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1. Introduction:
All over Europe farming contributes to social activities in rural areas. But social farming means more: Farms that include people with special needs, people recovering from drug addiction, psychiatric, mental or physical diseases or handicaps, long term unemployed persons, people with depression or burnout, homeless people, former prisoners, young people from youth welfare work, children and elderly persons with dementia or still active contributors to farm life. Social farms being part of a sheltered workshop for disabled people, school farms or kindergarten farms provide the rhythms of nature as an experience for the different groups of clients. The classical economic sectors of a commercial farm – animal and plant production – are widened by providing space for recreation, educational and therapeutic activities that can be an alternative to further reduction of expensive human labour in farming systems. The care for underprivileged people can also contribute to other fields of multifunctionality, i.e. care for nature and the development of cultural landscapes.

1.1 The special difficulties in the analysis of structure and distribution of social farming in Germany
Analysing social farming initiatives and structures in Germany faces special difficulties. With 82 million inhabitants it is the densest populated country in the European Union and in comparison with the SoFar – project partner countries (such as Belgium, Slovenia and Netherlands) - it has quite a large extension. Germany consists of 16 federal states and concerning agriculture, social, therapeutic and pedagogic work these federal states have different laws. The consequence is that social farming in Brandenburg might face different rules and regulations than in Hessa.

The discussion about occupation and employment for “fringe groups” and especially for people with handicaps is sensible respecting the special German history of the Nazi regime. Agricultural work is still seen as dirty and less appreciated work because it is physically hard and without freedom of choice. On the other hand the meaning of work itself changes currently and is seen more and more as fulfilment of ones personality. Intelligent construction might serve to make work more attractive. The Use of efficient technology might sometimes be suited to allow more vacancies for meaningful manual work and flexible composition of working time.

1.2 Structures of social farming
The integration and employment of people with handicaps and the rehabilitation of less capable persons are organized by social associations in Germany. A survey with 264 questionnaires, a quota of exhaust of 61% and sent back information from 167 social farms (only including “therapy of fringe groups” on farms; LENHARD et al. 1997: 459, 464) found out that most of the social farms belong to institutions.
Independent institutions like normal farms are mostly not authorised to get the public funding for integralional work, because a certain size of at least 120 handicapped clients is required by law. Nevertheless private and individual initiatives exist, but due to a lack of publicity and small size only few are known.

More than half of the farms surveyed by LENHARD et al. (1997) offer services and work for handicapped people and nearly half of them are registered as sheltered workshops (WfbM). The farms are run by

- **free social services**, mostly Christian or religious organisations such as Deacon Organisation, German Caritas, German Parity Welfare Organisation with anthroposophical organisations, Workers Welfare Organisation and the German Red Cross
- **public social services** such as federal state, ministry (for example prisons)
- **other social services** such as foundations, “Lebenshifte” association and self aid associations (LENHARD et al. 1997: 464f., see also LIMBRUNNER 2004: 9-10).

The judicial form is either an association (e.V.) or the charitable “society with limited liability” (GmbH) (LENHARD et al. 1997: 465). The importance and distribution of existing networks and associations are often only on a local or regional base. The national associations do not cover all initiatives and often hierarchies inhibit communication among them.

About 60% of the surveyed farms are certified organic (LENHARD et al. 1997: 467 p. 48, AGÖL 2000). They employ on an average 15 clients and the duration of employment on 84% of the farms takes longer than 6 months. This shows the importance of farming therapy for chronically ill (LENHARD et al. 1997: 473). The clients work in the fields of animal husbandry, vegetable and potato growing whereas they only scarcely work in less labour intensive plant production.

Also the structure of farms varies. The cultivated area reaches from animal keeping gardens to large farms with more than 1000 ha. The average social farm has got an area of about 79 hectares which is double compared to the average size of organic farms. Many of them grow cereals and keep animals, 66% grow animal fodder and potatoes, 55% grow on about 1.5 ha vegetables. Pigs (50%) and cattle are kept very often, some few keep sows (30%) and poultry. There are on an average 55 GV (1 GV = 500 kg) per farm and 0,69 VE (1 cow = 1 VE, 1 pig =0,33 VE) per ha. Direct marketing and consumption within the own institution are the most important outlets (LENHARD et al. 1997: 470).

### 2. The multifunctionality of social agriculture

Social farming comes as a term slowly into public awareness but the dissociation towards „non- social“-farming is quite difficult. In a country that suffers from 4.81 million unemployed people (http://de.wikipedia.org/wiki/Arbeitslosigkeit#Deutschland, access 23.3.07); including loss of social security and services as well as scarce opportunities for apprentices nearly every effort to create jobs, educational training or social help must be seen as “social”. The dissociation between farming, horticulture and green services are not clear cut. Are the claims to produce food and a minimum size needed to refer to as “social farming”? Should ecological standards get connected to the term social farming because exploitation of nature contradicts social principles? The next paragraph tries to approximate to the meaning of “social farming” in advance.

Today the production of food and raw materials is seen as principal duty of agriculture. In former times farming also meant social interaction and traditional living models in rural areas. With rationalisation and the use of new techniques the modern agricultural enterprise of today has as few employees as possible and manages giant units. Social inclusion is – like the maintenance of the cultural landscapes, the keeping of cultural values such as rural traditions, the production of own seeds etc. not seen as a multifunctional task of farming.
anymore. In Germany the term “social farming” is rather new and is not used in a uniform way by all who use it:

- Basically “social farming” describes paid or unpaid services for people (such as the care for family members), honorary engagement in society, donations of goods or money or simply an appropriate compensation of the employees performance of an enterprise, so called “social compatibility” (HERMANOWSKI 2006a: 14).

- In a study by LENHARD et al. (1997) the term social farming is proposed and discussed as a term for care of people that belong to “socially excluded fringe groups” on farms. That means farms - such as sheltered workshops for people with handicaps (WfbM), farms in connection with hospitals, prisons and other institutions - as “protected workplaces” where “people that are not completely capable in means of our society such as clients with illnesses or handicaps, criminals, homeless or other who live and work on the farm to rehabilitate or re-socialise them (LENHARD et al. 1997: 459).

- Beyond that the term “social farming” can include other societal groups such as children, young people and the pedagogical sector. Goal of the pedagogically attended integration is the understanding of the origin of food and its processing as well as the change of landscape through farming as starting point for the understanding of one’s own culture. The term social farming would then be used for farming activities where the classical economic sectors of plant and animal production get enlarged by social spheres of actions. Then not only the produces of agriculture get marketed but the actual production process: the participation in processes of production and processing, the experience of rhythms as healing forces while working in nature. Labour forces are not only and – more or less institutionalised - employed to get the work done but primarily to include them socially.

With this enlarged definition social farming includes agricultural, horticultural and landscape maintaining enterprises, where people with different needs get involved and participate in order to take a therapy, employment or pedagogies. There is a smooth transition to other services such as “holiday on farms” for example. Because of the lack of better terms the integrated people are called “clients” or “user” in the following.

