

Scotland's Rural College

## Factors influencing crop rotation strategies on organic farms with different time periods since conversion to organic production

Chongtham, IR; Bergkvist, G; Watson, CA; Sandstrom, E; Bengtsson, J; Oborn, I

*Published in:*  
Biological Agriculture and Horticulture

*DOI:*  
[10.1080/01448765.2016.1174884](https://doi.org/10.1080/01448765.2016.1174884)

First published: 19/04/2016

*Document Version*  
Peer reviewed version

[Link to publication](#)

*Citation for published version (APA):*  
Chongtham, IR., Bergkvist, G., Watson, CA., Sandstrom, E., Bengtsson, J., & Oborn, I. (2016). Factors influencing crop rotation strategies on organic farms with different time periods since conversion to organic production. *Biological Agriculture and Horticulture*, 33(1), 14 - 27. Advance online publication. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01448765.2016.1174884>

### General rights

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the public portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

- Users may download and print one copy of any publication from the public portal for the purpose of private study or research.
- You may not further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain
- You may freely distribute the URL identifying the publication in the public portal ?

### Take down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

1 **Factors influencing crop rotation strategies on organic farms with different time periods**  
2 **since conversion to organic production**

3 **Abstract**

4 Productive crop rotations are central to the success of organic production systems. The  
5 selection and sequence of crops are determined by a combination of agronomic and economic  
6 factors as well as the principles and standards of organic farming. Semi-structured interviews  
7 were conducted with sixteen organic farmers in Central-east Sweden to explore the factors  
8 that influence the design of crop rotations and the trade-offs between these factors, taking into  
9 account the length of time since conversion to organic production.

10 We discerned three crop rotation strategies: strict, flexible and liberal, based on how crop(s)  
11 are repeated over time. A major trade-off for arable farmers was between perennial leys to  
12 provide nitrogen and control weeds, and the use of more inputs such as purchased nutrients  
13 and mechanical weed control to allow continuous cereal production. Critical considerations  
14 for livestock farmers were the length of ley for feed production and weed control, cost of re-  
15 seeding leys and decisions about whether to grow crops to feed animals or cereals to sell.  
16 Farmers practicing organic for a long time (more than 10 years) often had flexible rotations to  
17 adapt to changing conditions, but they generally included leys and a selection of annual crops  
18 in line with the principles of crop rotation and organic farming. Recently converted organic  
19 farmers usually concentrated on controlling weeds and producing sufficient livestock feed by  
20 following strict crop rotations. We conclude that farm type and experience strongly  
21 influenced rotation strategies and that weed management and market prices were the most  
22 important influences.

23 *Keywords: crop rotation strategies, decision, organic farming, semi-structured interviews,*  
24 *time since conversion, trade-off*

25

26

27

28

29 **Factors influencing crop rotation strategies on organic farms with different time periods**  
30 **since conversion to organic production**

31

32 **Introduction**

33 Crop rotation is the sequence of crops on the same land in sequential seasons (Bullock 1992)  
34 and implies that crops generally follow a pre-determined order. Crop rotation is determined  
35 by decisions made by farmers on what type of crops to grow in the current and coming  
36 growing seasons. The choice of crops to include in a crop rotation can influence soil fertility  
37 and nutrient cycling, risks of infestation by weeds, pests and diseases, nutrient demand, crop  
38 diversity, and economic risk management (Karlen et al. 1994; Gerhardt 1997; Bertsen et al.  
39 2006; Papadopoulos et al. 2006; Moncada & Sheaffer 2010). Crop rotation is of particular  
40 importance in organic farming, compared to conventional farming, because of the restrictions  
41 on the use of easily soluble mineral fertilisers and the prohibition of synthetic chemicals to  
42 control weeds, pests and diseases. Hence, Article 5 of 834/2007 of European Union's  
43 principle applicable to organic farming (EU 2007) emphasises the adoption of appropriate  
44 crop rotations with diverse crops in order to maintain/improve plant and soil health, and also  
45 to minimise the dependence on external inputs as far as possible. A wider description of the  
46 core values and principles of organic farming was laid out by IFOAM (2005) which forms the  
47 basis for the definitions.

48 In practice, the crop sequence often changes over time as an adaptation to prevailing  
49 conditions, preferences and knowledge and the different trade-offs which farmers have to  
50 consider when choosing crops. Dury et al. (2013) reported that the cropping plan on a farm  
51 does not emerge from a single decision but from a dynamic decision-making process, which  
52 among other things incorporates unanticipated situations such as lack of availability of  
53 particular seeds, weather conditions and market opportunities. Since many factors influence  
54 crop choice in a rotation, it is not always practical for crops to follow each other in strict,  
55 repetitive cycles. This is particularly true on arable farms that depend on cash crops rather  
56 than growing crops for livestock feed. Therefore, it is often more relevant in practice to  
57 discuss crop sequences rather than crop rotations.

58 Castellazzi et al. (2008) identified several important factors to consider when designing well-  
59 functioning crop rotations, and grouped them into four main rules. According to the first rule,  
60 there should be a minimum return time period of the same crop in the rotation, or in some  
61 cases, the maximum period of growing the same crop, in order to break the cycle of the build-  
62 up of pests, weeds and diseases. The second rule states that crop rotations should be planned  
63 to optimise the benefits from crop succession. The benefits could arise from increased  
64 nitrogen supply, soil organic matter or water availability, improvements in soil structure, and  
65 decrease in pests, diseases and weed competition. The third rule relates to planning the timing  
66 of operations within a year to allow crops to follow each other without long gaps. The fourth  
67 rule relates to diversity of crops in space and time in order to spread the risk of total crop  
68 failure and economic loss, and also balance the distribution of work and the use of machinery  
69 and labour.

70 Decisions of individual organic farmers on crop choice may not always address the rules of  
71 crop rotations or the principles of organic agriculture, as farmers also have to consider many  
72 practical aspects. Several published studies on development of crop sequence/rotation are  
73 generic and based on decision support and modelling tools, e.g. Bachinger and Zander (2007),  
74 Power et al. (2011). These studies use mathematical optimisation techniques to generate  
75 rotations to assist in agricultural production planning. Other studies describe the different  
76 phases and processes which lead/link to the decision making process (Aubry et al. 1998;  
77 Öhlmer et al. 1998; Dury et al. 2013). The above tools help in designing crop rotations based  
78 on generic conditions and assumptions, but they do not reflect the individual farmer's  
79 experiences, motivations, arguments and uniqueness in their situations and decisions, as they  
80 are based on optimisation and prediction approaches. Although, the general needs and  
81 requirements of different farm types vary, individual farmers will respond to external factors,  
82 in addition to the requirement of their farm types. A report from the European Commission  
83 (2010) lists several factors such as climate, soil quality, water availability, local market  
84 opportunities, farm resources and policies, the education level of farmers, tradition on the  
85 farm or in the surrounding farming community, etc., which could influence the choice of crop  
86 rotations. This report did not explore how decisions are taken by individual farmers when  
87 faced with different constraints and trade-offs. The rationale behind their choices could reveal  
88 the different constraints and opportunities associated with various crops and crop rotations in

89 a particular farm or farm type. To our knowledge, there are no published studies which  
90 critically look into the rationale of organic farmers when determining their crop rotations.

