses, up from 59% in 2006 and representing an increase of **14%** since the 2005 survey.
- ❑ **28%** of non-members were aware of MBfP and **24%** were aware of EDGenetwork.

Table 18: Course/Program Awareness by Membership Status

	2005 Awareness (n=907)		2006 Awareness (n=204)		2007 Awareness (n=201)*	
	Member	Non Member	Member	Non Member	Member (n=147)	Non Member (n=54)
<i>Aware of MLA Programs</i>	80%	49%	90%	59%	93%	63%
<i>None (No Awareness of Programs at all)</i>	19%	49%	10%	41%	7%	37%

(*In the Tier 1 sample, 2% or n=5 producers did not know if they were MLA members)

4.1.4 Attended any MLA Programs or Courses

The KPI 2007 survey also sought to understand what proportion of producers had attended an MLA program or course and if not what reason did they give for choosing not to participate in MLA extension programs.

- ❑ **21%** of those respondents interviewed in the 2007 Tier 1 sample (n=206) indicated they had in fact attended or participated in an MLA course or program. **79%** of respondents indicated they had not.

The KPI 2007 survey also sought to understand why producers chose not to participate in MLA extension programs. Some producers provided more than one reason for not being able to attend.

- ❑ **39%** of those respondents interviewed who did not attend any MLA courses indicated that **‘they had no time’**.
- ❑ **19%** of non-attendees indicated they **‘did not know about’** the courses, **11%** indicated the **‘topics were of no interest’** to them and **15%** said the courses were **‘too far away’**.
- ❑ Only **6%** of non-attendees cited the **drought** as preventing them from attending any MLA course or program.
- ❑ **4%** indicated courses were too expensive, **3%** said they were **too old** to worry about change and **4%** had been to a course before.

(refer to survey data tables MLA_KPI_2007_Tables_07.doc)

4.2 Change in Management Practices (Tier 2 Sample n=287)

4.2.1 Management Changes Overall (Adoption)

Adoption of MLA target management practices either through the tools and procedures of the More Beef from Pastures manual or like recommendations in other courses is referred to in the KPI brief as a **change in management practice**.

The KPI **2007** Survey has sampled **n=287** course attendees to determine if course participation directly influenced a change in management or adoption of new management practices. When included in the cumulative sample from the 2006 survey this sample base becomes **n=636**.

- In **2007**, **64%** of aggregated course participants surveyed (cumulative sample of participants drawn from the 2006 and 2007 KPI surveys¹¹) indicated they have changed management practices as a direct result of attending one or more of the MLA course or programs they had attended.
- This result is slightly down on the same **2006** result of **67%**, this cumulative result does not recognise the effectiveness of the most recent MLA courses in influencing course participants to change management practices.
 - Of those producers surveyed who attended courses during the 2006-2007 sample interval, **58%** of course participants indicated they have changed management practices as a direct result of attending one or more of the MLA course or programs nominated. This 2007 result was **8%** higher than the previous 2005-2006 period where **50%** of course participants changed practices. This result could have been higher and is the result of fewer southern producers implementing change and a greater proportion (not necessarily larger numbers) of Northern Beef producers making changes to management practices as a result of MLA course attendance.
- By comparison, the 2005 LPI Awareness & Adoption survey indicated that of those who had attended an MLA program (**n=208**), **65%** initiated a change in management practice as a result of attending that course.

Table 19: Management Practice Change by Target Industry Segment

Producer Segments:	2005 Survey		2006 Survey		2007 Survey	
	Changed	Did Not Change	Changed	Did Not Change	Changed	Did Not Change
Northern Beef Producers	64%	36%	57%	43%	77%	23%
Southern Beef Producers	64%	36%	65%	35%	48%	52%
Southern Sheep Producers	66%	34%	74%	26%	58%	42%
Total :	65%	35%	67%	33%	64%	36%

(2005 LPI Sample Base **n=208**, KPI 2006 Tier 2 aggregated sample **n=349**, KPI 2007 Tier 2 Sample Base **n=287**, Cumulative Sample **n=636**)

(refer to survey data tables **MLA_KPI_2007_Tables_Combined_05-07.doc**)

Note - The 2005 results for management change was a general question and was not directly linked to the courses respondents had participated in, whereas the KPI 2006 and

¹¹ Sample frame has been constructed from course attendance files provided by MLA in July 2005, June 2006 and again in June 2007.

2007 surveys specifically addressed this question. The 2007 result is based on a cumulative sample of respondents and is weighted to the sum of course participants which each survey aimed to evaluate.(refer combined data tables 21)

Management Changes by Course/Program

- The overall results are remarkably consistent with the KPI 2006 surveys findings, however the overall rate of adoption or management practice change is stable at **64%**¹².
- **38% of all course participants** were influenced specifically by EDGENetwork workshops to change management practices, down from 49% in 2006 (this equates to 71% of EDGE workshop attendees¹³).
 - The EDGENetwork program has numerous courses and workshops attracting the largest number of producers (42% of known course participants, down from 66% in 2006), as such EDGE has had the most impact on producers when influencing change.
- The MBfP program has had an increasing impact on management change recording an increase of 7% to **20%** amongst all course participants (this equates to 50% of MBfP course attendees). This change is particularly significant in the southern livestock sectors.
- The MBfP program accounted for **22%** of course participants overall.

Table 20: Management Practice Change by Course/Program & Target Industry Segment

MLA Course/Program classifications:	Northern Beef		Southern Beef		Sheep/Lamb		Total:	
	2006 (n=78, 22%)	2007 (n=174, 27%)	2006 (n=126, 36%)	2007 (n=207, 37%)	2006 (n=145, 42%)	2007 (n=254, 40%)	2006 (n=349)	2007 (n=636)
More Beef from Pastures	7%	7%	21%	29%	5%	10%	13%	20%
Prime Time/Making More from Merinos	-	-	1%	-	13%	14%	5%	5%
PIRD's/Producer Research Support	1%	3%	-	1%	2%	4%	1%	2%
EDGE/EDGENetwork workshops	49%	46%	45%	32%	55%	43%	49%	38%
Cost of Production	-	-	-	-	-	2%	-	1%
Non MLA Events	-	-	1%	1%	2%	2%	1%	1%
Beef Up Forums	-	4%	-	-	-	-	-	1%
Changed:	57%	59%	65%	61%	74%	72%	67%	64%
Did Not Change	43%	41%	35%	39%	26%	28%	33%	36%
Total:	100%		100%		100%		100%	100%

¹² Based on aggregated sample representing the trend in change rather than year on year fluctuations.

¹³ Refer table 21 on following page.

(Tier 2 2007 Cumulative Sample **n=636**)

Figures represented in table 20 refer to results obtained from the aggregated sample, ie representing results from course participants from the past 3 survey intervals.

(refer combined data tables 22)

Management Changes as a Result of Course Attendance

The KPI 2007 Survey asked producers if they had changed any of their management practices as a **direct** result of participating in the specific course or program(s) they indicated they had attended. This approach aimed to **link change** directly with specific **course attendance**.

- **EDGENetwork** has the most influence on change with **71%** of EDGE workshop attendees indicating that these programs motivated them to adopt new management practices and/or implement changes to existing practices.
- **MBfP** had increases its influence with **50%** of participants indicating management changed in comparison with 44% in 2006. **COP** also improved its effectiveness with an increase from 30% in 2006 to **46%** in 2007.

Table 21: Management Practice Change by Course/Program and Program Participants

MLA Course/Program classifications:	Course Participants		% of Course Participants who Changed Management Practices	
	2006 (n=349)	2007 (n=636)	2006	2007
More Beef from Pastures	n=85	n=140	44%	50%
Prime Time/Making More from Merinos	n=70	n=81	47%	49%
PIRD's/Producer Research Support	n=32	n=79	72%	56%
EDGE/EDGENetwork workshops	n=205	n=265	69%	71%
Cost of Production	n=11	n=35	30%	46%
Beef Up Forum	-	n=35	-	46%

(Tier 2 Cumulative Sample **n=636**)

(*Note: The participants represented who did not change management practices as a result of attending the specified program, did not change as a result of attending any other course or program. Some specified course participants changed management practices as a result of also attending other courses, refer to tables for details).

These figures represent only a minor shift in the overall level of management practice change from the 2005 survey, increasing only **2%** from **65%** in 2005 to **67%** in 2006 and a falling slightly to **64%** in **2007**.