The increased outlay for social integration must be paid back to the farms. In sheltered workshops and some rehabilitative programs the outlay is balanced by funding from patient care allowances. Nevertheless compensation of the outlay is a bottle neck. Firstly because certain client groups and persons without clear diagnosis do not get funded by the state, public money is not sufficient to cover the expenses and often the funding is connected with diverse conditions that can not be fulfilled on farms easily. Mostly agricultural activities need more personal staff in order to guarantee an individual care (see chapter 7.2., 7.4.). Talking to farmers being interested in setting up social services on their farms mostly the missing financial compensation inhibits their engagement.

The integration of people is a multifunctional task of farming. The intension is that farming activities and working spaces are specially suited for people in need and prevent from (social) illnesses (salutogenesis). The clients participate in activities on farm and thereby change the farm in structure and atmosphere. Different tendencies can be described:

- Institutions in which the social work predominates and, from the point of view of business management, the agricultural is given less weight. The fields of integration get concieved according to the needs of the clients.

- Farms with commercially orientated business that (often later on) integrated some (few) people additionally in their existing procedures.

These two tendencies are not static, farms and institutions develop. From the historical point of view we can differentiate between farms that have included social tasks on the one and social homes or institutions that develop an agricultural sector on the other hand. Against the background of the European Union agricultural reform, according to which in future the
ecological achievements of farms are to be rewarded, and, with this aim in mind, jobs on farms are to be created outside agricultural production, new potential is offered for developing not only organic farming in a multifunctional manner.

3. State of the scientific research, knowledge and training

Currently there are – except from the departments of medical history (see http://www.uni-marburg.de/aktuelles/Elisabeth2007/Elisab1, access 29.3.2007) – very few scientific activities concerning "farming for health" covering social and therapeutic issues. The connection of "nature-garden-plant and people" in horticulture and agriculture is pursued by different groups and projects with different intentions. There is an estimated number of 1,000 different projects for mentally ill, disabled and elderly people in hospitals, sheltered workshops and farms with a multitude of individual workplaces (NEUBERGER et al. 2006: 193).

The data available about social services on farms with their different structures and diverse operators result from national surveys on sheltered workshops and on other social institutions such as prisons, hospitals etc. (HERMANOWSKI 2006a: p. 15; LENHARD et al. 1997, AGÖL 2000). There are different networks and associations according to client group, specific treatments and special approaches of therapy (such as horticultural or animal assisted therapy), education or rehabilitation. The networks run internet platforms, organise meetings and provide other services to their members. The different networks are shown in table 1 and are described in the dedicated chapters. Nevertheless a complete survey, central recording, advisory service or multi-cliental network on social services on farms are lacking hitherto.

Although the profession of a “social” gardener or farmer differs from the contents of what is normally taught in their educational training, qualifying certificates are currently still missing. Some social farms which offer apprenticeship give attention to the interest of the apprentice for social belongings (oral tradition Bingenheim, Oberrieden). Sheltered workshops use to recommend additional social-pedagogic training courses to their farmers. There are diverse institutions which offer educational training (i.e. horticultural- and animal assisted therapy or assistance for old people in gardening therapy); the certificates are mostly just informal.

Table 1 tries to give a review on networks and distribution of social farming in Germany.

Table 1: Characteristics of social farming in Germany

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group of clients</th>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>Network</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Disadvantaged young people (with misbehaviour,</td>
<td>People without final (school) examination, without Perspektive</td>
<td>No existing network</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>learning disabilities, eating disorders or criminal background)</td>
<td>Goal: structure the day as first step into working life</td>
<td>• address to turn: Systemic family therapy, <a href="http://www.blv-suchthilfe.de/tab/">http://www.blv-suchthilfe.de/tab/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• only local and individual initiatives i.e. <a href="http://www.therapiehof.de">www.therapiehof.de</a>, <a href="http://www.down-up.de">www.down-up.de</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Education under special circumstances (i.e. in prison)</td>
<td>No existing network</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Many prisons run a green sector and other workshops</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homeless</td>
<td>Goal: structure the day and give perspective</td>
<td>No existing network</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Few initiatives, no existing network, i.e. <a href="http://www.gut-dauelsberg.de">www.gut-dauelsberg.de</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning on farm for children and young people</td>
<td>Offer for schools linked in BAGLoB (about 45 pedagogic projects)</td>
<td>• BAGLoB: <a href="http://www.baglob.de">http://www.baglob.de</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>resp.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Old people** (retired, senior citizens, elderly persons with dementia) | **Apart from that many (bio-dynamic) farms offering integration for individuals and groups of Waldorfschools** | **http://www.lernenaufdembauernhof.de**  
- seminars in Altenkirchen  
  www.bagejl.de |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Kindergarten initiatives</strong></td>
<td><strong>No special network, possibly connected with network on “forest kindergarten”</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Immigrants and persons seeking asylum** | **According to demography well discussed sector; diverse requests range from alternative living in the age up to gardening therapy in homes for elderlies and day care services** | **No existing network, some single projects**  
- address to turn:  
  http://www.stmlf.bayern.de/hausw/dienste/produkte/17601/  
- diploma thesis on pilot projects at university of Kassel  
  www.garten-therapie.de (new established network MeGA) |
| **Forms of therapy** | **Possible i.e. in homes for asylant seekers for meaningful occupation despite missing work allowance (psychosocial hygiene, salutogenesis)** | **No projects known on farms,**  
- **similar approaches**  
  www.internationale-gaerten.de  
  www.stiftung-interkultur.de |
| **People with handicaps** (people with illnesses or disadvantaged) | **Broad and well organised sector in Germany**  
**Categories according to diagnosis:**  
- living and housing  
- (payed) occupation  
- therapy/rehabilitation**  
**Organization:**  
- Private/ alternative  
- integrated into first working sector  
- in Sheltered workshops for disabled people (WfbM)** | **Occupation and employment:**  
**Networks of the WfbM:**  
www.bagwfbm.de,  
http://www.werkstaetten-im-netz.de  
**Networks of WfbM with green sectors and mediation/coaching and publication run by FiBL Germany:**  
http://www.gruene-werkstatt.de  
**seminars in Altenkirchen**  
www.bagejl.de |
| **Such as** | **Rehabilitation** (i.e. drug and alcohol addicted) | **After physical withdrawal aims to reintegrate and employment**  
- Mostly over a period of one year** | **No existing network**  
- some pilot projects and diploma thesis on structures but no systematic catch up  
- Address to turn: Agencies for self-
| Physical handicaps (blind and deaf persons) | focuses more on nature experience such as sensual gardens |
| Mental handicaps | Biggest group with about 90% of handicapped people in rehabilitation, fast growing group |
| Psychic handicaps and mentally disordered | fast growing group with mostly new and unknown diagnosis |

4. **The development of social farming and the potentials of organic institutions**

Working with disabled people in agriculture and horticulture is nothing new in Germany. When institutions for disabled, imprisoned or other from society excluded persons were established in the 19th century, they usually had at least a kitchen garden to supply the institution (KALB 1999:5). Most institutions were set up in rural areas and thus areas of agricultural land were readily to hand.