91 We expect the longer-term organic farmers to be more knowledgeable about crop rotations  
92 since they have more varied and longer experience in organic farming systems than the  
93 recently converted organic farmers. This study seeks to explore crop rotations practiced by  
94 farmers with varying experiences and farm types, identify the trade-offs and discuss the  
95 rationales of different farmers in relation to the rules for a well-functioning crop rotation and  
96 the principles of organic agriculture. We do this by analysing qualitative data from semi-  
97 structured interviews with 16 organic farmers in the Uppland Province, Sweden. A qualitative  
98 approach was chosen based on the premise that farmers' goals and ideologies influence their  
99 decisions on crop rotations. The semi-structured interviews allowed the farmers as well as the  
100 interviewers to raise doubtful issues and questions and discuss further to get more meaningful  
101 answers.

## 102 **Materials and methods**

### 103 *Studied farms*

104 The study was carried out in the Province of Uppland located in Central-east Sweden.  
105 Uppland has a relatively flat topography with the highest elevation point 117 m above sea  
106 level. Agriculture is characterised by cereal farming on the open plains and more livestock  
107 and mixed farming with a high percentage of rotational or improved grassland (grass-clover  
108 ley) in the mixed and more forested areas. Rotational grass-clover leys (a mixture of clover  
109 and grass species) often including red clover (*Trifolium pretense*, L.), white clover (*Trifolium*  
110 *repens*, L.), timothy (*Phleum pratense*, L.) and meadow fescue (*Festuca pratensis*, L.) cover  
111 about 40% of the arable land while winter wheat (*Triticum aestivum*, L.) and spring barley  
112 (*Hordeum vulgare*, L.) are each grown on about 15% of the arable land (Swedish Board of  
113 Agriculture 2011).

114 We conducted the study with 16 organic farm owners with diverse farm types and time  
115 periods since conversion to organic farming, in order to include farmers with a variety of  
116 objectives and with different levels of experience in organic farming. The farms have been  
117 certified organic for between 2 and 25 years with the Swedish organic trademark, KRAV.  
118 These farms were originally selected to represent organic farms with different periods since

119 conversion and have been used in several studies of biodiversity and ecosystem services  
120 (Jonason et al. 2011; Jonason et al. 2012). The importance of landscape was considered in the  
121 original study by selecting the farms along a gradient of landscape heterogeneity. The farms  
122 have been grouped according to their main farming activity into arable, dairy, beef/sheep, pig  
123 and mixed livestock farms.

#### 124 *Interview methods and analysis*

125 We used semi-structured interviews, which are widely employed to gain a good understanding  
126 of the attitudes and decisions of farmers towards different management options (Longhurst  
127 2003). The interviews were carried out on the farms in spring 2011. A list of key words which  
128 could describe the essential information relating to crop choice and crop rotation was prepared  
129 and tested with one farmer (not within the group of farmers interviewed), and necessary  
130 changes were made and then used for conducting the 16 interviews (Table 1). Using the list of  
131 key words, farmers were asked open-ended questions, with probing whenever necessary to  
132 obtain robust information required for the study. The interviews lasted between one and three  
133 hours. Several farmers showed us around their fields and livestock units during and after the  
134 interviews and these also provided opportunities to observe the management procedures and  
135 also to gain additional information. All interviews were recorded and transcribed. We used  
136 the software 'Atlas.ti' (ATLAS.ti GmbH, Germany) to help condense structure and categorise  
137 the different statements of the transcribed information. This approach is recommended by  
138 Kvale (1996). All the statements relating to crop rotations and their rationale were coded into  
139 categories and key words.

140 [Table 1 near here]

#### 141 **Results and discussion**

142 General farm characteristics and crop rotation strategies are summarised in Table 2. The  
143 different crop rotations practiced by the farmers and their rationales are discussed within  
144 different farm groups in the following sub-sections.

#### 145 *Arable farmers*

146 The arable farmers interviewed mainly depended on cereals, mostly winter wheat, for their  
147 income. Most farmers also included perennial clover and grass crops used as a green manure  
148 (in the following text referred to as 'ley') in their crop rotations. The ley crops were under-

149 sown in annual cereal crops and remained for at least one more year during which they were  
150 cut regularly to control weeds, and also in some cases to sell hay or silage to neighbouring  
151 farms. In the year of ley incorporation, a short period of black fallow (repeated tillage to  
152 control weeds) was often applied before sowing winter wheat benefitting from the pre-crop  
153 effect of the ley. Most farmers also included a grain legume in the rotation, i.e. field beans  
154 (*Vicia faba*, L.) or peas (*Pisum sativum*, L.), in pure stand or in mixtures with oats (*Avena*  
155 *sativa*, L.).

156 Most of the arable farmers reported that they were growing cereals as frequently as possible  
157 in the rotation and avoided the use of break crops, such as legumes. With one exception, they  
158 did not follow a planned crop rotation, but adjusted their crop choice according to the  
159 prevailing situation. A farmer who had managed his farm organically for more than 20 years  
160 (Farmer 1) remarked:

161 *“I don’t follow a planned rotation as I might have to change crops according to market price.*  
162 *I mostly grow wheat after ley. But from this year onwards; I applied Biofer (meat and bone*  
163 *meal fertiliser, mainly from conventional sources) to my cereals and avoided growing ley and*  
164 *legumes. I cannot have peas and beans more than every sixth year in the rotation because of*  
165 *pests and diseases, and since I don’t have animals to eat them, they can easily be replaced*  
166 *with cereals”.*

167 His statement indicated that he was not happy with the practice of growing leys and annual  
168 legumes as he didn’t find them useful. However, frequent cultivation of cereal crops could  
169 increase damage caused by pest and diseases and risk to reduce grain yields compared to more  
170 diverse crop rotation. Recent research investigating effects of preceding crops using a wide  
171 range of experiments from all over the world shows that wheat grown after a break crop can  
172 be expected to yield between 0.5 and 1.2 t ha<sup>-1</sup> more than wheat after wheat (Angus et al.  
173 2015). Management of nutrient supply was reported to be one of the greatest challenges for  
174 arable (stockless) organic farmers as leys are of little economic benefit to them, and also do  
175 not increase the total supply of nutrients other than nitrogen through biological nitrogen  
176 fixation by legumes such as clover (Watson et al. 2002). Thus, the present farmer substituted  
177 the perennial ley, which produces many system benefits, such as break crop effects on weeds,  
178 pests, diseases as well as reducing external nitrogen input, with ‘Biofer’ fertiliser that provide  
179 a range of nutrients but not the other benefits. Farmers appear to see a choice between