(refer combined data tables 21-22)

4.2.2 Management Changes Compared with 2005 EDGE/More Beef from Pastures Survey

Table 22: Management Change 2005 V's 2006 V's 2007

MLA Course/Program classifications:	2005 EDGE & More Beef from Pastures Outcomes	2006 Course/Program Outcomes	2007 Course/Program Outcomes
	Changed Management Practices	Changed Management Practices	Changed Management Practices
More Beef from Pastures	37%	44%	50%
Prime Time	-	47%	49%
EDGE	78%	69%	71%

(2005 EDGE & More Beef from Pastures Sample Base $n=300$, 2006 Tier 2 Aggregate Sample $n=349$, 2007 Tier 2 Cumulative Sample $n=636$)

4.2.3 Management Changes of Course Attendees by Producer Segment

Table 23: Management Change by Northern Beef Producers

MLA Course/Program classifications:	Northern Beef Producers			
	Course Participants		Course Participants Who Changed Management Practices	
	2006 ($n=78$)	2007 ($n=174$)	2006	2007
PIRD's	$n=8^*$	$n=15$	75%	73%
EDGE/EDGENetwork workshops	$n=69$	$n=120$	54%	55%
Beef Up Forums	-	$n=35$	-	46%

Table 24: Management Change by Southern Beef Producers

MLA Course/Program classifications:	Southern Beef Producers			
	Course Participants		Course Participants Who Changed Management Practices	
	2006 ($n=126$)	2007 ($n=207$)	2006	2007
PIRD's	$n=6^*$	$n=20$	67%	35%
EDGE/EDGENetwork workshops	$n=60$	$n=59$	74%	79%
Cost of Production	$n=4^*$	$n=4$	47%	100%

Table 25: Management Change by Southern Sheep/Lamb Producers

MLA Course/Program classifications:	Sheep/Lamb Producers			
	Course Participants		Course Participants Who Changed Management Practices	
Prime Time	<i>n=67</i>	<i>n=79</i>	45%	50%
PIRD's	<i>n=18</i>	<i>n=44</i>	72%	61%
EDGE	<i>n=76</i>	<i>n=86</i>	75%	75%
Cost of Production	<i>n=7</i>	<i>n=31</i>	14%	40%

(*low sample base)

(refer combined data tables 24, 26 & 28)

Management Changes by Psychographic Profile

The proportion of each segment identified in the survey as changing management practices was as follows:

- ❑ **Innovators** represent 15% of the sample, **71%** of the Innovators who have participated in MLA courses/programs have implemented management change or adopted new management practices as a result of attending.
- ❑ **Early Adopters** (14% of the sample), of these **65%** implemented change.
- ❑ **Early Majority** (44% of the sample), of these **66%** implemented change.
- ❑ **Late Majority** (24% of the sample), of these **59%** implemented change.
- ❑ **Laggards** (3% of sample), of these **40%** implemented change.

These proportions correlate very closely with the 2006 psychographic profile and show no significant differences to previous evaluations. Evaluating the level of change or adoption using the psychographic profile highlights the profile of course participants and the need to recognise the time required to implement change.

Table 26: Management Change by Psychographic Segment

MLA Course/Program classifications:	Sample Segments					
	Total Sample (n=636, 100%)	Innovators (n=95, 15%)	Early Adopters (n=90, 14%)	Early Majority (n=281, 44%)	Late Majority (n=151, 24%)	Laggards (n=18, 3%)
More Beef from Pastures	50% 100%	35% 28%	17% 12%	21% 44%	10% 14%	15% 12%
Prime Time	49% 100%	5% 16%	4% 11%	5% 50%	2% 14%	13% 8%
PIRD's	56% 100%	2% 11%	5% 29%	2% 44%	1% 14%	2% 3%
EDGE	71% 100%	29% 12%	42% 16%	39% 43%	43% 29%	19% 1%
COP	46% 100%	2% 35%	-	1% 31%	1% 34%	-
Beef Up Forums	46% 100%	0% 6%	0% 6%	1% 63%	1% 25%	-
Change:	64%	71%	65%	66%	59%	40%
No Change:	36%	29%	35%	34%	41%	60%
Total:	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

(Tier 2 Cumulative Sample n=636)

A total of **71%** of Innovators implemented management change and **29%** of Innovators implemented management change as a result of attending an EDGE workshop, conversely of all respondents attending EDGE courses, **71%** have implemented a management change, of these 12% are Innovators.

(refer combined data tables 21).

4.2.4 Management Practice Changes after Attending MLA Courses or Programs

Table 27: Percentage of Course Attendees who Changed Management Practices

Management Practice:	PIRD's	Nett EDGE	Prime Time	More Beef from Pastures	COP	Beef Up Forums	Pro graze	Beef Cheque	Grazing Land Management	Nutrition EDGE	Total:
Grazing Management	32% <i>(22%)</i>	48% -	27% <i>16%</i>	41% <i>45%</i>	15% -	22% -	62% <i>63%</i>	67% <i>67%</i>	50% <i>50%</i>	14% <i>14%</i>	43% <i>31%</i>
Reproductive Management	12% <i>(9%)</i>	8% -	7% <i>5%</i>	1% -	21% -	22% -	10% <i>11%</i>	9% <i>9%</i>	6% -	4% <i>3%</i>	6% <i>4%</i>
Supplementary feeding and Nutrition	23% <i>(30%)</i>	21% -	33% <i>24%</i>	12% <i>17%</i>	16% -	39% -	14% <i>14%</i>	- -	- -	64% <i>64%</i>	19% <i>14%</i>
Calving, lambing or weaning times	19% <i>(9%)</i>	18% -	19% <i>25%</i>	18% <i>8%</i>	26% -	39% -	14% <i>14%</i>	24% <i>24%</i>	3% -	4% <i>3%</i>	18% <i>11%</i>
Management or preparation of sires	5% <i>(9%)</i>	3% -	1% -	1% -	- -	- -	- -	5% <i>5%</i>	- -	- -	2% <i>2%</i>
Genetic Selection	14% <i>(4%)</i>	4% -	9% <i>3%</i>	6% <i>9%</i>	- -	17% -	- -	5% <i>5%</i>	- -	- -	5% <i>3%</i>
Natural Resource Management	7% -	3% -	3% <i>5%</i>	4% <i>1%</i>	10% -	- -	- -	5% <i>5%</i>	24% <i>25%</i>	- -	3% <i>1%</i>
Animal Health Practices	7% -	7% -	9% <i>8%</i>	9% <i>10%</i>	10% -	- -	- -	9% <i>9%</i>	- -	3% <i>3%</i>	8% <i>5%</i>
Pasture Management	26% -	28% -	16% <i>7%</i>	36% <i>40%</i>	9% -	28% -	48% <i>47%</i>	20% <i>20%</i>	34% <i>25%</i>	22% <i>22%</i>	29% <i>18%</i>
Marketing & Finance	8% <i>(4%)</i>	15% -	2% <i>5%</i>	6% -	34% <i>50%</i>	11% -	5% <i>5%</i>	17% <i>17%</i>	3% -	2% <i>3%</i>	11% <i>8%</i>
Chemical & Fertiliser	2% -	5% -	3% -	2% <i>1%</i>	- -	- -	4% <i>4%</i>	14% <i>14%</i>	3% -	- -	4% <i>3%</i>
Feed Management	5% -	- -	1% -	- -	5% -	6% -	- -	- -	3% -	1% -	1% -
General Stock Management	7% -	- -	- -	- -	10% -	11% -	- -	- -	- -	- -	1% -

(Tier 2 Cumulative Sample n=636)

Percentages in **bold** represent the proportion of all survey participants who have changed management practices at the conclusion of the 2007 survey. Those percentages in *italics* refer to the same results for the 2006 survey.

As the 2005 and 2006 survey indicated, the 2007 survey continues to identify grazing management, pasture management, supplementary feeding & nutrition practices as the main management practices where producers have made changes. Interestingly there appears to be an increase in management practices associated with calving, lambing & weaning times.

(refer combined data tables 31 & 32).

4.2.5 Why did the MLA course not influence management practice change?

In the KPI 2007 Survey respondents who had not made any changes to management practices (**36%** of **course participants**) were asked to indicate why they had not done so. Many respondents provided more than one reason for not implementing change.

- **27%** indicated they felt they were '**already doing**' the management practices being represented in the course content.
- **16%** indicated the **drought conditions** were preventing them from implementing change.
- **18%** felt the management practices being promoted did **not suit** their existing enterprise structure or operations.
- **5%** felt they were doing **OK** without the changes, **4%** indicated they did not have the **financial resources** to effect change, **9%** were **still thinking about it** and **2%** needed to **talk with someone** further before implementing change.
- **4%** indicated they were **uncertain about benefits** of change.
- **6%** felt they had received **no new information** as a result of attending, **3%** felt their own practices were **more advanced** than those being proposed, **2%** felt they did not need to change.

(refer to **MLA_KPI_2007 & MLA_KPI_2007_Combined_05-07 data tables**)

4.2.6 More Beef from Pastures Course Influence

In the KPI 2007 survey a separate section addressed the impact of the More Beef from Pasture courses, more specifically the manual or CD. **This data refers only to the 2007 MBfP sample, it is not cumulative data.**

- **48% of More Beef from Pastures** course participants interviewed made changes to management practices, up from 44% in 2006, **19%** of producers indicated they **sought further advice** before making any changes.

More Beef from Pastures course participants were questioned whether they received a manual or CD and which modules they have read as well as what procedures and tools have they adopted as a result.

- Of those More Beef from Pastures participants interviewed in 2007 (*n*=65), **79%** indicated they received a More Beef from Pastures manual.
- Of those 79% of More Beef from Pastures course participants who received a manual, **83%** read 1 or more modules:
 - **17%** did **not read** any modules.
 - **29%** read >5 modules, **11%** read 4 modules, **7%** 3 modules, **17%** 2 modules and **7%** read only 1 module.
 - **12%** could **not recall** how many modules they had read.