Another example is the Camphill village movement founded mainly by the anthroposophist Karl KÖNIG (1902-1966) and distributed mainly in the British Isles experiencing integration of disabled people in organic farming for some decades (PIETZNER 1990, VERBAND FÜR ANTHROPOSOPHISCHE HEILPÄDAGOGIK UND SOZIALE ARBEIT, 2002). There are about 12 camphills in Germany mainly concentrated in the area of Lake Constance (www.camphill.de, access 28.04.2007).

The social institutions founded in the 19th century mentioned above were closed down or transformed into sheltered workshops in the nineteen seventies. Because of the decline of prices for food in the 1960s it became less and less worthwhile for such institutions to maintain a home-grown food supply. Furthermore, mechanisation resulted in fewer opportunities for employing the disabled in the agricultural sector. As a result, restructuring of employment from that sector to the industrial sector took place. Agricultural land was leased out or sold off. Since the end of the 1980s the call “back to nature” accompanied with a difficulty to sell handcrafts and industrial products a “rediscovery” of the green sectors took place in the sheltered workshops (KALB 1999: 7, HERMANOWSKI 1992: 9, 19-20). Goals of the re-established workplaces was not the home-grown food supply anymore but to sell high quality products on the market, the employment of people with handicaps in specially suited workplaces and to grow organic food. HERMANOWSKI (2005) collected reasons for the rediscovery of social farming:

- Many sheltered workshops have a garden and landscape group which manages not only the institution's grounds but also, as a service provider, land elsewhere. Thus, in these institutions, frequent consideration is given to extending to agriculture the positive experiences gained in horticulture and landscaping.
- Through adding value by means of a bakery or a cheese dairy and the direct marketing associated with them, further job opportunities are created which were no longer available in mechanised agriculture.
- Establishing organic farming as an alternative to conventional management offered the potential for creating jobs that were more secure and were more socially acceptable.
Increasing globalisation exposes sheltered workshops to increasing competition on price, thus increasing the quest for possible alternatives to industrial production.

In the face of the change in the structure of agriculture, traditional agricultural and horticultural enterprises disposed of their production buildings and grounds and thus sheltered workshops had increasing access to opportunities to run such enterprises.

Work in the ‘green sector’ has a high therapeutic value if the enterprise focuses on the requirements of working with the disabled. The diversity and differing demands of work in agriculture and horticulture, as well as working with animals, are fundamental features of activities in this employment sector which seeks to integrate the disabled. In practice it is increasingly reported that there are disabled employees whose integration into sheltered workshops engaged in industrial production is not wholly successful, but this is put right in the agricultural sector with its need to do physical work out in the countryside.

With these favourable conditions some 150 workshops for disabled people were established in the horticultural or agricultural sector. Here the number of organic enterprises is worth noting. In a representative survey by the AGÖL (former German umbrella organisation for organic farming) in spring 1999, about 60% of centres for the disabled working in the farming or horticultural sector were farming organically. From the point of view of organic farming this ‘dream statistic’ is explained through advantages of organic farming methods in working with the disabled. A study carried out in 1995 into the structure and organisational forms of therapeutic and care facilities in agriculture (LENHARD et al. 1997) emphasises that the production process in organic farming offers greater potential for meaningful work placements for ‘members of marginalised social groups’ than that of conventional agriculture. Other advantages are:

- Dispensing with chemical aids increases job security. The jobs created comprise ‘meaningful’ tasks and manual work which on conventional farms were rationalised away by the application of chemistry.
- The course of tillage, manuring, sowing, the natural growth of crops and their care, harvesting and the subsequent adding value are all much more vividly experiencable and comprehensible on organic farms than conventional ones.
- By appropriate pricing, organic products can command a better market and thus isolation of sheltered workplaces in the agricultural sector is avoided.
- Not least is the potential for using state aid through subsidies and investment support (HERMANOWSKI 2005).

These clear advantages seem to make organic agriculture the method of choice for working in social farming with disabled people. Organic farming claims holistic thinking and closed cycles. These claims could be expanded on the social health of the people working and living on an organic farm and fair trading. IFOAM developed social standards for employees on organic farms (http://www.ifoam.org/organic_facts/justice/index.html, access 28.3.2007). In the regulations of some German associations of organic farming those standards are included but they are not committing in terms of law.

5. SoFar survey on 24 selected social farms (transversal analysis)

Within the EU- SoFar- Project questionnaires were sent to 38 German social farms in 2006 that were selected as being interesting and innovative projects. 22 farms answered the questionnaire and sent it back. The data derived serves to give an impression of the diversity of social farming. Because of the low number and the conscious preselection they can not be considered as being a representative choice for the average of social farms in Germany.

There are five independent (family) farms with disabled people, one project that works with autistic persons, six “green sectors” of sheltered workshops (WfbM), three projects with
mixed client groups, two farms where formerly drug addicted clients are living and working, three education farms and two farms with integration of disadvantaged young people among the interrogated projects. Four of the 22 projects are horticultural enterprises.

5.1 Motivation to start/work in social farming (values and incentives/barriers)
The 22 social farms were asked about the motivation to start their social work. Following aspects were given in the questionnaire and named by the completing persons:

- Diversification of activities for clients
- Better quality of life for clients
- Cost reduction of care/therapy
- Diversification of income services
- Better use of available facilities
- Strengthening the process of normalization/integration of clients
- Financial gains
- Expanding social network
- Wanting to help people
- Need of additional labour on the farm
- Wish to start private care business, instead of working in a health institution

Diversification of activities and increased quality of life for clients were the most frequent motivations mentioned. Also to help the clients, educate young people (in school farms), the better use of available facilities and need of additional labour are main motivations to start the social work on farms. Additional motivations could be written below the given answers. The following items were added:

- Through following the production process in agriculture people’s own creative power gets released
- The alliance of scientific and philosophical knowledge in agriculture is realized.
- Naturalistic education of pedagogues.
- To be able to show children agricultural connections
- Create young people’s and children’s consciousness of agriculture and the value of food.
- Nature conservation and environment- educational reasons
- To motivate clients to have contact with animals and nature
- Enrichment of farm life

5.2 Barriers in the beginning and current limitations
The social farms were asked about those barriers and limitations they were facing in the past and those they are constricted of today. Following barriers in the beginning are named in the questionnaires:

- Lack of knowledge, experience
- Lack of professional support
- Lack of financial support
- Reserve of professionals
- Reserve of officials
- Opposition of parents, clients, neighbours

Current limitations were referred as:

- No/ not enough financial support
- Lack of time
- Lack of labour force
- Legislation (e.g. no permission to change the farm, to build a canteen etc.)
- No direct use/outcome for the farm
- Bad experiences with social farming
- I do not see limitations

In the beginning most of the asked persons faced lack of experience and financial support. Also the lack of support from professionals and officials were very often main problems. Nearly every asked farm mentioned that lack of time and financial support are still limiting factors. The lack of labour force is named many times, whereas some do not see any limitations at all. The farms added following limiting issues:

- Not enough responsible/competent persons (2)
- High fluctuation of workers
- No union in the staff and diverging opinions of the goals
- Administration
- To find suitable farm and fields
- Resistance (opposition) of established co-workers
- Competition between the different workshops in sheltered workshops (WfbM)
- Administration counsellors realize their goals without being able to estimate the consequences
- Obligation to economy

5.3 Gender issues

Concerning gender issues the farms were asked about the sex of their co-workers and clients.