180 growing leys and annual legumes in the rotation on one hand, and applying ‘Biofer’ to have  
181 more land available for cereal, on the other hand. The use of ‘Biofer’ to grow more cereal  
182 crops can be seen as a shift towards a more ‘conventional’ farming approach, in terms of the  
183 farmer’s reliance on off-farm nutrient inputs and more specialisation in the system. This  
184 approach deviates from the rules of crop rotation as the same/similar crops are grown  
185 consecutively for several years which might result in the build-up of pests, weeds and  
186 diseases. In addition, the dependence on external fertiliser and less crop diversity in the farm  
187 does not seem to fit with the principles of organic agriculture to utilise diversity and to use  
188 legumes to provide nitrogen rather than purchasing external inputs. Replacing nitrogen fixing  
189 and soil improving crops, such as grass-clover ley, with inputs from outside the system that  
190 are derived from e.g. livestock raised conventionally were widely used in organic farms in  
191 Denmark (Oelofse et al. 2013). Several other studies have also reported that many organic  
192 farmers are moving towards ‘conventionalisation’ of their organic farms in terms of more  
193 farm specialisation, larger farms and intensive use of external fertilisers and less regard for the  
194 principles of organic farming (de Wit & Verhood, 2007; Darnhofer et al. 2010; Oelofse et al.  
195 2011; Nowak et al. 2013). Another farmer who has been organic for the last 12 years (Farmer  
196 3) already followed a more conventional approach similar to that of Farmer 1. Farmer 3 did  
197 not plan his crop rotation in advance, and grew crops according to the market price. His goal  
198 was intensive production reliant on purchased fertilisers. He said:

199 *“My crop sequence is almost free. I choose crops which give the most profit at the moment. So*  
200 *I have a very intensive organic system. I buy organic fertilisers such as Biofer and Biovenass*  
201 *(a by-product from commercial yeast production) for my crops to produce more wheat*  
202 *instead of growing ley or peas.”*

203 The above quote indicates that the current market price was the most decisive factor for him  
204 when choosing crops in the sequence. He was the only farmer who did not grow any ley and  
205 he also reported managing the weeds successfully using modern machines and without any  
206 break crops in his cereal rotation. The farmer, however, reported growing field beans in some  
207 years, if the price was high enough.

208 The same farmer further commented:

209 *“I think the first farmers who started organic farming were idealists. But now it is not like*  
210 *that. I think it is more that we want to have the same output as conventional farms.”*



211 His comment indicates that he thinks that there is a trend towards more market oriented  
212 farming practices amongst the recent organic adopters and that he thinks it is possible to  
213 achieve the same yields as in conventional agriculture. He explained that his generation of  
214 organic farmers aims at increasing productivity by managing the farm intensively using  
215 external fertilisers and modern machinery to control weeds. One farmer (Farmer 4) who had  
216 tried to grow mostly cereals in the crop rotation describes how that led to problems with  
217 weeds. Because of these problems, the farmer decided to go back to a planned crop rotation  
218 with legumes and break crops in order to find solutions to the problems. He made the  
219 following comment on his earlier crop rotation strategy:

220 *“Before developing this crop rotation three years ago, I had quite a free crop rotation. It was*  
221 *much more depending on the market. The price of different cereals was a bit uncertain at that*  
222 *time, so you never really knew what to sow. Maybe the free crop rotation caused the big*  
223 *thistle problem that I have experienced. I was too eager to grow cereals, not really thinking*  
224 *about the consequences.”*

225 The quote reveals how this farmer shifted his focus from a profit-oriented crop rotation to a  
226 more ecological farming based on the rules and principles of crop rotations and organic  
227 agriculture, because of problem with creeping thistle (*Cirsium arvense* L.). This farmer has  
228 been practicing organic farming for 12 years and grew as much cereal (mainly winter wheat)  
229 as possible to maximise returns until three years ago. The new rotation includes leys for one  
230 or two years to control perennial weeds followed by two years of winter wheat. Thus, the  
231 farmer made the choice to grow wheat with leys in the rotation to avoid weeds, rather than  
232 growing more crops of wheat at low yield due to e.g. weed problems. During the interview,  
233 the farmer also highlighted that his crop rotation with a ley crop in the sequence offers other  
234 benefits, such as building up the nutrient stock for the winter wheat crop and improving the  
235 soil structure.

236 A farmer managing his farm organically for the last 10 years (Farmer 5) did not follow a  
237 planned crop rotation. He was flexible in the choice of crops species in the rotation. The  
238 rationale for his decision was to be able to adapt to variable conditions such as disruptions due  
239 to pests, weather, etc.

240 Crop rotation strategy of a farmer who inherited the farm from his grandfather and has been  
241 managing his farm organically for 18 years (Farmer 2) was based mainly on tradition and

242 farming experience. Although the livestock component was abandoned 16 years ago in the  
243 farm, he reported following the same crop rotation as in the last 70 years as he claims to have  
244 good knowledge of this rotation. He remarked:

245 *“I have not changed the crop rotation that my grandfather used since the 1940s, because I*  
246 *know it very well and this rotation controls the weeds. I still grow ley even though I do not*  
247 *have cows now, as I trust this rotation. I can sell some of the forage to the neighbours, though*  
248 *not at the same good price as the wheat.”*

249 His statement reflects the importance of experience when deciding crop choice and rotation.  
250 The farmer chose to trust the well tested crop rotation which was designed with proper break  
251 crops, rather than changing to a new one, which could potentially be more profitable. During  
252 the interview, the farmer also mentioned that he thinks that the inclusion of ley in the rotation  
253 helps to improve the soil. Rotational leys are known to increase yields of the other crops in  
254 the rotation (Johnston et al. 1994; Persson et al. 2008)

255 In summary, lack of direct economic benefits of growing leys was the reason why several of  
256 the arable farmers do not to grow leys and diverge away from the rules of crop rotation and  
257 principles of organic agriculture. Instead, some of the farmers follow a market oriented crop  
258 rotation practice focused on growing cereals with the intensive use of machines and external  
259 fertilisers. The two most important trade-offs mentioned were, firstly, the use of external  
260 fertilisers and intensive control of weeds to grow more cash crops, and secondly, the use of  
261 legume crops and crop diversity in rotation to support soil fertility and for controlling weeds  
262 and diseases. Moreover, the farmers who followed a planned crop rotation seemed to be more  
263 driven by organic principles than the more commercially oriented farmers with more flexible  
264 and liberal crop rotation strategies.

#### 265 266 *Dairy farmers*

267 The typical crop rotation reported by the dairy farmers was two or three years of ley followed  
268 by two years of cereals. The first year of cereal was always wheat (winter wheat preferred  
269 over spring wheat), while the second year could be wheat, barley or oats, e.g.:

270           Ley 1- Ley 2-Winter wheat- Wheat/Barley/Oats-peas under sown with a clover-grass  
271           mixture

272 It is evident from the general crop rotation (above), that the need for feed leads the dairy  
273 farmers to incorporate more ley crops in their rotations than the arable farmers. According to  
274 a farmer who had been practicing certified organic farming for 25 years (Farmer 6), he  
275 followed a planned crop rotation in order to produce sufficient feed for the livestock, and also  
276 some cereals for direct cash income. He included oats in the rotation even if he had more use  
277 for barley and wheat as feed, because he considered oats to be more competitive towards  
278 weeds, and easier to manage than higher value crops such as wheat and barley. Oats is  
279 considered an important crop in areas with short growing seasons and long day-length  
280 regimes and hence is well suited to the study area (Buerstmayer et al. 2007). Oats are  
281 particularly suitable in organic farming where the availability of nitrogen is generally lower  
282 and the need for competitive crops is larger than in conventional systems. He also wanted to  
283 have great crop diversity to spread risks and because it was his experience that more crop  
284 diversity leads to fewer problems with weeds, pests and diseases.