Pasture growth and pasture utilisation were the 2 most read modules in the manual with **64%** of readers nominating the **pasture growth** module, **58%** of readers nominated **pasture utilisation**.

Table 28: MBfP Manual – Modules Read

More Beef from Pastures Manual Modules:	% of MBfP attendees who have read manual modules (<i>n</i>=42)
Setting Directions	37%
Tactical Stock Control	49%
Pasture Growth	64%
Pasture Utilisation	58%
Genetics	40%
Weaner Throughput	27%
Herd Health & Welfare	39%
Meeting Market Specifications	30%
Other (incl. Don't Know)	32%

(Tier 2 2007 MBfP Sample only, n=65)

- Of the **83%** of readers, **49%** also read the **Tactical Stock Control** module, **40%** read **Genetics**, **39%** read **Herd Health & Welfare** and **37%** read **Setting Directions**, however **18%** could not remember what modules they had read.

As a result of participating in the MBfP courses and reading the manual, readers were asked which **procedures** they had implemented:

- ❑ **27%** of manual readers indicated they ‘**manipulate pasture species composition** in each pasture zone to give best pasture growth and quality’.
- ❑ **18%** of readers indicated they carried out the ‘**Predict pasture availability** for a range of weather patterns and compare with stock requirements’ procedure. This means that **all course participants** implementing procedures implement this one.
- ❑ **16%** indicated they ‘**select a paddock and determine grazing duration** to achieve best utilization and animal performance targets’.
- ❑ **14%** indicated they ‘**take early or corrective action** when an excess or shortage of pasture is predicted’.
- ❑ **10%** indicated they carried out the ‘**manage the nutrition and health** of sale animals to meet target market specifications on time’ procedure.

Also as a result of participating in the MBfP courses and reading the manual, readers were asked which **tools & practices** they had used:

- ❑ **28%** of manual readers indicated they had used ‘**pasture rulers, sticks and meters**’.
- ❑ **22%** indicated they had used ‘**methods for setting pasture targets**, for slow rotations and set stocking’.
- ❑ **9%** has used tools as ‘**information sources** on pasture utilisation’.

When specifically asked which element of the MBfP extension program had the most influence on attendees, **36%** indicated the **manual** was most influential.

Table 29: Influence of MBfP Course Components

More Beef from Pastures Course Components:	More Beef from Pastures Course Attendees who made changes	Most Influence on More Beef from Pastures Course Attendees
	2006	2007
Workshop	64%	34%
Manual (CD Rom)	20%	36%
Other	37%	21%

(Tier 2 2007 MBfP Sample only, n=65)

Note: Question construct has changed slightly from the previous KPI 2006 Survey

The impact of MBfP tools and procedures appears to have had most impact on **productivity increases** and **better natural resource management**.

- ❑ **Productivity increase** was ranked **1st** as the most important aspect of their management with regard to change.
- ❑ **Better natural resource management** and **Profit** were also ranked (**2nd**) as significant areas of impact from MBfP.

Table 30: How did MBfP Tools & Procedures impact on grazing program

More Beef from Pastures tools & Procedure Outcomes:	In what way did MBfP tools & Procedures impact on grazing	How Producers ranked these in order of importance (mean ranking).
Productivity Increases	27%	1st
Profit	11%	2nd
Time savings	6%	6th
Turnover	11%	7th
Reduced overheads	8%	5th
Lower cost of production	13%	4th
Better natural resource management	23%	2nd
To early to tell	16%	

(Tier 2 2007 MBfP Sample only, n=65)

As previously mentioned **19%** of MBfP course participants sought further advice or information before making changes.

- ❑ **24%** indicated the most influence on their management change was the **MLA program**.
- ❑ **17%** nominated the **Dept. of Ag (DPI)**.
- ❑ **6%** indicated their **neighbour** and **8%** an **influential producer** as having the most influence.
- ❑ **15%** identified MBfP **coordinators** as having the most influence and a further **15%** nominated **producer forums**.
- ❑ **18%** nominated other **MLA publications** as being of most influence.

(for MBfP insights refer to MLA_KPI_2007_Tables_07, refer tables 39-71).

4.2.7 MLA Course attendance outcomes

The **impact of management change** as a result of MLA course attendance and participation were mainly seen as **very positive**:

- ❑ **19%** of participants said the changes had a **very positive impact** and a further **52%** said they had a **positive impact**.
- ❑ **18%** felt they had **no impact** at all and only **1%** indicated the changes had a negative impact.

The survey also explored in an open question what the **positive and negative outcomes** were that resulted from attending any of the courses.

Positives:

- ❑ **12%** of participants indicated the main positive outcome was that **'feeding strategies were better** and stock were matched to pasture'.
- ❑ **15%** said that **'income or profit had increased'**.

- ❑ **21%** indicated that **pasture management and improvement** had led to being able to run more stock.

Negatives:

- ❑ **7%** felt that '**advice was not drought applicable**'.
- ❑ **13%** had made **no changes** to management as a result of attending and this was felt to be a negative.
- ❑ **6%** felt that they needed more time or too much time to implement changes.

4.2.8 Areas of most Impact from MLA Courses

The 2007 KPI survey also sought to identify which key areas of farm management the MLA extension programs had the most impact on.

- ❑ **54%** of participants clearly identified **profitability** as the area that MLA courses had influenced the most.
- ❑ **Cost of Production** was regarded by **53% of participants** as the second most important area that MLA courses impacted on.
- ❑ **Prime time** appears to have had the most impact on participants in the area of **cost of production** with **85%** of course participants indicating that was where the course had the greatest impact.

Table 31: Areas MLA Information had greatest impact by Course Attendees

Areas of impact:	PIRD's	EDGE	Prime Time	More Beef from Pastures	COP	Beef Up Forums	Total:
	(n=47)	(n=95)	(n=20)	(n=65)	(n=25)	(n=35)	(n=287)
Profitability	66%	48%	70%	43%	80%	43%	54%
Environment	26%	44%	40%	32%	44%	37%	34%
Cost of Production	53%	56%	85%	50%	84%	40%	53%
Pasture persistence	45%	55%	30%	46%	48%	34%	46%
Lifestyle	17%	29%	20%	15%	20%	23%	17%
Labour Saving	15%	37%	35%	20%	24%	20%	18%

(Tier 2 2007 Sample only, n=287)

(for outcomes refer to MLA_KPI_2007_Tables_07, refer tables 72-79).

5 Conclusions and Recommendations

5.1 Conclusions

The objective of the KPI Survey was to evaluate the performance of the LPI communication and extension programs by measuring the level of awareness achieved amongst the general producer population, and the adoption by program participants of the management practices and knowledge being advocated within these programs. LPI also strives to increase the level of participation within these courses, a function of awareness and course content.

The LPI communication strategies aimed at reaching producers continue to have a significant impact on increasing the level of awareness amongst the target producer segments.

Overall **Awareness** of MLA courses has risen by **11%** to **84%** since the 2005 LPI Survey, this increase in overall course awareness was apparent in each of the producer segments.

- Overall, **84%** of all livestock producers surveyed recalling one or more of the MLA Courses or Program(s) mentioned actually represents a **decrease** of **3%** from **87%** in 2006. This figure should be regarded as being consistent with previous surveys.
- **16%** of respondents were unaware of any MLA Courses or Program(s), this was consistent with 2006 survey and is indicative that the task of achieving higher levels of awareness of MLA programs will be increasingly challenging. Whilst this is significantly fewer than the levels in 2005 it represents a slight increase on the 2006 level of 13%. **71%** of those respondents interviewed in the 2007 Tier 1 sample ($n=206$) indicated they were MLA Members (received Feedback magazine), this figure is likely to be more accurate than the 2006 result of 79% which was regarded as overstating the actual level of membership, representing producers perception of their membership status.

93% of members are aware of one or more MLA courses or program(s), this is a minor increase of 3% on 90% in 2006 and represents an increase of 13% since the 2005 survey.

Improving on this overall level of awareness will be difficult as it is likely to be close to saturation point. However, the significantly higher level of awareness amongst MLA members suggests that the communication strategy is clearly more effective with this segment of the population.

Adoption rates have fallen slightly overall from **67%** to **64%** of livestock producers surveyed indicating they had implemented management practice changes as a result of participating in an MLA course or program. This is consistent with 65% of producers identified in the 2005 LPI Survey.

- Attendance at an **EDGEnetwork** workshop motivated **71%** of participants to change management practices. This represented an increase of **2%** from the **69%** recorded in the 2006 KPI survey.
- **50%** of **More Beef from Pastures** program participants have now implemented management change, this represents a **6%** increase from **44%** in the 2006 KPI survey.
- Other courses evaluated have instigated management change, **PIRD's** motivated **56%** of participants to change management practices, **Prime Time** **49%** and **COP** **46%**.

- ❑ **43%** of program participants made changes to **Grazing management** practices, up from 31% in 2006, **19%** made changes to **Supplementary feeding & Nutrition** practices, up from 14%, and **29%** to **Pasture management** up from **18%**.