- Nearly every asked project said that there are less than 50% women who are working in agricultural activities. But in care activities the share of female workers is very often more than 50%.
- Many projects did not give answer to the question of the sex of their clients. Most of the farms who answered had clearly less than 50% female clients.

5.4 Targets and intentions of employment of clients in nature conservation measures

Main intentions to employ the clients in nature- and rural conservation are:

- Providing meaningful work (14)
- Providing additional labour in periods with less work in existing sectors (9)
- Employment (6)
- Support service (5)
• Therapy (5)
• additional income (4)

Environmental education, nature conservation and to earn a living were additional named intentions.

### 5.5 Benefits from social farming for users

All asked projects confirmed the positive effects of social farming for their users. All following positive effects on physical, mental, social and societal health given in the questionnaire were named:

**Physical effects:**
- Development of skills
- Improved physical health
- Employment

**Mental health effects:**
- Awareness
- Enthusiasm
- Increased personal responsibility
- Increased self esteem
- Increase self value
- Increased well-being

**Social effects:**
- Social interaction within the project
- Social interaction outside the project
- Social skills
- Team working
- Work habit, discipline
- Work success
- Independence
- Academic success (education)

**Community effects:**
- Better understanding of disability /health issues in the society
- Improvement of social contacts in local community
- Participation of persons with disability in local community

There are differences according to the diverse kind of difficulties the clients have. Educational farms for example name awareness of agricultural connections and appreciation of agricultural products. Whereas projects with rehabilitation and integration services named for example increased well-being, discipline and work success. Additionally the projects named following effects:

- Keep level of competence or ability
- Structured day
- Participation in economic life
- Learn to control one’s will
- Define goals for life
- Development of motoric skills (school farm)
- Increased esteem for agricultural products
- Get to know agricultural coherences
- Learn how to contact animals
• Professional qualification or integration, competence, appreciation
• placement in the first labour market

5.6 Benefits from social farming for society
Integration and recognition of the clients in society are often referred as positive benefits for society. Farms with social agriculture have model-character for integration and living together in society. Social farming supports awareness for organic farming and agricultural products. It supports solidarity, sensibility and reduces prejudices. In this way clients cause less costs for society. Often visitors feel addressed and want to support the initiative i.e. with donations. The persons that answered the survey think that this kind of therapy and work is meaningful and alternative. Only one farm integrating disadvantaged young people mentioned that there are reservations against the project in the village. As a positive side-effect of the care activities the preservation of landscape as recreational area was stressed.

5.7 Care for landscape
For most of the projects support for nature conservation measures is not an important source of income. Mainly sheltered workshops mentioned it as such. Main limiting factors for landscape activities are:

• lack of time (nearly every one),
• lack of labour force and supports (very often).
• Three did not see any limitations.

Tight conditions of national nature conservation schemes and bad experiences with nature conservation were also mentioned. Client integration in landscape care is mainly a matter of manual work – according to their capabilities.

Many of the asked projects think that care farms are well suited to perform measures in nature conservation and landscape care. Some consider measures in nature conservation and landscape care as excellent suited. Whereas other think that care farms are rather not suited to do this work. The immediate visibillty of labour success and provision of a future perspective through work are advantages of landscape activities. Furthermore landscape care can be done with less expense in that way.

On the other hand there is a necessity of good care taking which often can not be given because of time limitations. Good organisation is needed. There is a high risk of accidents when machines are used. Especially educational farms but also others mentioned that this physical strength demanding work is often too hard for the children.

5.8 Economic of social farming
Many projects are part of a constitutional, educational or integrational institution or department for employment and financed in this way (8). Also some projects have national health service accreditation and are paid by insurance companies or national government (6). Projects that are financed this way mainly take care of clients with mental disorders. Some receive subsidies from government (3), some receive no funding (3). Other mentioned models are collaborating with a health institution as a subcontractor (1), are financed by local authorities (1) or the clients pay for the services with their own budget (1). Many of the asked projects expect that future economic situation (personal assessment) will improve (10). Most farms believe that costs (12) and income (8) will increase. But there are also some who expect that future situation will become worse (5) and that income will decrease (4). No one expects that costs will decrease.
5.9 Networks and public relation
Many estimate their current contribution to the organisation of networks and activities related to social farming as medium and take part in activities (8). Some are sometimes involved (5) and some take intensively part in organisation of activities (3). Only few are members of the managing board in the associations (2). Some know that there are activities and would like to join (2), but they do not have time to participate.

Meetings and activities with other farmers and institutions at regional/national/international levels are most frequented (15). Many are members of associations focused on these topics (10). Only few participate in lobbying and supporting social farming politically (4) and negotiation processes with local administrations and public/private social services (3). Social farming is principally supported by providing information on social farming activities to consumers and clients (16) and by open visits for other farmers and citizens (15). Some actively participate in educational training programmes (7) and meetings to present social farming to a wider public (7).

5.10 Appearance of social farming in society and political support
Many asked projects think that there is a lack of attention on the topic (9) and social farming still does not receive adequate support or recognition though there is a discussion (8). Some said that there are adverse positions against social farming (6). Whereas other experienced clearly recognition (4) and support (4) by public institutions.

Most believe that social farming should be supported partially by the state (16) and many regard indirect support from consumers (10) and direct support from the clients (paying services) as adequate (9). Only a few think that social farming should be fully supported by the state. Nobody wants social farming to be conducted only on voluntary basis.

No projects doubts the need for special political efforts. Supporting the progress of social farming politically might be conducted through aids for structural investments (11), a juridical framework to regulate activities (10) and monetary compensations (10). Other suggest the issues given in the questionnaire:
- Support for networking activities (9)
- Support for communication and information (9)
- Definition of practical guidelines for entry farmers (6)
- Vocational training (6)
- Technical assistance (6)

6. Structures of social farming for different client groups
In the following you will find the state of the art for every single client group.

6.1 Farming with disabled people in Germany
According to statistics of the german government 6.639.000 people are considered to be heavily disabled in Germany. The real amount is estimated to be about 10 per cent of the whole population. Most of these persons are physically handicapped, more than 50 years of age and became handicapped after an illness. 17 per cent of them are mentally disordered (STATISTISCHES BUNDESAMT 2003). In practice there is no differentiation between different kinds of handicaps. About 16% of the disabled people are unemployed, but a lot of severely disabled people are not taken into account by the agency of employment (TERNO 2005), although their right to work is assured in the law for severely handicapped persons § 54 “Sheltered Workshops”. Prognoses assume that there will be demand to increase the number of Sheltered Workshops (www.werkstaetten-im-netz.de). Eighty per cent of the workers in those workshops are mentally, sixteen percent psychic and four percent physically handicapped.
handicapped (www.bagwfbm.de). Housing, (paid) occupation and therapy or rehabilitation for these people are often provided and financed by different sources.