285 Furthermore, his crop rotation was aimed at managing weeds and he experimented with  
286 different crop sequences to develop his farm management. He remarked the following about  
287 his crop rotation for controlling the weeds:

288 *“We had problem with weeds. We have tried rotations with 3 or 4 years of ley, but then there*  
289 *was the problem of the perennial weed, couch grass. The couch grass spread to the barley.*  
290 *We also got less material for silage. So now, with two years of ley, there are fewer weeds and*  
291 *we could get good yields. Of course it is also expensive to re-seed the ley every 2 years, but it*  
292 *is better than having weeds.”*

293 His statement reflects the choice between efficient weed control and the costs of frequent re-  
294 seeding of the ley crop. According to his experience, two-year leys were optimal for long  
295 term yields considering the need for keeping weeds, i.e. couch grass (*Elymus repens*, L.),  
296 under control in the rotation. Several other perennial weeds, particularly stationary ones such  
297 as dandelion (*Taraxacum* spp.), thrive in leys, but are not very competitive in annual crops.  
298 The control of couch grass depends mainly on having competitive crops and cultivating the  
299 soil between crops (Håkansson 2003). This also shows that proper planning and length of  
300 period of certain crops in a rotation can prevent propagation of particular problematic weed  
301 species.

302 According to a farmer rearing 90 dairy cows and practicing organic farming for 13 years  
303 (Farmer 7), the rationale for the crop rotation was to meet the feed requirement of the dairy  
304 cows. He said the following about his crop rotation:

305 *“I follow a planned crop rotation because I am compelled to do it. I need a lot of grass-clover*  
306 *ley to produce forage for the animals and then, peas and barley mixture as protein*  
307 *supplement for the cows. The good thing is also that I do not need to buy fertilisers, and the*  
308 *rotation is good for the soil. Thistles are controlled in this rotation if I cut the leys 3 times a*  
309 *year.”*

310 The focus on producing feed for the animals is in line with Flaten et al. (2005) who reported  
311 that the main cropping goal of Norwegian dairy farmers was to produce sufficient feed for the  
312 livestock as organic livestock feed was reported to be expensive. Producing livestock feed on  
313 farm also fits within the guidance of organic regulations for the use of locally produced feed.

314 The aim of a farmer practicing certified organic farming for 12 years (Farmer 8) was to adapt  
315 his crop rotation according to the market price of cereals. He often chose to grow wheat  
316 instead of protein rich crops such as peas and beans for his livestock. Thus, this farmer could  
317 consider replacing feed crops with profitable cash crops and instead purchase the feed. The  
318 crop rotation strategy of a recently converted organic farmer (Farmer 9) was to avoid weeds  
319 and diseases in the crops. The farmer developed a crop rotation plan when he became a  
320 certified organic farmer which included two years of ley followed by one year of winter wheat  
321 and then a fourth year with winter wheat or *Triticale*. His strategy was to buy the protein  
322 fodder from other farmers, because he considered the annual legumes difficult to grow as they  
323 are susceptible to adverse weather conditions, pests and diseases.

324 To summarise, most dairy farmers followed the rules of crop rotation by having diverse crops  
325 and leys to control weeds, pests and diseases. However, the strategy of a few of the farmers to  
326 rely on external feed by growing more cereals is not in line with the principles of organic  
327 agriculture. The most important trade-off observed amongst dairy farmers in regard to their  
328 crop rotation was between growing sufficient feed for the livestock, and growing cereal crops  
329 for cash. Several farmers who were flexible in their crop rotation tended to focus on cereal  
330 cash crops and thus had a higher dependence on external sources for feed than other organic  
331 dairy farmers interviewed. It appears that it was more important for the long term organic

332 farmers in the study to be self-sufficient in feed than it was for the recently converted farmers,  
333 who were more willing to purchase feed.

334

### 335 *Beef and sheep farmers*

336 The crop rotation strategies of beef cattle/sheep farmers were very variable, but it was quite  
337 common to have three years of ley and two years of cereals (winter wheat or spring barley).  
338 Some farmers also had peas or beans after the first or second year of cereals and then added  
339 another cereal crop at the end of the rotation. A typical rotation was:

340           Ley 1- Ley 2- Ley 3- Wheat /Barley- Wheat/Oat under sown with grass-clover

341 Similar to many dairy farmers, the objective of the crop rotation for Farmer 13 was to follow  
342 a planned rotation in order to produce sufficient feed for the livestock as well as cereals for  
343 direct cash income. Despite mentioning the problem of thistles in wheat, the farmer continues  
344 growing wheat because it is profitable even if yields are quite low. Another farmer practicing  
345 organic farming since 11 years (Farmer 12) claimed that the purpose of his crop rotation was  
346 to solve the problem of thistle and couch grass. The farmer remarked:

347       *“Thistles are difficult to control and that is why I have three-four years of ley in the rotation.*  
348 *I also avoid growing wheat after wheat or barley. The disadvantage of my rotation is that*  
349 *couch grass propagates. The couch grass multiplies in the ley, especially if you have ley for*  
350 *three years, but they are not as stubborn as thistle”.*

351 Similar to several arable farmers, he reported thistles to be an important factor when deciding  
352 his crop rotation, which had not been mentioned by many farmers with livestock. However,  
353 Farmer 12 had four years between the ley crops, which is more than any other livestock  
354 farmer. According to his experience, two years of ley was not enough to control thistles. The  
355 risk of having three year leys in the rotation was also highlighted by this farmer. After three  
356 years of ley the problem with couch grass accelerated according to Farmer 12. This is  
357 evidence of a trade-off between controlling thistle and couch grass and this farmer prioritised  
358 the control of thistle, because he found couch grass easier to control by other means,  
359 supposedly through tillage. It is well known that perennial weeds can easily become a major  
360 problem if crop sequences are not properly planned and managed (Liebman & Dyck 1993)

361 and that the occurrence of thistle decrease with the age of the ley crops, while this is not the  
362 case with couch grass (Håkansson 2003). Couch grass has a similar growth habit as the sown  
363 grasses and can therefore tolerate the frequent cuttings associated with harvest well (Cussans  
364 1973), while creeping thistle is sensitive to cutting (Graglia et al. 2006).

365 A long-term organic farmer who had been raising beef cattle and sheep organically for 23  
366 years (Farmer 10) did not follow a crop rotation. When asked what determined his rotation,  
367 the farmer replied:

368 *“I grow whatever suits me. I have a lot of ideas about different crops and rotation. But I can*  
369 *never decide in advance what I am going to grow in the coming year as my chosen crops*  
370 *sometimes die or fetch a lower price. As time goes on, it will tell. You have to change your*  
371 *plans in order to benefit according to each particular year and I buy feed sometimes in order*  
372 *to grow more cereals”.*

373 This farmer did not seem to be interested in following a planned crop rotation because of  
374 several uncertainties. According to him, he could gain more by adapting to the prevailing  
375 conditions and market prices than following a planned rotation and this determined his crop  
376 rotation. Smit and Pilifosova (2003) reported that farmers who have experienced the effects of  
377 extreme events, e.g. extreme weather, can plan better to adapt to the impacts of future extreme  
378 events. Despite being a livestock farmer, his crop rotation strategy was similar to several of  
379 the arable farmers.