The process of changing management practice was also heavily influenced by the current seasonal conditions with 16% of course participants indicating the drought prevented them from implementing the changes they would like. Of more concern to the ongoing evaluation of management change was the proportion of participants who have already implemented the change being advocated, in the 2007 survey this was as high as 27% and inadvertently retards the efficacy of the survey process as an evaluation technique.

5.2 Recommendations

The recommendations from the 2005 survey discussed improving course content and embracing alternative communication channels to create a repeat impact, amongst the wider population of targeted producers, for the messages MLA is communicating to producers.

2007 producer awareness levels of MLA courses and programs indicate that these strategies continue to improve the unaided awareness of specific programs, LPI should continue to focus on clearly branding the key course streams and their content.

- ❑ Of critical importance is the management practice content being promoted within each program, the more applicable to current management challenges the more appealing the courses and programs will be.
- ❑ It is also clear that the time taken by producers to implement change will impact on the overall level of adoption when evaluated as a percentage of course attendees. Axiom recommend changes to the 2008 survey include question(s) identifying any previous course participation to the period being surveyed as well as any resulting management change.

As discussed in the 2006 survey the measurement of cumulative adoption or management change amongst course participants is a complicated one. At the conclusion of the 2006 survey Axiom discussed a number of ways of measuring adoption or management change. They included:

- ❑ As a % of all course attendees (aggregated sample) and graphed over time.
- ❑ As a rolling 12 month % (sample of attendees segmented by year of attendance and repeated). Graphed annually this will identify the rate of adoption over time.
- ❑ Possibly the simplest method will be as a % of all producers (subject to definition) and graphed over time. This can be done as a weighted analysis of course participants relative to the overall producer population.

The 2007 survey has adopted the first option using 3 data sets to construct a weighted average of management change relative to the total number of course participants. The other two are at this time difficult to employ on the basis that the information available for each course participant is in such a format that makes it almost impossible to tie them with previous course attendance and/or multiple course attendance in any given year. If this information were easily obtained and analysed much of the survey would involve only adoption questions relative to those courses participated in.

If this survey process is undertaken again in 2008, for the purposes of the cumulative adoption measure Axiom propose continuing with the a rolling sample format so that the 2005 data is removed from the data set and replaced with the 2008 data. This approach will in effect provide a moving cumulative total (based on 3 survey intervals) that would identify a current cumulative overall trend, either upwards or downwards.

To achieve a continuing increase in management change amongst course attendees it is apparent MLA must continue to focus on:

- Promotion of key course brands and so that MLA is recognised as the source of improved business practice in the livestock industry. Many producers indicate that management change does not come about as a direct result of course attendance, this could be a result of MLA peddling old news or MLA being only one source of influence.

In order to improve on the level of adoption of management change LPI needs to position courses as the definitive advice source, obviating the need for producers to seek further advice before implementing change.

- **44%** of surveyed producers (down from 52% last year) have **attended more than one MLA course/program**, this provides an opportunity to reinforce the new management practices being promoted as part of KPI Practices.
- **Promotion of courses/programs to members** continues to attract support. It is evident from the survey that a large proportion of livestock producers are already MLA Members, this valid figure of **71%** is only slightly fewer than the 79% measured dubiously last survey.

Database development

Following the 2006 Survey Axiom provided all merged data files in a suitable Access platform to MLA for the purpose of standardising the records of past course participants. This initiative has not aided the 2007 survey and in fact the participant list provided to Axiom in 2007 were inferior to previous lists and were inconsistent with the 2006 recommendation.

This database should encompass **all** MLA programs if their impact is to be evaluated using a sampling technique in the future.

- The format of this database is also critical to the ongoing viability of maintaining it. Axiom recommends that the database records an incidence of each persons participation in **any** extension programs including program name and date as well as a standardised contact format so that most of the input work is focussed on adding new course participation details.

If this database were available the KPI survey would simply be required to evaluate the level of adoption amongst course participants of certain key management practices that can be attributable to course material. With the inclusion of course dates, timelines for adoption can be more accurately determined.

This database initiative will add another analytical dimension to LPI's activities that can be used to provide much of the ongoing analysis MLA will need to promote courses and programs and measure their impact. For example:

- MLA will know at any given time the proportion of producers the course activity is reaching, with regular contact or follow up surveys of participants feeding the database a longitudinal tracking process will be able to measure course participation and plot the time it takes to implement change.
- This type of information will also assist in determining and managing the lifecycle of individual MLA courses.

The evaluation of LPI through KPI evaluation can continue to be undertaken using survey techniques as required, however the level of accuracy and the segmentation options for survey results will be improved if population information is provided in greater detail. Not only will a more comprehensive database of course participants improve the basis for sample design, it will also reduce the impact of survey fatigue that small populations suffer from.

- The methodology for future surveys is likely to remain with a telephone interview platform until such time as a suitable sample of email contacts can be established to move to the more efficient method of online self-completion surveying. This technique will work best in association with an established contact database that can be used to pre-populate questions.

6 Appendices

6.1 Appendix 1 Main data file(s) details

Word files containing SurveyCraft tables of the survey dataset. Various analysis perspectives have been required and due to the volume and complexity of the data several different data processing initiatives have been undertaken.

These have been included in the attached files.

- ❑ *MLA_2007_KPI_Tables_07*
- ❑ *MLA_2007_KPI_Tables_Combined_05-07*

Note: Data tables include filtered and cross tabulated information, if additional cross tabs or filters are required please contact Axiom Research.

6.2 Appendix 2 Questionnaire

The 2006 & 2007 KPI surveys are based on the original 2005 LPI questionnaire, designed in consultation with MLA. The 2007 survey incorporates much of the same profiling and segmentation protocols used in the 2005 LPI survey to ensure continuity of data and population representation.

MLA TARGET PRODUCER 2007 KPI AWARENESS & ADOPTION RESEARCH QUESTIONNAIRE V.2.7

INTRODUCTION

Good evening, my name is _____ from Axiom Research in Sydney.

I am calling on behalf of **Meat and Livestock Australia** to ask you some questions regarding your awareness of programs that MLA conduct to assist producers in their operations. Your input will help ensure that the right programs are being developed to meet both yours and the industry's needs.

IF FIRST NAME LISTED ASK:

INTRO Q#1. Am I speaking with *(insert contact name)*? **IF YES GO TO INTRO #2, IF NO ASK** May I speak with *(insert contact name)*? **IF YES** reintroduce to main contact and follow from **INTRO#1, if NO GO TO INTRO #2**

IF NO FIRST NAME LISTED ASK:

INTRO Q#2. Are you able to answer questions about livestock production on the property?
if NO ARRANGE CALL BACK.

REINTRODUCE AS NECESSARY

All responses are held in the strictest of confidence and are used for statistical purposes only.

INTRO Q#3. Are you able to help us by participating in our survey this evening?

YES	0	CONTINUE 'Thanks for your help, your time is appreciated'.
	1	

NO	0 2	ASK IF ANOTHER TIME IS MORE SUITABLE. ARRANGE CALL BACK OTHERWISE THANK & CLOSE
----	--------	---

SC.Q1. FIRSTLY CAN I PLEASE ASK SOME PROFILING QUESTIONS, WHAT IS THE **TOTAL AREA** OF YOUR PROPERTY, INCLUDING ALL LEASED LAND AND ANY UNUSED LAND?
(Interviewer note: check whether the answer is acres or hectares)

250 Acres = 100 Hectares / 1 Hectare = 2.5 Acres / 100 Acres = 40 Hectares

ACRES		IF LESS THAN 250 ACRES, THANK AND CLOSE
HECTARE S	OR	IF LESS THAN 100 HECTARES, THANK AND CLOSE

Q5.2 WHAT PERCENTAGE OF YOUR FARM DECISION MAKING WOULD YOU SAY YOU ARE RESPONSIBLE FOR, OR INVOLVED IN?

DO NOT READ OUT

Very little	1
Some	2
About half	3
Most of it	4
All	5
REFUSED (DO NOT READ OUT)	0

DP Note: Q5.2 TO BE CROSSTABBED WITH Q5.7 TO DETERMINE WOMENS ROLE IN THE DECISION PROCESS.

TERMINATE INTERVIEW IF ONLY INVOLVED IN A 'LITTLE' BIT OF THE DECISION MAKING.

SC.Q2. DO YOU RECEIVE A COPY OF 'FEEDBACK' MAGAZINE FROM MEAT AND LIVESTOCK AUSTRALIA?

RECORD RESPONSE BELOW

Yes (Member)	1
No (Non Member)	2
Don't know	99

Q.SC3. *Interviewer note: check contact database source to determine question stream*

Origin of Contact:	TIE R		
FARMbase (Random sample of pop.)	1	ASK Section 1, 2, & 5	n=205
EDGE/MBfP/PIRDS/PRIME TIME/COST OF PRODUCTION (COP)/BEEF UP (Participant Sample)	2	ASK Section 1, 3, 4 & 5	n=280

(DP Note: Course attendees will be segmented by course to provide a base for evaluation by course of management practice change – quotas of n=50 apply to each course. This quota does not include other course mentions not specified above).