6.1.1 “Sheltered workshops for disabled people” (WfbM)

In Germany the employment of mentally and physically disabled people is organized in “sheltered workshops for disabled people” (WfbM). Only they are authorized to receive public care allowance. There are only few examples of employment in family farms and their number is not known (HERMANOWSKI 2005). Mostly they try to finance their social initiatives by donations. It is up to them to insure the risk of injuries and accidents. Some initiatives aim to implement workplaces on organic farms as “integrated workplaces” independently from WfbM sheltered structures i.e. as so called external workplaces. A pilot-project of FiBL Germany investigates possibilities and supports interested organic farmers to establish new external workplaces for people with handicaps (HERMANOWSKI & KLEINHEITZ 2006).

There are about 660 WfbM throughout Germany with 21,500 employees and an annual turnover of 1 billion Euros. The federal agency for employment forecasts further increases in the need for WfbM (www.werkstaetten-im-netz.de¸KALISCH 2006: 17, compare HERMANOWSKI 2006b: 27; www.bagwfbm.de: 670 workshops with 220,000 places, 80% mental handicaps, 16% psychic, 4% physical). The jobs in these workshops are diverse and range from assembly and services up to agriculture or hand crafts (WICK 1998: 6).

The wide range of activities and the condition to offer at least 120 work places per sheltered workshop guarantee an adequate job for every client can be provided appropriate to his special needs, capabilities and potential (HERMANOWSKI 1992, www.werkstaetten-im-netz.de). Therefore, workplaces for disabled people in agriculture can often only be provided in cooperation with an industrial or manufacturing business (HERMANOWSKI 1992: 15). There are about 150 WfbM that run agricultural enterprises with about 5,000 workplaces altogether (HERMANOWSKI 2005). WINKLER (1997) quoting HERMANOWSKI refers in her elaboration of 2,500 workplaces (KALISCH 2006: 17f.).

A sheltered workshop is a structure to integrate disabled people into active life. It is designed for disabled people who, because of the type or the impact of their handicap, cannot or cannot yet enter or re-enter the labour market. It must:

1. offer an appropriate professional education and activity with regard to their performances, appropriate salary for the result of their work and
2. give the opportunity to develop, increase or re-appropriate their performances and capacities, and through this develop their personality.

It must as far as possible be able to offer a large variety of training possibilities and workstations as well as to present qualified staff to ensure work quality and for the supervision of disabled people” (HERMANOWSKI in NEUBERGER et al. 2006: 201).

Sheltered workshops aim to support the individual performance of the disabled people in a way that they become able to contribute at least to a certain amount to the economic productivity or moreover that they can be integrated into normal working life. The disabled people are cared for and get individual support by supervising services and professionals (social educators, therapists, physiotherapists, physicians, psychologist). The financial support for integrating handicapped people into working life is provided by daily rates from different institutions (like providers of pension scheme, income support) (HERMANOWSKI 2006b: 27).

6.1.2 Surveys on green sectors of sheltered workshops

The estimated number of sheltered workshops that run an agricultural or horticultural section is 150, sixty percent are conducted organically (HERMANOWSKI in NEUBERGER et al. 2006: 201). A survey from 1999 on 95 of the 150 sheltered workshops (WfbM) (2/3) showed that farm units are mostly between 30 and 50 ha and an average of 26 disabled people per unit
that varies from 1 co-worker up to 133 on workstations with different green sections. Within the 95 sheltered workshop, 14 are exclusively concentrating on landscape design and maintenance without actual farming (HERMANOWSKI in NEUBERGER et al. 2006: 202).

The German research institute of organic agriculture (FiBL) aims to connect and represent the green sectors of the WfbM through surveys on structures, maintaining a website and a newsletter, giving informations to interested people, run a job agency to cover vacancies (mediating), organize seminars and giving financial consultations (http://www.gruene-werkstatt.de/).

6.1.3 Update of the survey "Green sections in sheltered workshops" in 2006

In 2006 the FiBL started to repeat the surveys of the sheltered workshops from 1993 and 1999 (Yvonne BERGMANN). On the one hand the aim was to refresh the data of the former survey, on the other hand the new survey tries to evaluate additional data of the ability of WfbM to include activities of multifunctionality into their work like i.e. caring for nature conservation and landscape development. The questionnaires were sent to 335 institutions and 106 of them could be evaluated. 93 (88%) of the 106 institutions are organised as sheltered workshops for people with handicaps (WfbM) and 13 are independent. Seven of these non-WfbM were referred as social therapeutic institutions with an anthroposophical background.

6.1.3.1 Scope of work

The green sectors of the surveyed institutions have 26 different scopes of work, 62 (58,5%) run horticultural enterprises, 58 (54%) farms and 51 maintain landscape and gardens. 35% of the institutions consist only of one of the three sectors, the others combine them with each other and additional fields of activity such as growing and processing of fruit, wine and vegetables. Table 2 shows the frequency of different scopes of work in the interrogated green sectors of sheltered workshops.

Table 2: Frequency of different scopes of work in the interrogated Green sectors of sheltered workshops (BERGMANN unpubl. 2007)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scope of work</th>
<th>Mentioned Number in % (N= 106)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Horticulture</td>
<td>58,5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture (farming)</td>
<td>54,7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landscape management</td>
<td>48,1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horticulture &amp; farming &amp; landscaping</td>
<td>3,8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fruit- growing</td>
<td>2,8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture &amp; horticulture</td>
<td>1,9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vegetable growing</td>
<td>1,9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture &amp; horticulture &amp; landscape management &amp; processing &amp; house keeping &amp; training on the job</td>
<td>0,9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture &amp; horticulture &amp; landscape management &amp; growing and processing of wine &amp; horse pension</td>
<td>0,9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horticulture &amp; landscape management / agriculture &amp; fruit- growing/ nursery/ horticulture &amp; nursery/ agriculture &amp; horse pension/ forestry/ herb growing/ seed workshop/ ornamental plants/ landscape management/ butcher/ marketing (organic market)/ processing/ work in the stable/ holiday &amp; house keeping/ juice manufactory</td>
<td>each 0,9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The number of workplaces ranges from two up to 60 places, two third of the clients work in the classical sectors of agriculture, horticulture and landscaping. The sizes of the working groups are different and might depend on the size of the green sector, the scopes of work, main emphasis of the work and expected care requirement. 67 (33%) of the green sectors are conventional whereas 123 (61%) work organically certified. This number was determined also in the surveys of recent years.

The farms have 82 different sectors of production and processing, often they grow vegetables on fields, in greenhouses or poly tunnels, potatoes, cereals, ornamental plants; furthermore they run potato peeling, bakeries, fire wood and fruits (figure 1).