380 A long-term organic farmer (Farmer 11) who had been raising beef cattle organically for 23  
381 years mentioned that the soil type in his farm was the most important determinant for his crop  
382 rotation. The farmer said:

383 *“If you run your farm organically, you should terminate the ley after a shorter length of time*  
384 *to take advantage of the nitrogen. If you don't, the nitrogen just leaches. But knowing is one*  
385 *thing and doing is another. The peat soils in my fields are mainly suitable for growing ley, it*  
386 *is difficult to grow cereals on them, and you easily get a lot of weeds. That is why we have*  
387 *mostly cereals on the mineral soils and ley on the peat soils”.*

388 He grew mainly barley on the mineral soils and ley on the peat soils (soils with a relatively  
389 high percentage of organic matter). In spite of his awareness of the benefits of ley crops and  
390 crop rotation, he chose to grow his leys on the peat soils, because of the difficulties of

391 producing good cereal crops without herbicides on these soils. A sheep farmer who converted  
392 to organic farming four years earlier (Farmer 14) claimed to follow a planned crop rotation in  
393 order to produce sufficient fodder on peat soils, with one year oats followed by three years of  
394 ley in the rotation. He shared similar experience as Farmer 11 on the difficulty of growing  
395 cereals on peat soils. The farmer commented:

396 *“Well, on the peat soils it is only oats, because wheat, barley and peas don’t grow well on the*  
397 *peat soil and I don’t know what other crops to grow. Oats is followed by ley for some years. It*  
398 *is mainly to establish a new ley crop that I have oats every fourth year and I do not need to*  
399 *buy feed from neighbours.”*

400 In summary, several long-term organic farmers were aware of the ‘potential benefits’ of  
401 practicing crop rotation, but they were generally quite flexible in their rotations and adapted  
402 them to soil type, climate, market, and weeds. The important considerations for the farmers  
403 were the number of years to keep the leys in the rotation to optimise weed control, residual  
404 effect of the leys, the possibility to grow cash crops and presumably the need for feed. The  
405 recently converted organic farmers seemed more eager to follow planned crop rotations and  
406 the main purpose of the crop rotation planning was to control weed propagation, especially  
407 thistle and couch grass. Most of the farmers in this group followed crop rotation rules quite  
408 diligently.

409

#### 410 ***Pig and mixed livestock farmers***

411 The main reason for following a planned crop rotation for a pig farmer who converted to  
412 organic farming three years earlier (Farmer 16) was to achieve good break crop effects. He  
413 practiced the following crop rotation:

414 Oats (under-sown with grass-clover) - Ley 1 - Ley 2 - Wheat/Barley - Oats- Pea

415 The farmer remarked on his crop rotation:

416 *“My rotation is to produce enough feed for my pigs. I avoid barley after barley in the rotation*  
417 *as there could be fungi (in the crops). Maybe my application of manures worsens the fungus*  
418 *situation. I am also trying to get rid of the weeds. I am a pig farmer but I grow ley to remove*  
419 *the weeds. I think it has reduced the problem with fungal diseases and also fertilised the soil”.*

420 The farmer changed his earlier crop rotation because of his experience with fungal diseases  
421 and weeds in the crops. He related the occurrence of fungal diseases in his crops to growing  
422 barley for several consecutive years and also to the application of manures. He chose to  
423 follow a proper rotation with two years of ley even though the pigs did not consume much  
424 forage, as it offered other benefits such as reducing the problem of weeds and diseases and  
425 also improving the soil fertility. The increase in fungal disease with animal manure that the  
426 farmer report could probably be an effect of the resulting high nitrogen availability that is  
427 known to increase risk of fungal diseases, but, in general, animal manure is considered to  
428 promote crop health by increasing soil biological activity (van Bruggen 1995).

429 The crop rotation strategy of a farmer who had practiced organic farming for 25 years  
430 (Farmer 15) was based not only on economic and agronomic reasons but also on very strong  
431 ecological arguments. He practiced a highly diversified system with several farm income  
432 sources: pig, beef, dairy, sheep, poultry and cereals on 170 ha farmland.

433 He claimed to follow a planned crop rotation most of the time, but sometimes interchanged  
434 crops with similar properties, or changed crops as response to weather conditions. He gave the  
435 following statement on his crop rotation:

436 *“The aim of my crop rotation is to produce enough to make a profit, control pests and weeds*  
437 *and also enhance biodiversity. One goal is to have enough grains to sell, (which means) more*  
438 *than we consume, including household consumption. We also look into the resilience of the*  
439 *farm using different combination and ways of integrating crops and animals. The extension*  
440 *agent advised me to invest in one species to make greater profit. But I don’t want to put all*  
441 *eggs in one basket.”*

442 Although the extension agents have advised him to specialise in one type of farm enterprise in  
443 order to increase profitability, the farmer had deliberately diversified the farm with several  
444 crops and animal species. The farmer also mentioned that he thinks his farm will be more  
445 sustainable if he has income from diversified sources. He seems to prioritise long-term farm  
446 sustainability more than the short-term economic benefit. It has been shown earlier that some  
447 organic farmers have a long-term concern for sustainability and these farmers are willing to  
448 risk a reduced yield in the short-term for a good chance of a higher yield in the future (Mccan  
449 et al. 1997). Darnhofer et al. (2005) also suggested that farmers with this focus on  
450 sustainability are likely to be long-term organic farmers and that they are likely to be willing



451 to risk foregoing incomes for the cause of organic principles. The farming ideals of Farmer 15  
452 seemed to be deeply rooted in the principles of organic farming and his crop rotation with  
453 diverse crops and proper length of crop sequence fits well to the rules of crop rotation.

454 [Table 2 near here]

455

## 456 **Concluding discussion**

457 The study illustrates that farmers' past experiences with crop rotation and management  
458 greatly influenced the farmers' current crop rotation strategies. The case of arable farmers  
459 using 'Biofer' as a substitute for legumes is a good example where the convenience of use and  
460 short-term better economic return from consecutive cereal crops makes them choose cereal  
461 crops over legumes and perennial crops in the rotation. This allowed them to grow crops  
462 according to market demand and price without considering the best possible use of crop  
463 rotation. Although, this practice appears to be more of a conventional farming approach, it  
464 seems to be getting more common among organic farmers in many parts of the world (Lockie  
465 & Halpin 2005; Darnhofer et al. 2010; Oelofse et al. 2011). The intensification may also  
466 increase the extent to which organic farming relies on nutrient imports from conventional  
467 production as discussed by Nowak et al. (2013). The organic standards are characterised by a  
468 description of what is not allowed in organic farming rather than describing the positive  
469 practices. One of the difficulties of translating the principles of organic farming into practice  
470 is associated with the interpretation of those principles as there is no single or exact  
471 interpretation of these. Padel et al. (2009), Darnhofer et al. (2010) and Dinis et al. (2015) all  
472 point out specifically that the principles of organic farming are only partly expressed in the  
473 certification rules in relation to biodiversity, nutrient cycling etc. Many authors suggest that  
474 this can result in a type of organic farming which is very close to conventional farming but  
475 without the prohibited substances (Allen & Kovach 2000; Constance et al. 2008). The organic  
476 farmers in this study who are moving away from diverse crop rotation towards the use of  
477 purchased organic fertilisers and high-tech solutions of mechanical weeding could be seen as  
478 falling into this category. On the contrary, there were also farmers who had experienced the  
479 problem of diseases, weeds and low yield from their earlier rotation strategy that focused on  
480 producing as many cash crops (cereals) as possible, and who have changed their crop rotation  
481 strategies to address the problems.