INDUSTRY SEGMENTATION

SECTION 1: ASK ALL

Q1.1 IN THE LAST FINANCIAL YEAR (2005 – 2006), ROUGHLY WHAT PERCENTAGE OF YOUR TOTAL GROSS FARM INCOME, THAT IS, ONLY INCOME FROM YOUR FARM, CAME FROM THE FOLLOWING ACTIVITIES?

READ OUT & RECORD

Beef cattle	%	IF 10% OR MORE, CLASSIFY AS "BEEF".
Wool	%	IF ADD TO 10% OR MORE, CLASSIFY AS "SHEEP".
Lambs	%	
Mutton	%	
Farmed goats	%	IF <u>ANY</u> INCOME, CLASSIFY AS "GOAT".
Feral goats	%	
Dairy	%	IF THESE ADD TO 95% OR MORE OF INCOME, THANK AND CLOSE
Winter cereal crops (Wheat, Barley, Oats, Triticale)	%	
Other crops (SPECIFY)	%	
TOTAL	100%	

(Interviewer & DP note: This filter will determine how the respondent is classified, i.e. as a beef producer or as a sheep producer. The 10% minimum refers to respondents largest farm enterprise, i.e. where no other livestock enterprise contributes greater than 10% to gross farm income then that enterprise is how the respondent is classified for the purpose of this survey. Respondents also do not qualify for the survey if Dairy, winter cereal or other crops add to more than 95% of farm income)

SC.Q4. Interviewer to insert postcode / regional location of the property from contact list?

(DP to link with master region code frame to manage location quota)

POSTCODE	Nth Beef	Sth Beef	Sth Sheep	State Tag:

(DP note: check postcode with regional definitions and rainfall zones for quota management. livestock type will also need to be included in quota).

Q1.2 WHAT WAS THE MOST NUMBER OF **BEEF CATTLE**, INCLUDING MARKED CALVES, THAT YOU CARRIED ON YOUR PROPERTY DURING **2005-2006**?

**Q1.3 AND, HOW MANY OF THOSE WERE BREEDING COWS?
(includes all cows and heifers)**

WRITE IN NUMBER OF BEEF CATTLE AND CIRCLE RESPONSE

	Q1.2 Beef Cattle	Q1.3 Breeding Cows
< 15	01	01
15 – 49	02	02
50 – 99	03	03
100 – 299	04	04
300 – 499	05	05
500 – 999	06	06
1,000 – 1,999	07	07
2,000 – 4,999	08	08
5,000 – 9,999	09	09
10,000 – 14,999	10	10

Terminate interviews with producers with less than 15 hd or less than 100Ha

Q1.4 DURING 2005-2006, CAN YOU TELL ME WHAT WAS THE MOST NUMBER OF SHEEP, INCLUDING MARKED LAMBS, YOU CARRIED ON THE PROPERTY?

Q1.5 AND FROM THAT TOTAL, HOW MANY LAMBS FOR SLAUGHTER (FOR MEAT PURPOSES) WERE ON THE PROPERTY?

ENTER NUMBER IN APPROPRIATE CELL AND CIRCLE RESPONSE

WRITE IN NOS & CIRCLE CODE	Q1.4		Q1.5	
	TOTAL SHEEP Nos		LAMBS for SLAUGHTER Nos	
NO SHEEP(< 30)		00		00
30 – 499		01		01
500 – 999		02		02
1,000 – 1,499		03		03
1,500 – 1,999		04		04
2,000 – 2,999		05		05
3,000 – 4,999		06		06
5,000 – 9,999		07		07
10,000 – 20,000		08		08
> 20,000		09		09

AWARENESS OF MLA PROGRAMS

SECTION 2: ASK TIER 1 SAMPLE ONLY (*RANDOM SAMPLE OF TARGETED PRODUCERS n=205*)

Q2.1 MEAT & LIVESTOCK AUSTRALIA (MLA) ORGANISES AND RUNS A RANGE OF PROGRAMS FOR BEEF, SHEEP, LAMB AND GOAT PRODUCERS. COULD YOU PLEASE TELL ME WHICH MLA PROGRAMS YOU ARE AWARE OF?

(INTERVIEWER: CHECK ACTUAL COURSE NAME TO CONFIRM COURSE CODE FROM ATTACHED LIST OF MLA COURSES AND PROGRAMS – DO NOT RECORD ACTUAL COURSE OR PROGRAM ONLY CORRESPONDING COURSE CODE.

RECORD FIRST MENTIONED UNDER Q2.1

AND ALL OTHER MENTIONS UNDER Q2.2 DO NOT READ OUT OR PROMPT AT THIS STAGE.

Q2.2 ... ANY OTHERS?

(If not in MLA course and programs list Please Specify)

Q2.3 I AM GOING TO READ OUT SOME OTHER MLA COURSES & PROGRAMS TO YOU. HAVE YOU HEARD OF...

(INTERVIEWER: READ OUT FULL COURSE CODE DESCRIPTION (IN BRACKETS), FROM TABLE BELOW. READ OUT ONLY THOSE MLA COURSE CODES NOT ALREADY RECALLED IN Q2.1 and Q2.2)?

OR

PROMPT FOR ALL SAMPLE: (read out)

WHAT ABOUT 'PRIME TIME' or 'MAKING MORE FROM MERINO'S FORUM', Bounce Back from Drought, Know and Grow with Lamb forums (Qld/WA only) or lamb finishing forums; 'MORE BEEF from PASTURES'; 'PIRD'S or DEMONSTRATION TRIAL'S', 'PRODUCER RESEARCH SUPPORT'; 'EDGE' or 'EDGenetwork' and 'COST OF PRODUCTION WORKSHOPS' and BEEF UP FORUMS.

AND

Also read out these specific EDGE or EDGenetwork courses (code 02) if respondent is from state identified:

PROMPT, IF NSW Southern WA or TAS: (read out)

WHAT ABOUT 'WEAN MORE LAMBS' & 'PROGRAZE'.

PROMPT, IF VIC or SA: (read out)

WHAT ABOUT 'WEAN MORE LAMBS', 'PROGRAZE', 'BEEF CHEQUE' & 'LAMB CHEQUE'.

PROMPT, IF QLD, NT, or Northern WA: (read out)

WHAT ABOUT 'GRAZING LAND MANAGEMENT or GLM' and 'NUTRITION EDGE' or 'BREEDING EDGE'.

Awareness:	Unaided		Aided
	Q2.1 First Mention	Q2.2 Other Mentions	Q2.3 Prompted
MLA Course Code			
MLA PUBLICATIONS TIPS & TOOLS / THE VARIETY OF ON-FARM BOOKLETS SUCH AS <i>WATER MEDICATION MANUAL</i> , ETC. Prograzier, Feedback, Frontier magazine (northern producers only)	08	08	08
PIRDS (PIRDS or Producer Research Support (ALL producers) and PDS or Producer Demonstration Sites North only)	01	01	01
EDGenetwork (any EDGE or EDGenetwork course) (ALL producers)	02	02	02
PRIME TIME (Prime Time, Making More from Merino's	03	03	03

BounceBack from Drought and Lamb Finishing Forums, Know and Grow Forums (Qld/WA only) (Sheep and Lamb producers only)			
More Beef from Pastures (More Beef from Pastures Manuals and Forums, Tools for the time challenged expos)- Southern Beef producers only	04	04	04
Cost of Production Workshops (excluding Northern Beef)	05	05	05
Beef -Up forums (Northern beef only)	06	06	06
Non MLA Events (Courses conducted by organisations other than MLA where MLA contributed either course content or sponsorship) (ALL)	07	07	07
OTHERS (Please Specify)	99	99	99

(DP Note: Identify for tables those respondents with first, second and nett unaided mentions then prompted, then nett total aided & unaided awareness).

Q2.4 DID YOU ATTEND ANY OF THESE ACTIVITIES OR RELATED TRAINING COURSES?

DO NOT READ OUT

Yes (Attended or participated in at least 1 course or program)	01
No	02

IF Q2.4=01 Ask Q2.5, IF Q2.4=02 Go To Section 5

Q2.5 IF YOU DID NOT ATTEND ANY OF THESE ACTIVITIES OR RELATED TRAINING COURSES, WHAT WERE YOUR REASONS FOR NOT PARTICIPATING?

DO NOT READ OUT

Do not like group activities	01
Did not know about them	02
No time	03
Too expensive	04
Drought	05
Don't know	99
Topics of no interest	
Other	

(Interviewer Note: TIER 1 Respondents Skip to Section 5, Q5.1)

ADOPTION

SECTION 3: TIER 2 - PARTICIPANTS OF PIRDS/EDGE/MBfP/PRIME TIME/COST OF PRODUCTION (COP)/BEEF UP PROGRAMS AND CHANGE OF MGT PRACTICES: ASK ALL MLA COURSE CONTACTS ONLY
(MLA SAMPLE n=280)

Q3.1 MEAT & LIVESTOCK AUSTRALIA (MLA) ORGANISES AND RUNS A NETWORK OF PROGRAMS AND COURSES FOR BEEF, SHEEP AND LAMB PRODUCERS. CAN YOU CONFIRM YOU HAVE PARTICIPATED IN... (PRE POPULATE Q3.1 WITH COURSE CODE FROM CONTACT LIST)?