Figure 1: Plant production and processing in green sectors of sheltered workshops (BERGMANN unpubl. 2007)

### 6.1.3.2 Animal husbandry

32 green enterprises do not keep animals, 23 of them are horticultural enterprises and four (7%) farms. Small animals such as pigs, sheep and poultry are preferred on 64% of the enterprises with animal keeping (fig. 2). The keeping of pets is also spread and might serve therapeutic purposes. Altogether 33 different species and races are kept.
Figure 2: Occurrence of animal production and processing in green sectors of sheltered workshops (BERGMANN unpubl. 2007)

Table 3: Farm animals in green spaces of sheltered workshops (BERGMANN unpubl. 2007)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kind of animal</th>
<th>Number of animal keeping farms</th>
<th>% of all farms</th>
<th>Size of herd (number of kept animals from minimum to maximum)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dairy cows</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>5 to 150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suckling cows</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>1 to 90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dairy and suckling Cows</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0,9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cattle for beef</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>1 to 125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young cattle and offspring</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3,8</td>
<td>2 to 75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Breeding Bulls</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2,8</td>
<td>1 to 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sows</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1 to 65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Animal Type</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>Range</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fattening pigs</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>5 to 300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piglets and small pigs</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0,9</td>
<td>35 to 61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dairy sheep</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0,9</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suckling Sheep</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>2 to 501</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camerun sheep</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0,9</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheep</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,8</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dairy goats</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2,8</td>
<td>1 to 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goats</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2,8</td>
<td>2 or 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hens</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>6 to 3000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cocks</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6,6</td>
<td>30 to 3000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goose</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3 to 500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ducks</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4,7</td>
<td>80 to 600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkeys</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,9</td>
<td>57 resp. 300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work horse</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0,9</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No animals</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 6.1.3.3 Use of the cultivated area

70 farms are cultivating arable land, 68 have grasslands, 56 grow vegetables on fields, 50 potatoes, 44 grow vegetables in poly tunnels and 38 in greenhouses, 25 maintain their grounds, 20 grow ornamental plants, six orchards, five nurseries and three care for orchards and forests.

The size of cultivated land varies from 0.44 ha up to 380 ha. Half of the farms with less than 20 ha are horticultural enterprises, 23 farms size 20-50 ha, 10 run 50-95 ha and 6 farms have more than 100 ha.

The products get marketed on 22 different ways. 80% of the organic farms sell them in farm shops (71), on weekly markets (30) and in natural food stores (34). The kitchen of the own institution (63) is the second most important customer. Other canteens and gastronomy (28) as well as supermarkets (18) are also important purchasers.

### 6.1.4 Trends and development in comparison of the different studies

There are no proven data concerning the development of the green sectors, such as increase, decrease or intensification available. In three surveys on the structure of sheltered workshops from 1993, 1999 and 2007 carried out by FiBL different people and initiatives answered the questionnaires. In the study by LENHARD et al. (1997) sheltered workshops, prisons and hospitals were included – according to the definition of fringe groups.

The analysis of the questionnaires from 2006 differentiates between horticultural, agricultural and landscape maintaining activities of the green sectors in sheltered workshops. This differentiation makes a comparison of numbers and statements with LENHARD et al. (1997) difficult. LENHARD et al. (1997) found that in more than 50% of the farms fattening pigs, cattle and milking cows (sows and suckling cows in 28%) were kept; whereas BERGMANN in her data from 2006 found keeping of those animals on only 36% (or sows and suckling cows 25%) of the interrogated farms.

LENHARD et al. (1997) counted 8 farms without any animal husbandry, in green spaces of sheltered workshops 32 were counted, four of them actual farms and the other enterprises specialised in horticulture and landscape management. LENHARD et al. (1997) did not ask
any questions on landscape care. If the reduction of dairy cows follows the general trend in agriculture remains unclear. The average area managed by social farms is 79 ha in LENHARD et al. (1997) and about 40 ha in the new data by BERGMANN. Presumably the cultivated land was reduced whereas at the same time additional clients were employed in specialised and intensive activities such as gardening and vegetable growing. Both surveys agree that social farms are structured in a diverse way and have multiple outlets for their products. The strong share of organic farms (60%) shows that conventional production and marketing is not attractive for social farms.

Green sectors in WfbM do not seem to increase since the nineties (HERMANOWSKI oral 2006). The economic pressure in WfbM has increased and agriculture is hardly a sector where profits are gained easily. There is no room for financial experiments and setting up new agricultural enterprises is expensive. Existing green sectors have to avoid closure and find financial perspectives. Only those sectors have the chance to grow which implementation takes low investments such as gardening. There is not such an enthusiasm in Germany like in other European countries concerning the perspectives of green care, even though there are some few good examples well published which nourish the impression of enthusiasm. “Hot topics” in the green sectors of the WfbM concern marketing and stability of economy and psycho-social care (HERMANOWSKI, oral 2006).

6.1.5 Farming and Gardening with handicapped or disadvantaged people as employment and therapy

Workplaces in agri- or horticultural sectors aim to employ and occupy but they also have a “therapeutic component” for the client. Additionally there are special measurements in form of therapy lessons offered for individual clients. Examples for this kind of therapeutic aims are animal assisted and horticultural therapy. Mostly mobile therapists visit the institution like hospitals or residences and contribute their knowledge and/or equipment such as pets or farm animals or even plant materials to work with. Many studs and horse therapists offer those services. These therapeutic approaches could be possibly conducted on farms also. Drawing the line from therapeutic measurements to “social farming” is sometimes not easy.

6.1.5.1 Horticultural therapy

Horticultural therapy is applied in about 400 hospitals and rehabilitation centres for alcohol and drug abuse. There are 180 anthroposophical work and life communities and between 265 and 500 “green” departments in sheltered workshops, where physically and mentally handicapped people work in garden and landscape maintenance. Horticultural therapy services are financed like occupational therapy by health insurances if rendered in a hospital or by social insurance if part of a rehabilitation programme. Different quality management systems are applied according to the general management systems of the head organization. As horticultural therapy is not a autonomous method of treatment but a component of therapy it has to comply with the general rule. “Horticultural therapist” is an informal profession in Germany. People working in this field have a heterogeneous educational background. It has not yet found its way as a profession into occupational therapy schools or into the departments of horticultural science at college or university level. Lectures are held at the universities of Hannover, Bonn and Dresden. Scientific research is rare and scarcely found in exam papers.

There is no governmental support for horticultural therapy; restrictions are usually based on economic grounds. The association for horticulture and therapy (GGuT) is a non profit membership organization that works on a voluntary basis financed by its members from Germany, Austria, Swiss, Italy and the Netherlands (NEUBERGER et al. 2006). In 2002 and 2006 GGuT contributed to the first and second German congress Garden & Therapy. A third meeting is planned in 2007 (www.gartentherapie.de, http://www.garten-therapie.de, access 23.3. 2007).
6.1.5.2 Animal assisted therapy

The term “animal assisted therapy” describes alternative medical methods to cure psychiatric and neurological illnesses and handicaps where animals get used. Different species are used for different purposes. Dolphins, dogs, horses and alpaca are typical examples (http://de.wikipedia.org/wiki/Delfintherapie, access 29.3.2007). There are no facts recorded on the distribution of those therapeutic or pedagogic approaches in Germany. There is – similar to horticultural therapy – no common training; the persons offering this therapy have different professional backgrounds. There is an independent website that provides information to interested persons as well as exchange for professionals (see www.tiergestuetzte-therapie.de).