482

483 The results shows that farmers decisions on their crop rotations are not necessarily based on  
484 the rules of crop rotations (Castellazzi et al. 2008 ), and the principles of organic agriculture  
485 (by IFOAM), but also by factors such as soil type, weeds, price, tradition, etc., as mentioned  
486 in the European Commission (2010) report. In addition, our study has identified important  
487 trade-offs which farmers have to consider when deciding their crop rotations. The case of  
488 arable farmers preferring to grow more cereal crops than perennial ley or annual legumes fits  
489 with the ideas of Watson et al. (2002), as these crops are of little economic benefit and also do  
490 not increase the total supply of nutrients other than nitrogen. It is logical for the arable  
491 farmers to focus on growing profitable cereal crops more frequently in the rotation as their  
492 income comes from crops only. However, the evidence of several livestock farmers preferring  
493 to grow cereal crops and purchase feed is a general cause for concern about the reliance of  
494 organic farming on external (conventional) sources. Kirchmann et al. (2008) reported that  
495 75% of organic mixed farms in Austria and Sweden imported fodders from external sources,  
496 mainly from conventional farming. Neighbouring farmers with and without animals could  
497 also collaborate in order to use resources more efficiently at a regional scale, allowing some  
498 specialisation while keeping some of the advantages of the diversified systems.

499 Most of the livestock farmers in the study region, excluding the dairy farmers, have the  
500 features of 'mixed farms' as their crop rotations were based on producing feed for the  
501 livestock, as well as, cereals for earning direct cash income. This diversification of income  
502 sources was evident amongst the long-term organic livestock farmers (more than 10 years of  
503 certified organic farming) within the group. Their farming aims were to produce sufficient  
504 feed as well as different cash crops. The recently converted organic livestock farmers tended  
505 to be specialised and focused on producing feed for their livestock and grew few crop species.  
506 Zander (2005) showed that personality of the farmer is the key driving factor for  
507 diversification among organic farmers in Germany and that presence of highly qualified  
508 labour on the farm was a pre-condition to successful diversification. Perhaps, the long-term  
509 organic farmers in our study had gained experience and skills through many years of organic  
510 farming and this might be the reason why they had more diversified systems than the recent  
511 organic farmers. The case of long-term organic farmers practicing more diversified farming  
512 and adhering to the principles of organic farming than the recently converted ones was also  
513 reported in other parts of Europe (Best 2008, Padel 2008; Dinis et al. 2015).

514 We could distinguish three different crop rotation strategies; strict, flexible and liberal crop  
515 rotation. Farmers practicing strict crop rotation strategies have a pre-planned crop sequence  
516 and followed the sequence stringently through several rotations. Farmers with flexible crop  
517 rotation strategies also had a pre-planned crop sequence, but the crop species in the sequence  
518 sometimes varied and changed to adapt to environmental conditions and economic  
519 considerations (especially cereal price). Finally, farmers practicing liberal crop rotations  
520 lacked crop sequence plans and chose crops according to the market price, seed availability,  
521 personal preference and weather conditions. Several recently converted organic farmers  
522 practiced strict crop rotation and their strategy appeared to be mainly related to controlling  
523 weeds and diseases in the cereals. Flexible and liberal crop rotation strategies were more  
524 associated with long-term organic farmers and their rationale was to adapt to, or gain from the  
525 changing conditions such as market and weather.

526 In conclusion, farmer's past experiences with the trade-offs between different practices  
527 greatly influenced their crop rotation strategies, i.e. strict, flexible or liberal. Irrespective of  
528 the farm type, the most important trade-off was to grow frequent cereal cash crops at the  
529 expense of ley and legumes in the rotation leading to flexibility in their crop rotations. The  
530 rotation strategies of long-term organic farmers were much influenced by organic principles  
531 and they generally incorporated ley crops in their rotations. Their rationale for flexible and  
532 liberal crop rotations was to be able to adapt to changing conditions. Recently converted  
533 organic farmers often practiced strict rotation and followed the rules of crop rotations to  
534 control weeds and diseases. Farmers who chose crops without an intended crop-rotation  
535 (liberal) claimed to continuously adapt to prevailing economic and agro-environmental  
536 conditions as well as their personal preferences, and their rotation strategy tend to deviate  
537 from the rules of crop rotation and organic agriculture. Most livestock farmers built their crop  
538 rotation around ley and forage and their overriding aim was to produce sufficient feed, but  
539 some preferred to grow more cereals for sale and purchase some feed for better economic  
540 return. We conclude that despite the multifunctional benefits of ley and crop rotation in  
541 organic system, many farmers tend to overlook it for short term economic benefits. As a  
542 result, these farmers may need to invest in technology or labour for weed control and become  
543 more reliant on other external inputs.

#### 544 **Acknowledgements**

545 We thank Dennis Jonason for the farm selection and providing the contact information of the  
546 farmers and Kristin Thored for taking part in the interviews and helping with the  
547 transcriptions. We would also like to thank the farmers who have happily agreed to share  
548 valuable information with us. The study is funded through a PhD grant from the Faculty of  
549 Natural Resources and Agricultural Sciences (NJ Faculty), the Swedish University of  
550 Agricultural Sciences (SLU) and the Swedish Research Council Formas (Agri-Multifunk  
551 project, J Bengtsson). Christine Watson was supported by the August T. Larsson guest  
552 researcher position in the NJ-Faculty, SLU.

553

## 554 **References**

555 Allen P, Kovach M. 2000. The capitalist composition of organic: the potential of  
556 markets in fulfilling the promise of organic agriculture. *Agr Hum Val.* 17:  
557 221–232.

558

559 Angus JF, Kirkegaard JA, Hunt JR, Ryan MH, Ohlander L, Peoples MB. 2015. Break crops  
560 and rotations for wheat. *Crop Pasture Sci.* 66:523–552.

561

562 Aubry C, Papy F, Capillon A. 1998. Modelling decision-making processes for annual crop  
563 management. *Agric Syst.* 56:45–65.

564

565 Bachinger J, Zander P. 2007. ROTOR, a tool for generating and evaluating crop rotations for  
566 organic farming systems. *Eur J Agron.* 26:130–143.

567

568 Bertsen, J, Grant R, Olesen JE, Kristensen IS, Vinter FP, Møllgaard JP, Petersen BM. 2006.  
569 Nitrogen cycling in organic farming systems with rotational grass-clover and arable crops.  
570 *Soil Use Manage.* 22:197–208.

571

572 Best H. 2008. Organic agriculture and the conventionalization hypothesis: a case study from  
573 West Germany. *Agr Hum Val.* 25:95-106.