**Q3.2 CAN YOU RECALL ANY OTHER MLA COURSES THAT YOU HAVE ATTENDED OR PARTICIPATED IN?
 (REFER TO COURSE CODE FRAME THEN RECORD ALL OTHER COURSES MENTIONED UNDER Q3.2.
 ANY OTHERS NOT INCLUDED PLEASE SPECIFY.**

Q3.3 HAVE YOU CHANGED ANY OF YOUR MANAGEMENT PRACTICES OR ADOPTED ANY NEW MANAGEMENT PRACTICES AS A DIRECT RESULT OF PARTICIPATING IN THE (INSERT COURSE CODE FROM Q3.1 & THEN Q3. 2) COURSE YOU MENTIONED?

ASK ONLY FOR THOSE PROGRAMS MENTIONED (ask in succession for each program)

MLA Course Codesee code frame	COURSE CODE	Q3.1 Attended	Q3.2 Other Attended	Q3.3 Changed	
				Yes	No
MLA PUBLICATIONS TIPS & TOOLS / THE VARIETY OF ON-FARM BOOKLETS SUCH AS <i>WATER MEDICATION MANUAL</i> , ETC. Prograzier, Feedback, Frontier magazine (northern producers only)	08	08	08	01	02
PIRDS (PIRDS or Producer Research Support and PDS or Producer Demonstration Sites North only)	01	01	01	01	02
EDGenetwork (any EDGE or EDGenetwork course)	02	02	02	01	02
PRIME TIME (Prime Time, Making More from Merino's, BounceBack from Drought and Lamb Finishing Forums, Know and Grow Forums (Qld/WA only)	03	03	03	01	02
More beef from pastures (More Beef from Pastures Manuals and Forums, Tools for the time challenged expos)	04	04	04	01	02
Cost of Production Workshops	05	05	05	01	02
Beef -Up forums	06	06	06	01	02
Non MLA Events (Courses conducted by organisations other than MLA where MLA contributed either course	07	07	07	01	02

content or sponsorship)				
OTHERS (Please specify		99	99	01 02

(DP Note: for Q3.3 Identify for tables those respondents who made 1 change and those who made more than 1, then create a nett change field).

Q.3.4 WHY HAVE YOU NOT CHANGED PRACTICES AS A RESULT OF YOUR PARTICIPATION IN THIS ACTIVITY?

Still thinking about it	
Need to talk to someone for further information/advice (if so who - neighbour, consultant, DPI, Stock agent, family other producers, other)	
Does not suit existing operations	
Lack of finance to make changes	
Workload or labour issues	
Uncertainty regarding outcomes or benefits	
Lifestyle choice	
Other	

ASK ONLY FOR THOSE RESPONDENTS WHO ANSWERED YES (01) to Q3.3

Q3.5 WHICH PARTICULAR MANAGEMENT PRACTICES HAVE YOU **CHANGED** AS A RESULT OF ATTENDING THE (INSERT PROGRAM NAME FROM Q3.1 & THEN Q3.2) COURSE?

Management Practice Changes.....prompt only to clarify answer.	Q3.1 Course Name	Q3.2 Course Name
GRAZING MANAGEMENT including feed budgeting	01	01
REPRODUCTIVE MANAGEMENT	02	02
SUPPLEMENTARY & NUTRITION PRACTICES	03	03
CALVING, LAMBING OR WEANING TIMES	04	04
MANAGEMENT OR PREPARATION OF SIRES	05	05
GENETIC SELECTION using EBVs	06	06
NATURAL RESOURCE MANAGEMENT	07	07
ANIMAL HEALTH PRACTICES including monitoring worm egg counts and conducting drench resistance tests	08	08
PASTURE MANAGEMENT including monitoring feed quality and quantity	09	09
MARKETING AND FINANCE	10	10
CALCULATE COST OF PRODUCTION (COP)	11	11
Assessing stock using fat or condition scoring	12	12
WEIGHING STOCK SHEEP/CATTLE	13	13
CHEMICAL & FERTILISER	14	14
Use ABCD framework to monitor land condition (North only)	15	15
Grazing management - wet spelling (north only)	16	16
Heifer management - segregate heifers from main breeder herd until pregnant with second calf (north only)	17	17
Use pregnancy testing and foetal aging	18	18
Have a supplementary strategy (north only)	19	19
Have a vaccination strategy (north only)	20	20
OTHER (Please Specify)	99	99

SECTION 4: APPLICATION OF THE 'MORE BEEF from PASTURES' MANUAL : ASK 'MORE BEEF FROM PASTURES' CONTACTS ONLY *n=50*

IF MBfP Course participant (Q3.1 or Q3.2 = 04) ASK Q4.1 to Q4.10

Q4.1 THE FOLLOWING QUESTIONS REFER TO THE MORE BEEF FROM PASTURES MANUAL, HAVE YOU RECEIVED THE MORE BEEF FROM PASTURES MANUAL or CD?

Probe to confirm that they do actually have one? Yes = Continue / No= Go To Q4.15

Q4.2 HOW MANY MODULES OF THE MORE BEEF FROM PASTURES COURSE MANUAL HAVE YOU READ?

DO NOT READ OUT

None	01
1	02
2	03
3	04
4	05
>5	06
Don't know	99

Q4.3 WHICH MODULES IN THE 'MORE BEEF FROM PASTURES' PROGRAM MANUAL YOU HAVE READ?

RECORD FIRST MENTIONED UNDER Q4.31

AND ALL OTHER MENTIONS UNDER Q4.32. DO NOT READ OUT. PROBE: ... ANY OTHERS?

Q4.4 HAVE YOU ALSO READ (READ OUT ONLY THOSE NOT ALREADY RECALLED)?

DP Note: Where respondent has indicated they read 'MORE BEEF from PASTURES' modules in Q4.3 or Q4.4, pre populate for Q4.4.

ASK ONLY FOR THOSE MODULES READ (ask in succession for each module)

Q4.5 HAVE YOU CARRIED OUT ANY OF THE PROCEDURES FROM THE MODULES YOU'VE READ INSERT MODULE NAME(S) AND ANSWER FOR EACH MODULE READ?

(if yes ask Q4.5.1)

Q4.5.1 CAN YOU RECALL WHICH PROCEDURES?

(multi - insert answer using attached code frame - probe)

Q4.6 HAVE YOU USED ANY OF THE TOOLS OR PRACTICES IN THE MANUAL?

INSERT MODULE NAME(S) AND ANSWER FOR EACH MODULE READ?

(if yes ask Q4.6.1)

Q4.6.1 WHICH TOOLS OR PRACTICES DID YOU USE?

(multi - insert answer using attached code frame - probe) Do not prompt or read out.

e.g.

Cost of Production Calculator	
Feed demand calculator	
Rainfall to pasture growth outlook tool	
Other	

Q4.7 DID YOU SEEK FURTHER INFORMATION AND ADVICE FOLLOWING THE MORE BEEF FROM PASTURES PROGRAM BEFORE YOU USED ANY OF THE PROCEDURES OR TOOLS THAT YOU LEARNED FROM THE COURSE OR MANUAL?

'MORE BEEF from PASTURES' Manual Modules	Q4.31 First Mention Unprompted	Q4.32 Other Mentions Unprompted	Q4.4 Prompted	Q4.5 Carried out procedure		Q4.6 Used any tools		Q4.7 Advice or Info.	
				Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No
Setting Directions (Enterprise business planning)	01	01	01	01	02	01	02	01	02
Tactical Stock Control (managing stocking rate)	02	02	02	01	02	01	02	01	02
Pasture Growth (mapping land class, soil fertility, pasture selection)	03	03	03	01	02	01	02	01	02
Pasture Utilisation (developing the grazing plan)	04	04	04	01	02	01	02	01	02
Genetics (breeding objective)	05	05	05	01	02	01	02	01	02
Weaner Throughput (joining management, reproduction, weaning)	06	06	06	01	02	01	02	01	02
Herd Health and Welfare (risk identification, preventative management)	07	07	07	01	02	01	02	01	02
Meeting Market Specifications (knowing markets specifications, managing to meet them)	08	08	08	01	02	01	02	01	02
Other (<i>SPECIFY</i>) Other would be if they have only read the introduction only. (DP to code Other).	09	09		01	02	01	02	01	02

Q4.8 HAVE YOU CHANGED YOUR MANAGEMENT PRACTICES AS A RESULT OF CARRYING OUT ANY OF THESE PROCEDURES OR TOOLS FROM THE 'MORE BEEF FROM PASTURES'MANUAL?