An example for animal assisted therapy especially with farm animals is the “Institute for social learning with animals” in Wedemark near Hanover that since 1996 uses pets and farm animals in its pedagogical work (STEPHAN 2006b). The team visits residential establishments, Institutions with children and adults, schools and homes for old people regularly, gives two-year courses for professionals from therapy and education (STEPHAN 2006a) and since 2003 they offer short term therapy for families with children and young people who show severe disturbances in communication and contact and / or have physical restrictions (STEPHAN 2006b). The therapy units with animals last 45 minutes and are done in the mornings (STEPHAN 2006b). The appropriate animals are chosen out of 60 animals and 12 species (STEPHAN 2006a), such as dogs, ponies, donkeys, cattle, miniature pigs, sheep, goats, rabbits, guinea pigs, hens, doves and geese according to the picture of disability, character and interest of the children. In the evenings records of the interactions are showed and discussed with the parents and the exchange between other families is encouraged (STEPHAN 2006b). Goals of the short term therapy are:

- To enable a relation between people and animal through riding, watch, feed, touch and caress, create trust
- To get to know the animal through all senses in its whole being
- To strengthen abilities of the children
- Strong emotional bonds between animal and children to grow at it
- To experience the animal as a partner who does not evaluate or keep prejudices but is accepting the child as a whole being without any claims, use the animal as a medium to make steps development (STEPHAN 2006b)

Farm animals and pets are especially suited for client centred pedagogical work because they send clear signals and their communication is honestly, non-verbal and analogue. They have strong positive social and psychological effects on humans (STEPHAN 2006a). The possibilities to get into close contact with animals this way are quite restricted today.

6.2 Care farms for former drug addicts (survey in 2004/2005)

6.2.1 A survey in Germany

In 2004/2005 an investigation was set up to get an overview of German farms integrating former drug addicts and their therapy and of the engagement of such farms in landscape development and nature conservation (VAN ELSEN et al. 2006a). The benefit of such farms for the society is quite obvious: on the one hand working on a farm can offer new perspectives for addicted people and is able to support therapy, so that integration of these clients into society becomes easier. The hypothesis of the investigation was that on the other hand such care farms can contribute to landscape development and nature conservation, too.

97 questionnaires were sent to care farms with former drug addicts all over Germany. 52 % of these could be used for the survey; 28 % of the institutions did not answer, and 16 %
answered that the amount of their farming activities were not comparable to a full size farm (GÜNTHER 2005).

Table 4 shows the size of the farms that integrate clients. The smallest one has a 200 m² of therapeutic garden with a glasshouse, the biggest has 230 ha; the average is 36 ha. 40% of the farms are organic farms, 44% conventional.

Table 4: Size of the farms that integrate clients (n = 48)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Size of the farmland</th>
<th>&lt; 1 ha</th>
<th>≥ 1 to &lt; 10 ha</th>
<th>≥10 to &lt;50 ha</th>
<th>≥ 50 ha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of farms</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proportion of total surveyed [%]</td>
<td>14,0</td>
<td>36,0</td>
<td>20,0</td>
<td>26,0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>∅ area of farmland [ha]</td>
<td>0,52</td>
<td>4,30</td>
<td>20,64</td>
<td>102,48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>∅ area of arable land [ha]</td>
<td>0,31</td>
<td>1,43</td>
<td>9,25</td>
<td>46,93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>∅ area of grassland [ha]</td>
<td>0,07</td>
<td>2,80</td>
<td>11,01</td>
<td>53,32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Structure | Parcels united | 5 | 11 | 2 | 5 |
|           | Parcels partly united | 0 | 1 | 6 | 5 |
|           | Parcels spread | 0 | 4 | 1 | 3 |
| Method    | Organic | 3 | 5 | 3 | 9 |
|           | Conventional | 1 | 12 | 6 | 3 |
|           | Other | 2 | 1 | 2 | 1 |

Almost all of these farms belong to a hospital or an institution for rehabilitation or social therapy. They receive an important amount of their income for these therapeutic activities; the income of the agricultural products is mainly used to finance the farm. Most of the farms grow labour intensive crops, like vegetables and potatoes. Only farms with a size of more than 10 ha grow grains.

![Figure 3: Number of clients (former drug addicts) on the farms.](image)

The farms keep a great variety of different animals. Often small animals like chicken, geese, ducks and rabbits are kept but also pigs. Dairy cows seem to be not so suited for the clients, as there are high standards and the whole dairy system is rather sophisticated and requires precise work. Many of the products are used for own consumption, but especially on the
organic farms also direct selling to consumers and the use of the products for manufacturing (bakery, cheese production, etc.) plays an important role.

On most farms 5-10 or 11-20 clients are integrated (Fig. 3). Only few farms integrate clients into traditional family farms. In most cases the clients stay several months on the farms, often up to one year.

The main aim to integrate the former drug addicts into the farms is to offer them an economically relevant work and a meaningful occupation with therapeutic effects (Fig. 4). Also the capabilities of the clients to deal with their life independently shall be supported. Almost all of the questionnaires answer that the qualities of work on farms are especially suited to reach that goal, like transparency of the sense of handwork, a great variety of different tasks, natural rhythms of growth, the connection to nature, the contact to animals.

![Figure 4: Functions and aims of agricultural work for the clients (as percentage of clients reporting)](image)

![Figure 5: Occupations of the clients on the farms (percentage of clients engaged).](image)
The clients are mainly occupied in labour intensive fields of activities, like keeping animals, gardening and also landscape care (Fig. 5). Integrating clients also influences the farm structure: A large amount of handwork, a diversity of different fields of activities, and simple structures of the schemes of work are needed to deliver a sufficient occupation for the clients. Also enough time for care is needed to combine the therapeutic goals with food production.

6.2.2 Care for landscape and nature development on care farms for addicted clients

In general the examined institutions show a great interest in landscape care as a field of activity for the clients. More than 70% of the farms deal with such measures, especially planting hedgerows or taking care for orchards and for different biotopes. Furthermore clients do work in the forest; they care for the surroundings of the institutional buildings and public places. Concerning these activities there are small differences between organic and conventional farms.

Half of the examined institutions think that farms with clients are especially suited for activities related to nature conservation and landscape care (Fig. 6). Also concerning protection and management of biodiversity more than 60% of the farms are active. Concrete measures are the conservation of species-rich grassland, the care for orchards with rare or local varieties and also the keeping of rare and endangered animal husbandry breeds. 85% of the organic and 50% of the conventional farms integrate such activities into their system.

6.3 School Farms and their initiatives

Many children of today lack contact to nature. Farms can contribute to renew this contact by agricultural work, caring for animals and by becoming aware of the origin of agricultural goods. A definition of school farms by HÜBNER (2000: 6) focuses on the instructed educational approach outside the school, the active way of participation and the intensity of experience during a visit that lasts several days. The first German school farm was founded in 1985 in Bielefeld- Ummeln. Today more than 30 school farms exist. Most of the
agricultural work is lead back to the stage of handwork, what allows children and young people to participate and to understand the processes going on.

Figure 7: Children experiencing agricultural work.

‘Who once in his life has milked a cow or a goat with his own hands won’t ever forget where the milk comes from’ (HAMPL 2006: 32). In most cases the school farms offer visits of several days up to some weeks for school classes and provide accommodation for the children. The children usually work in small groups (see fig. 7) which shift from task to task daily, so they get to know different workplaces on the farm, like caring for the farm animals (feeding, work in the stable, milking), working in the garden (sowing, planting, weeding, harvesting), processing of own food, practical environmental protection and work in the kitchen. Most of the farms are organized as private charity (BMVEL 2003: 76).