574

- 575 Buerstmayer H, Krenn N, Stepha, U, Grausgruber H, Zechner E. 2007. Agronomic  
576 performance and quality of oat (*Avena sativa* L.) genotypes of worldwide origin produced  
577 under central European growing conditions. *Field Crop Res.* 101:345–351.  
578
- 579 Bullock DG. 1992. Crop rotation. *Crit Rev Plant Sci.* 11:309-326.  
580
- 581 Castellazzi MS, Wood GA, Burgess PJ, Morris J, Conrad KF, Perry JN. 2008. A systematic  
582 representation of crop rotations. *Agric Syst.* 97(1):26-33.  
583
- 584 Constance D, Choi JY, Lyke Ho-Land H, 2008. Conventionalization, bifurcation, and quality  
585 of life: certified and non-certified organic farmers in Texas. *South Rural Sociol.* 23(1):208–  
586 234.  
587
- 588 Cussans GW. (1973) A study of the growth of *Agropyron repens* (L) Beauv. in a ryegrass ley.  
589 *Weed Res.* 13:283-291.  
590
- 591
- 592 Darnhofer I, Schneeberger W, Freyer B. 2005. Converting or not converting to organic  
593 farming in Austria: Farmer types and their rationale. *Agric Hum Val.* 22(1):39-52.  
594
- 595 Darnhofer I, Lindenthal T, Bartel-Kratochvil R, Zollitsch W. 2010. Conventionalisation of  
596 organic farming practices: from structural criteria towards an assessment based on organic  
597 principles. A review. *Agron Sustain Dev.* 30(1):67-81.  
598
- 599
- 600 De Wit J, Verhoog H. 2007. Organic values and the conventionalization of organic  
601 agriculture. *NJAS-Wag J Life Sc.* 449–462.  
602
- 603 Dinis I, Ortolani L, Bocci R, Brites C. 2015. Organic agriculture values and practices in  
604 Portugal and Italy. *Agric Syst.* 136:39-45.  
605
- 606 | Dury J, Garcia F, Reynaud A, Bergez JE. 2013. Cropping-plan decision-making on irrigated  
607 crop farms: A spatio-temporal analysis. *Eur J Agron.* 50:1-10.

608

609 European Commission. 2010. Environmental effects of different crop rotations in the  
610 European Union. Final report.[cited 2014 Nov 10]. Available from:  
611 [http://ec.europa.eu/environment/agriculture/pdf/BIO\\_crop\\_rotations%20final%20report\\_rev%](http://ec.europa.eu/environment/agriculture/pdf/BIO_crop_rotations%20final%20report_rev%20executive%20summary_.pdf)  
612 [20executive%20summary\\_.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/environment/agriculture/pdf/BIO_crop_rotations%20final%20report_rev%20executive%20summary_.pdf)  
613

614 EU. 2007. Council Regulation (EC) No 834/2007 of 28 June 2007 on organic production and  
615 labelling of organic products and repealing Regulation (EEC) No 2092/91.  
616 [cited 2015 Dec 07]. Available from:  
617 <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=CELEX%3A32007R0834>  
618

619 Flaten O, Lien G, Koesling M, Valle PS, Ebbesvik M. 2005. Comparing risk perceptions and  
620 risk management in organic and conventional dairy farming: Empirical results from Norway.  
621 *Livest Prod Sci.* 95(1):11–25.  
622

623 Gerhardt RA. 1997. A comparative analysis of the effects of organic and conventional  
624 farming systems on soil structure. *Biol Agric Hortic.* 14:139-157.  
625

626 Graglia E, Melander B, Jensen RK. 2006. Mechanical and cultural strategies to control  
627 *Cirsium arvense* in organic arable cropping systems. *Weed Res.* 46:304-312.  
628

629

630 Håkansson S. 2003. Weeds and weed management on arable land: an ecological approach.  
631 CABI Publishing. Wallingford, UK.  
632

633

634 IFOAM. 2005. The principles of organic agriculture. [cited 2015 Sep15]. Available from:  
635 <http://infohub.ifoam.bio/en/what-organic/principles-organic-agriculture>  
636  
637

638 Johnston AE, McEwen J, Lane PW, Hewitt MV, Poulton PR, Yeoman DP. 1994. Effects of  
639 one to six year old ryegrass–clover leys on soil nitrogen and on subsequent yields and  
640 fertilizer nitrogen requirements of the arable sequence winter wheat, potatoes, winter wheat,  
641 winter beans (*Vicia faba*) grown on a sandy loam soil. *J Agric Sci.* 122:73–89.  
642

- 643 Jonason D, Andersson GK, Ockinger E, Rundlöf M, Smith HG, Bengtsson J. 2011.  
644 Assessing the effect of time since transition to organic farming on plant and butterflies. *J Appl*  
645 *Ecol.* 48:543-550.  
646
- 647 Jonason D, Andersson GK, Ockinger E, Smith HG, Bengtsson J. 2012. Field scale organic  
648 farming does not counteract landscape effects on butterfly trait composition. *Agr Ecosyst*  
649 *Env.* 158:66-71.  
650
- 651 Karlen DL, Varvel GE, Bullock DG, Cruse RM. 1994. Crop rotations for the 21st century.  
652 *Adv Agron.* 53:1-45.  
653
- 654 Kirchmann H, Kätterer T, Bergström L. 2008. Nutrient supply in organic agriculture—plant  
655 availability, sources and recycling. *Organic Crop Production—Ambitions and Limitations.*  
656 Springer, Netherlands. 89-116.  
657
- 658 Kvale S. 1996. *Inter Views: An introduction to qualitative research interviewing.* Sage  
659 Publications. Thousand Oaks, CA.  
660
- 661
- 662 Liebman M, Dyck E. 1993. Crop rotations and intercropping strategies for weed  
663 management. *Ecol Appl* 3(1):92-122.  
664
- 665 Lockie S, Halpin D. 2005. The ‘conventionalisation’ thesis reconsidered: Structural and  
666 ideological transformation of Australian organic agriculture. *Sociologia ruralis.* 45(4):284-  
667 307.  
668
- 669 Longhurst R. 2003. Semi-structured interviews and focus groups. In: Clifford N, French S,  
670 Valentine G, editors. *Key methods in geography.* Sage Publications Ltd. London; p.103-114.  
671
- 672 Mccann\_E, Sullivan S, Erickson D, De Young R. 1997. Environmental Awareness,  
673 Economic Orientation, and Farming Practices: A Comparison of Organic and  
674 Conventional Farmers. *Env Manage.* 5:747-758.