Yes	01
No	02

Q4.9 IN WHAT WAY DID CARRYING OUT THESE PROCEDURES OR TOOLS IMPACT ON YOUR GRAZING ENTERPRISE? (1ST MENTION)

Q4.10 ANY OTHERS? (OTHER MENTIONS - MULTI)

Q4.11 WHICH OF THESE ARE YOU MOST INTERESTED IN CHANGING OR IMPROVING? (read out 1-7 and rank in order)

	Q4.9	Q4.10	Q4.11
Productivity increases	01	01	01
Profit	02	02	02
Time savings	03	03	03
Turnover	04	04	04

Reduced overheads	05	05	05
Lower cost of production	06	06	06
Better Natural Resource Mgt	07	07	07
Too early to tell/Don't Know Yet	99	99	

Q4.12 AS A RESULT OF ATTENDING OR PARTICIPATING IN THE **MBfP** COURSE, WHICH ELEMENT OF THE MBfP COURSE MOST INFLUENCED YOU TO **CHANGE** MANAGEMENT PRACTICES?

Read out: THE CD MANUAL or the WORKSHOP?

Prompt with: ANY OTHERS? (*read out remaining options*)

Course Components:	Q4.12
MANUAL (CD Manual)	01
WORKSHOP	02
MANUAL & WORKSHOP	03
FEED DEMAND CALCULATOR	04
MORE BEEF FROM PASTURES EXPOS	05
COST OF PRODUCTION (COP) WORKSHOPS	06
RAINFALL TO PASTURE GROWTH OUTLOOK TOOL	07
OTHER (Specify)	99

IF Q4.7=01 Ask Q4.13 & Q4.14, IF Q4.7=02 Go To Section 5

Q4.13 WHICH OR WHO WERE THE MOST INFLUENTIAL SOURCES OF **INFORMATION** AND **ADVICE**, THAT HELPED YOU DECIDE, OR CONVINCED YOU TO USE THE PROCEDURES AND TOOLS CONTAINED IN THE 'MORE BEEF FROM PASTURES' MANUAL? (**1ST MENTION**)

Q4.14 Any others? (*Other Mentions - Multi*)

DO NOT PROMPT

	Q4.13	Q4.14
Neighbour	01	01
Consultant	02	02
Department of Ag. (DPI)	03	03
Stock Agent (Elders, Landmark etc)	04	04
MLA Programs	05	05
Influential producer you know	06	06
Family	07	07
Media	08	08
Producer Forum	09	09
'MORE BEEF from PASTURES' Coordinators	10	10
Other MLA publications including Tips & Tools, pasture ruler etc.	11	11
Others (<i>SPECIFY</i>)	99	99

Ask All Tier 2 respondents:

Q4.15 AS A RESULT OF IMPLEMENTING SOME OF THE RECOMMENDATIONS THAT **MLA** HAS BEEN PROMOTING, HOW HAVE THEY IMPACTED ON YOUR FARM BUSINESS?

DO NOT READ OUT

A Very Negative Impact	01
Some Negative Impact	02
No Impact at all (Status Quo)	03
Some Positive Impact	04
A Very Positive Impact	05
Don't know	99

IF Q4.15=01 or 02 Ask Q4.16, IF Q4.15=03 to 05 Go To Q4.17, IF Q4.15=99 Go To Q4.14

Q4.16 WHAT WERE THE POSITIVE OUTCOMES FOR YOUR BUSINESS THAT RESULTED FROM ATTENDING THE COURSE?

Q4.17 WHAT WERE THE NEGATIVE OUTCOMES FOR YOUR BUSINESS THAT RESULTED FROM ATTENDING THE COURSE?

Q4.18 IN WHAT AREAS OF YOUR FARM OPERATION DO YOU BELIEVE THE MLA INFORMATION OR TOOLS HAVE HAD THE GREATEST IMPACT?

(read out)

Profitability	01
Environment	02
Cost of Production	03
Pasture persistence	04
Lifestyle	05
Labour saving	06
Other (Please Specify)	99

INTERVIEWER REFERENCE MATERIAL – Where specific course names are mentioned please ensure they are recorded under their MLA Course Code, i.e. 02 EDGENetwork or 01 PIRDS.

**THE LIST BELOW ARE ALL MLA COURSES and PROGRAMS
INTERVIEWER CHECK LIST Q3.1 – Q3.2**

PIRD's = 01	PIRD's (Producer Initiated Research & Development) or demonstration trials.
	PRS or Producer Research Support
	PDS or Producer Demonstration Sites
EDGENetwork = 02	Conflict resolution and negotiation
	Leadership
	Working in Groups [®] (WIGs)
	Farm Business Meetings
	Time Control
	BizCheck [®] for Meat.
	Developing the strategy
	Generating Profit and Wealth
	Working Records
	Enterprise Health Check
	Effective Pricing
	Making Business Decisions
	Grazing Land Management or GLM (<i>Nth Producers only</i>)
	Healthy Soils, Healthy Profits (<i>Towards Sustainable Grazing Workshops</i>)
	Profit from Saline Lands (<i>Towards Sustainable Grazing Workshops</i>)
	Managing Living Systems (<i>Towards Sustainable Grazing Workshops</i>)
	Weed Removers, Pasture Improvers (<i>Towards Sustainable Grazing Workshops</i>)
	Grazing Land Management (<i>Nth Producers only</i>)
	PROGRAZE [®] Update
	Lamb Cheque [®]
	Better Grazing Decisions [®]
	PROGRAZE [®]
	Beef Cheque [®]
	6.2.1 The Breeding EDGE (Nth Producers only)
	6.2.2 Terminal Sire Selection or Effective Breeding (lambs)
	6.2.3 Wean More Lambs
	6.2.4 The Nutrition EDGE (Nth Producers only)
	6.2.5 Effective Breeding (beef)
	6.2.6 Money Making Mums (sheep)
	NLIS in Your Business
	The Marketing EDGE (<i>Nth Producers only</i>)
	Lean Meat Yield (prime lambs)
	Markets and Customer Needs

	Marketing Performance
	Negotiating the Sale
	Understanding Marketing
	Meat Standards Australia (MSA)
	The Selling EDGE (<i>Nth Producers only</i>)
	Making the Most of Mutton
	Market Intelligence
	Marketing Strategy and Plan
	Selling Options
	BeefNet Product Knowledge
PRIME TIME = 03	Prime Time or Making More from Merino's, BounceBack from Drought
MBfP = 04	More Beef From Pastures (CD Manual or Forum)
	Cost of production (COP)
	Feed demand calculator
	Rainfall to pasture growth outlook tool
	Tools for time challenged expos
COP = 05	Cost of Production Workshops
Beef Up Forums = 06	
Non MLA Events = 07 (Courses conducted by organisations other than MLA where MLA contributed either course content or sponsorship)	Sheep updates - WA
	Merino Forums - SA
	Sheepvention seminars - Vic
	Bestwool / Bestlamb groups - Vic
MLA PUBLICATIONS = 08	TIPS & TOOLS / THE VARIETY OF ON-FARM BOOKLETS SUCH AS <i>WATER MEDICATION MANUAL</i> , ETC. Prograzier, Feedback, Frontier magazine (northern producers only)
OTHERS = 99	

DEMOGRAPHICS

SECTION 5: TIER 1 & 2 - ASK ALL

And finally, just a couple of questions to make sure we have interviewed a representative sample of producers.

Q5.1 COULD YOU TELL ME INTO WHICH OF THE FOLLOWING AGE GROUPS YOU FALL?

READ OUT

Less than 20 years	1
21 – 30 years	2
31 – 40 years	3
41 – 50 years	4
51 – 60 years	5
Over 60 years	6
REFUSED (DO NOT READ OUT)	0

Q5.2 HAVE YOU EVER PARTICIPATED IN COLLABORATIVE RESEARCH PROGRAMS WITH UNIVERSITIES, STATE DPI, MLA, AWI, GRDC, OR SOME OTHER RESEARCH BODY?

READ OUT

Universities	1
State DPI (Dept of Agriculture)	2
MLA	3
AWI	4
GRDC	5
Grain and Graze	6
Evergraze	7
Other (Specify)	8
Don't know	99

Q5.3 THINKING ABOUT INFORMATION, FROM **WHAT SOURCE** DO YOU GENERALLY FIRST HEAR ABOUT MOST **NEW TECHNOLOGIES** OR **MANAGEMENT PRACTICES**? (eg. MLA PUBLICATIONS SUCH AS FEEDBACK, PROGRAZIER, FRONTIER MAGAZINE, TIPS AND TOOLS RURAL NEWSPAPERS, FARM MAGAZINES, ABC RADIO, DPI, STOCK & STATION AGENT, RURAL MERCHANT, STATE FARMER ORGANIZATION, MLA, AWI, FAMILY MEMBER, PRODUCER NETWORK OR GROUP, OTHER INDIVIDUAL PRODUCERS, WORKSHOPS OR SEMINARS, INTERNET, OTHER)?

DO NOT READ OUT

Rural Newspapers	1
Farm Magazines	2
Radio (ABC)	3
DPI	4
Livestock Agent	5
Rural Merchandise Store	6
Farmer Organisations (eg. NSWFA)	7
MLA	8
AWI	9
Family member	10
Producer Network or Group	11
Farm Consultant or Agronomist	12
Field Days or Seminars	13
Other Producers	14
MLA PUBLICATIONS	15
FRONTIER (NORTHERN ONLY)	16
PROGRAZIER	17
FEEDBACK	18
TIPS AND TOOLS	19
Don't know	99

Q5.4 WHO OR WHAT DO YOU GENERALLY RELY ON WHEN **YOU NEED ADVICE** ABOUT HOW TO USE OR APPLY MOST NEW TECHNOLOGIES OR MANAGEMENT PRACTICES? (eg. MLA PUBLICATIONS SUCH AS FEEDBACK, PROGRAZIER, FRONTIER MAGAZINE, TIPS AND TOOLS, RURAL NEWSPAPERS, FARM MAGAZINES, ABC RADIO, DPI, STOCK & STATION AGENT, RURAL MERCHANT, STATE FARMER ORGANIZATION, MLA, AWI, FAMILY MEMBER, PRODUCER NETWORK OR GROUP, OTHER INDIVIDUAL PRODUCERS, WORKSHOPS OR SEMINARS, INTERNET, OTHER)?

DO NOT READ OUT

Rural Newspapers	1
Farm Magazines	2
Radio (ABC)	3
DPI	4
Livestock Agent	5
Rural Merchandise Store	6
Farmer Organisations (eg. NSWFA)	7
MLA	8
AWI	9
Family member	10

Producer Network or Group	11
Farm Consultant or Agronomist	12
Field Days or Seminars	13
Other Producers	14
MLA PUBLICATIONS	15
FRONTIER (NORTHERN ONLY)	16
PROGRAZIER	17
FEEDBACK	18
TIPS AND TOOLS	19
Don't know	99

Ask All

Q5.5 MLA WOULD ALSO LIKE TO DISCUSS FURTHER HOW THAY CAN BETTER SERVICE LIVESTOCK PRODUCERS NEEDS?

WOULD YOU BE INTERESTED IN PARTICIPATING IN FURTHER DISCUSSIONS WITH MLA?

DO NOT READ OUT

Yes	1
No	2

Note: LARGE PRODUCERS ONLY will be screened out at time of research - (>2000 sheep and >300 cattle).
Need to be able to link Case ID with their name with those who said yes.

Q5.6 RECORD GENDER OF RESPONDENT

DO NOT READ OUT

Male	1
Female	2

CLOSE:

THANK YOU FOR YOUR HELP. GOODBYE

CODEFARME FOR SECTION 4

'MORE BEEF from PASTURES' Pasture Manual Modules - PROCEDURES

6.2.7	Module 1 - Setting directions	Q4.5.1
	Determine the enterprise strategy and herd structure most likely to maximise profit.	01
	Develop a transition plan from the current enterprise to the preferred position, to achieve beef enterprise targets.	02
	Measure and analyse current performance and compare with expected physical and financial targets and periodically review the strategic direction.	03
6.2.8	Module 2 - Tactical stock control	
	Predict pasture availability for a range of weather patterns and compare with stock requirements.	01
	Take early corrective action when an excess or shortage of pasture is predicted.	02
6.2.9	Module 3 - Pasture growth	
	Map farm grazing land into pasture zones based on land class and capability.	01
	Characterise the seasonal pattern and variability of rainfall and establish water use efficiency.	02
	Build and maintain soil nutrients to improve soil fertility and health in all pasture zones.	03
	Manipulate pasture species composition in each pasture zone to give best pasture growth and quality.	04

6.2.10	Module 4 - Pasture utilisation	
	Determine stocking rate , plan paddock sequences and use tactical grazing to maximise conversion of pasture into beef.	01
	Select a paddock and determine grazing duration to achieve best utilisation and animal performance targets.	02
	Start grazing before pasture energy content and growth starts to decline .	03
	Stop grazing before pasture regrowth potential is affected .	04
	Determine rest period required to give best regrowth between grazing events.	05
6.2.11	Module 5 - Genetics	
6.2.12	<i>Set the breeding objective for the herd by ensuring that the right emphasis is on different animal traits that improve enterprise profit.</i>	01
6.2.13	<i>Select the most profitable breed and/or crossbreeding system to achieve genetic progress.</i>	02
6.2.14	<i>Buy the right bulls (or semen) to maximise progress toward enterprise profit.</i>	03
6.2.15	<i>Allocate bulls to mating groups to reduce risk of inbreeding and dystocia in heifers.</i>	04
6.2.16	Module 6 - Weaner throughput	
	Maximise number of live calves per breeding female and minimise infertility in cows and bulls.	01
	Control the mating period to reduce calving spread and to maintain selected annual calving date(s).	02
	Wean as early as possible, without compromising calf growth rate.	03
	Use a female culling and replacement policy to minimise pasture use by breeders and maintain the best herd structure.	04
6.2.17	Module 7 - Herd health and welfare	
	Choose the appropriate management practice , corrective treatment or a combination to prevent common diseases or disorders	01
	Determine the risk and vaccinate to prevent specific diseases	02
	Watch for sporadic diseases and disorders	03
	Prevent the introduction of infectious diseases	04
6.2.18	Module 8 - Meeting market specifications	
	Manage the nutrition, health and welfare of sale animals to meet target market specifications on time.	01
	Manage cattle two to three weeks before sale and during mustering and transport to achieve best carcass dressing percentage and avoid downgraded meat and carcasses.	02
	Regularly evaluate market opportunities as feed supply, financial situation or market prices change, and select markets to maximise enterprise profit.	03

'MORE BEEF from PASTURES' Pasture Manual Modules – TOOLS or PRACTICES

6.2.19 Toolkit	Q4.6.1
Tool 1.1 Specifications for a typical enterprise simulation model	01
Tool 1.2 Template of partial budget calculations for comparing change scenarios	02
Tool 1.3 Enterprise audit sample form	03
Tool 2.1 Guidelines for establishing minimum and maximum limits for whole enterprise pasture availability into the future (or days of feed available)	04
Tool 3.1 Guide to mapping pasture zones and developing the capacity for differential land management	05
Tool 3.2 Methodology for assessing soil texture	06
Tool 3.3 Visual indicators for identifying waterlogged and salt affected soils	07
Tool 3.4 List of state departments of agriculture websites for further information	08
Tool 3.5 Establishing the normal pattern and variability of rainfall	09
Tool 3.6 A guide to measuring water use efficiency (WUE) and setting targets for all pasture zones	10
Tool 3.7 Methodology for field-based pasture measurements	11
Tool 3.8 Table of critical limits for soil nutrients and other ratios important to pasture productivity	12
Tool 3.9 Guidelines for pasture nutrient applications	13
Tool 3.10 NATA-accredited soil testing laboratories	14
Tool 3.11 Guidelines to composition measurements	15
Tool 3.12 Sources of information on common pasture species and weeds	16
Tool 4.1 Pasture rulers, sticks and meters	17
Tool 4.2 Methods for setting pasture targets for slow rotations and set stocking	18
Tool 4.3 Daily pasture growth estimates for localities and regions across southern Australia	19
Tool 4.4 Information sources on pasture utilisation	20
Tool 4.5 Grazing management options to convert pastures into beef production	21
Tool 4.6 Plant-based grazing management methods	22
Tool 5.1 BreedObject™ software	23
Tool 5.2 Sources of information for breed and crossbreed averages for important traits	24
Tool 5.3 Guidelines when considering using different breed types	25
Tool 5.4 Generic market-based breeding objectives and selection indexes	26
Tool 5.5 Bull earning capacity calculator will help you predict the estimated earning capacity of each bull based on the dollar index value and estimated number of cows to be mated	27
Tool 5.6 Calving ease EBVs for bulls available from breed society websites	28
Tool 6.1 A guide to minimum liveweights of weaner heifers	29
Tool 6.2 Condition scoring beef cattle	30
Tool 6.3 The Australian Association of Cattle Veterinarians' publication, 'Evaluating and Reporting Bull Fertility'	31
Tool 6.4 Calving histogram calculator	32
Tool 6.5 Weaning age and projected liveweights	33
Tool 6.6 A template for calculating the number of replacement heifers required	34
Tool 7.1 Conditions that exist for the development of common cattle diseases	35
Tool 7.2 Distribution maps showing trace element and mineral deficiencies for southern Australia	36
Tool 7.3 Diagnostic tool for common diseases	37
Tool 7.4 Decision support calculator to determine cost-effectiveness of common preventative treatments	38
Tool 7.5 Management strategies to prevent disease	39
Tool 7.6 Diagnostic tool to detect presence of diseases	40
Tool 7.7 Conditions and vaccines for prevention of common cattle diseases	41
Tool 7.8 Vaccination strategies	42

Tool 7.9 Zoonotic diseases of cattle	43
Tool 7.10 National Vendor Declaration (NVD) Waybill for cattle	44
Tool 7.11 Disease information sources	45
Tool 7.12 References to identification of toxic plants and noxious weeds	46
Tool 7.13 Disease risk assessment protocols	47
Tool 7.14 Diagnostic tools to assess disease status	48
Tool 7.15 Strategies to lessen the impact if disease is introduced	49
Tool 8.1 Beef cattle market specifications	50
Tool 8.2 Graphs indicating liveweight and fat score ranges over which specifications for most prime beef markets are likely to be achieved	51
Tool 8.3 Meat Standards Australia (MSA) tips & tools	52
Tool 8.4 Range of selling options	53
Tool 8.5 Obtaining price and other market information	54