- 675  
676 Moncada KM, Sheaffer CC. 2010. Weed management. In Moncada K, Sheaffer CC, editors.  
677 Risk Management Guide for Organic Producers. Saint Paul, MN: University of Minnesota.  
678
- 679 Nowak B, Nesme T, David C, Pellerin S. 2013. To what extent does organic farming rely  
680 on nutrient inflows from conventional farming? *Environ Res Lett.* 8 044045.  
681
- 682 Oelofse M, Høgh-Jensen H, Abreu LS, Almeida GF, El-Araby A, Hui OY, Sultan T, de  
683 Neergaard A. 2011. Organic farm conventionalisation and farmer practices in China, Brazil  
684 and Egypt. *Agron Sustain Dev.* 31(4):689-698.  
685
- 686 Oelofse M, Jensen LS, Magid J. 2013. The implications of phasing out conventional nutrient  
687 supply in organic agriculture: Denmark as a case. *Organic Agriculture* 3(1):41-55.  
688
- 689 Padel S. 2008. Values of organic producers converting at different times: results of a focus  
690 group study in five European countries. *Int J Agr Resour Gov Ecol.* (7):63-77.  
691
- 692 Padel S, Röcklinsberg H, Schmid O. 2009. The implementation of organic principles and  
693 values in the European Regulation for organic food. *Food Policy.* 34 (3):245–251.  
694
- 695 Papadopoulos A, Mooney SJ, Bird, NRA. 2006. Quantification of the effects of contrasting  
696 crops in the development of soil structure: an organic conversion. *Soil Use Manage.* 22:172–  
697 179.  
698
- 699 Persson T, Bergkvist G, Kätterer T. 2008. Long-term effects of crop rotations with and  
700 without perennial leys on soil carbon stocks and grain yields of winter wheat. *Nutrient*  
701 *Cycling in Agro-ecosystems.* 81:193–202.
- 702 Power B, Rodriguez D, DeVoil, P, Harris G, Payero J. 2011. A multi-field bio-economic  
703 model of irrigated grain–cotton farming systems. *Field Crops Res.* 124:171–179.  
704



- 705 Smit B, Pilifosova O. 2003. Adaptation to climate change in the context of sustainable  
706 development and equity. *Sustain Dev.* 8(9):9.
- 707
- 708 Swedish Board of Agriculture. 2011. Year book of Agricultural Statistics .2011. SCB-Tryck,  
709 Örebro, Sweden
- 710
- 711 Van Bruggen AH. 1995. Plant disease severity in high-input compared to reduced-input and  
712 organic farming systems. *Plant disease.* 79(10):976-84.
- 713
- 714 Watson CA, D, Atkinson D, Gosling P, Jackson LR, Rayns FW. 2002. Managing soil fertility  
715 in organic farming systems. *Soil Use Manage.* 18:239-247.
- 716
- 717 Zander K. 2005. Diversification and specialisation as development strategies in organic  
718 farms. 16th IFOAM Organic World Congress, Modena, Italy, June 16-20, 2008. [cited 2014  
719 Nov 02]. Available from: <http://orgprints.org/view/projects/conference.html>
- 720
- 721 Öhlmér B, Olson K, Brehmer B. 1998. Understanding farmers' decision making processes and  
722 improving managerial assistance. *Agr Econ.* 18:273-290.
- 723
- 724
- 725

## 726 **List of Tables**

727 **Table 1.** List of keywords for the interviews.

728

729 **Table 2.** Summary of general farm characteristics and farmer's crop rotations, typical  
730 sequence or crops grown, and type of rotation strategy, i.e. strict (always the same crops  
731 grown in rotation if at all possible), flexible (aim for a special rotation and adjust according to  
732 circumstances) and liberal (no special rotation). Ley refers to a crop mixture of red clover and  
733 grasses. All crops except winter wheat and triticale are spring sown.

734

735 **Table 1.** List of keywords for the interviews

736 A .Farm Overview:

737 1. Size; Labourers; Number of crops, animals. Why?

738 2. History- ownership, farming type (crops/animals)

739 B .Farming/cropping systems:

740 1. Organic/conventional: since when, why?

741 2. Crop sequence and rotation in the farm

742 3. Purpose of the sequence/rotation

743 4. Pros and cons of the rotations , e.g. effect on soil, water, disease/weeds, yield, price

744 5. Change in crop rotations in the recent past.

745 6. Source/knowledge of crop rotation from where/whom?

746 7. Any Intercropping, how and why?

747 8. Annual crop distribution

748 9. Crops in the farm (according to area, economic expenditure and benefits ),

749 10. Crops/crop rotations that are most challenging to grow, and why, how it is overcome?

750 11. Cash crops/how much for internal use? Where he sells, why? Any contract?

751 C. Decisions:

752 1. Sowing and harvesting time

753 2. When and how the decisions on crop choices are taken?

754 D. Management:

755 1. Fertiliser/manures and amount (for different crops), internal or external

756 2. Farm expenditure (ranking)

757 3. Farm challenges (rank)

758 4. Subsidies and market price on type of crop/farming

759 E. Farmers' information:

760 1. Age: Farming education; Any techniques he learnt from education or visiting farms  
761 abroad

762 |

763 **Table 2.** Summary of general farm characteristics and farmer's crop rotations, typical sequence or crops grown, and type of rotation strategy, i.e.  
 764 strict (always the same crops grown in rotation if at all possible), flexible (aim for a special rotation and adjust according to circumstances) and  
 765 liberal (no special rotation). Ley refers to a crop mixture of red clover and grasses. All crops except winter wheat and triticale are spring sown.

<i>Farm no.</i>	<i>Farm type</i>	<i>Farm size (ha)</i>	<i>No. of livestock</i>	<i>Year since conversion to organic</i>	<i>Crop rotation/typical sequence</i>	<i>Rotation strategy</i>
1	Arable	70	0	20	Grow ley, winter wheat, oats, barley	Liberal
2	Arable	150	0	18	Barley (under-sown ley) - ley - ley/black fallow <sup>1</sup> - winter wheat - winter wheat	Strict
3	Arable	235	0	12	Mostly winter wheat and other cereals, but occasionally also field beans	Liberal
4	Arable	163	0	12	Barley (under-sown with ley) - ley/black fallow <sup>1</sup> - winter wheat - winter wheat - field beans	Strict
5	Arable	55	0	10	Oats (under-sown) - ley - wheat - oats/peas	Flexible
6	Dairy	90	50	25	Spring barley/oats (under-sown ley) -	Strict

ley - ley - winter wheat

7	Dairy	105	90	13	Barley and pea (under-sown ley) - ley - ley - ley - winter wheat	Strict
8	Dairy	310	280	12	Barley/peas/field beans (under-sown ley)-ley - ley - ley - winter cereal (Wheat/triticale)	Flexible
9	Dairy	75	21	5	Winter wheat/triticale (under sown ley)- ley - ley - winter wheat	Strict
10	Beef/sheep	85	22 beef, 33 sheep	23	Grow at least two years of ley and also other crops such as winter wheat, barley and oats	Liberal
11	Beef	34	35	23	Grow cereals, mostly barley, and ley	Liberal
12	Beef	180	150	11	Oats (under-sown ley) - ley - ley - ley - winter wheat -oats - field beans	Flexible
13	Beef	220	30	10	Mixed grains (under sown with ley) - ley - ley - winter wheat - spring wheat	Strict

14	Sheep	50	60	4	Oats (under-sown ley) - ley - ley - ley - oats/peas -	Strict
15	Mixed	179	110 pig, 20 dairy, 10 beef, 80 sheep, 350 hen	25	Barley (under sown ley) - ley- ley- winter wheat - oat- pea- winter rye	Flexible
16	Pig	145	50	3	Oats (under-sown ley) -- <u>ley</u> - ley - winter wheat/spring barley - oats - peas	Strict

---

766 <sup>1</sup> Short period with black fallow to control perennial root weeds between incorporation of ley crop and sowing of winter wheat.