The increased outlay of those farms gets paid from their users (schools and children) and partly they can apply for public support and subsidies (BMVEL 2003: 90). The financing seems to be unsufficient on many farms. A contribution of the WDR television (http://www.wdr.de/themen/freizeit/freizeitgestaltung/ schulbauernhof/index.jhtml, access 23.3.07) describes the case of a school farm where financial and personal bottle necks because of lacking support can only be compensated by donations and honorary engagement. This case is not a single one. Nevertheless many farmers are willing to open their farm to children; there is a growing demand and popularity that is reflected by two initiatives in Germany that will be described as follows.

6.3.1 Federal initiative “Learning on the Farm”

During a project Federal initiative “Learning on the Farm” supported by the Federal Ministry of Agriculture (a two years study that ended in November 2003) a survey of existing projects and initiatives about farms as educational places was carried out (www.lernenaufdembauernhof.de). The aim was to elaborate information material on educational farms and to support the connection of children and pupils to farms in order to become aware of the origin and the production of food. More than 500 initiatives took the chance to register on the project website, some of them offer presentations, and others also have pedagogical approaches that offer to stay on farm for a period of one day up to several weeks.
6.3.2 Federal community of practice “Learning-Site Farm”
(Bundesarbeitsgemeinschaft Lernort Bauernhof e.V. (BAGLoB))

This alliance of educationally working projects and institutions aims to make daily life on a farms and the origin of food visible and an experience for children, young people and multipliers (http://www.baglob.de). The Federal Working Community represents the interests of its members by the following activities (http://www.baglob.de):

- Support of internal exchange by networking
- Public information about the possibilities of learning on farms
- Organisation of further education, seminars and conferences
- Development of quality systems for learning on farms.

The BAGLoB organises a national conference at the Evangelische Landjugendakademie in Altenkirchen each year in February. In workshops, educational training and lectures members and other participants have the chance to learn about different aspects of the “Learning-Site Farm” such as security, concepts and other. In February 2007 more than 160 persons attended – a sign for an enormous interest (http://www.baglob.de/index2.html, access 23.3.07). In order to assure a certain quality standard of projects and initiatives of “Learning-Site Farm”, the BAGLoB has developed the following criteria for membership:

- Integration of children shall be in small groups.
- The activities within the groups shall be prepared in a concept.
- The co-workers shall be trained (pedagogical or agricultural education)
- The children shall take part into feeding of animals and the care for plants.
- The children shall participate into production and processing of food.
- Supply with food being produced on the farm.
- Support of social competence, i.e through teamwork und share of responsibility.

If these criteria are fulfilled, projects can join the association and get the permission to use their membership for own advertising. Today 44 (“more than 60” in HAMPL 2006: 32) approved member-projects are registered in the BAGLoB; containing environmental and biology centres, schoolfarms, farmers and single personal members (http://www.baglob.de, 22.3.2007). The BAGLoB aims for a governmental certification like it already exists i.e. in Austria (http://www.baglob.de), in order to get a clear separation of school farms from other educational activities like the initiative “Learning on the Farm” mentioned above.

6.3.3 Survey on school farms

To gain information on organic farms providing space for school classes 116 school farms in Germany were addressed. The addresses were taken from the web pages of the Ministry of Agriculture (BMVEL 2003) concering “Learning on the farm” and from the diploma thesis of HÜBNER (1998). 84 (72, 4 %) questionnaires were sent back and could be analysed. The results give an image of the structure of such farms, but also of their ability to integrate issues like nature conservation and landscape development into their work with the pupils (SEILING & VAN ELSEN 2007).

The first questions were asked about structures of the farms. According to that the average school farm has

- farm land of 77,2 ha (median 42 ha),
- 4 – 8 different animal species are kept,
- 4 – 8 different cultures are grown,
• mostly there are 2 – 3 other farming sectors,
• there is an average of 7 people working on the farm.

In comparison to the average organic farm which farms about 44,6 ha (BMVEL 2003: 37) school farms have more land. This fact may be explained because some of them are busy in landscape management. There are more school farms located in the south of Germany and only few in the east and north.

The membership of school farms in organic associations is similar to that of other organic farms. Only the amount of belonging to Demeter-association is higher what might be due to the school practices that are done in Waldorf schools.

The second part of the questionnaire asked questions concerning the integration of pupils. To enable the analysis the farms were structured in three groups: farms without overnight accommodation (n=39), farms with overnight accommodation (n=27) and farms with or without overnight accommodation (n=15). The duration of the stay on farms without overnight accommodation is about 4 hours on an average and most of the farms are visited more than once by the school classes. On farms with overnight accommodation the stays last about 5 days on an average and they are visited by school classes between 2 up to 50 (24 on an average) weeks per year.

Visits with a duration of half a day or a whole day are easier to organize than longer lasting visits (HÜBNER 1998: 16). But short term stays can show only spotlights on the farm life. Therefore longer lasting or repeated stays should be preferred in order to raise awareness of young people. The visiting groups consist of about 21 to 30 persons. Most of them come from primary schools and with increase of age the frequency of visits decreases.

In all three farm groups the following sectors of working dominate: care for animals, nature conservation measurements, vegetable growing and work in the kitchen. On the farms without overnight accommodation pupils work only about 1-2 hours. On farms with overnight accommodation they work 1-2, 3-4 or 5-6 hours. Usually the classes are divided into smaller groups. From pedagogical point of view a group size of 3-5 children seems very important because otherwise no individual supervision is possible. To guarantee the small group size an appropriate quantity of staff is required, that can hardly be financed these days (DEMUTH 2003: 25f.).

The third part of the questionnaire was about nature conservation and landscape care. More than half of the farms think that nature conservation issues have a high priority on their farms and an additional third thinks it has priority. Nearly all of the farmers talk with their visitors about these issues; the following topics are stated frequently: landscape care, biodiversity, organic cycles, animal husbandry and the habits to deal with water, waste and remaining matter. Pupils show an intermediate or high interest for these topics and the teachers are interested, too.

Almost 90% of the school farms carry out measurements of nature conservation and landscape management. Mostly planting and care of hedgerows, orchards, wetland biotopes, brooks and ponds get realized. Also measurements of protection and support of biodiversity are carried out such as planting and care of orchards with local or rare varieties or support of species rich grassland. An example of a school farm where pupils get actively integrated into such measures is Gut Hohenberg (KRÜGER & VAN ELSEN 2005). – About 2/3 of the school farms integrate their visitors into activities of landscape care; especially farms with overnight accommodation do so. At the end the farms should estimate the special suitability of school farms to carry out measurements of nature conservation and landscape management. 2/3 of the interrogated agreed and 20% were not sure about it.

Besides the great performances that are already done by school farms there are two major problems that need more research: the financial and the pedagogical situation. The pedagogical work and the work in nature conservation of the farmers and farmer's wives can not be honorary and must be paid appropriate. The training of farmers and teachers could contribute to more effectiveness of the visits as well as the integration of those visits into the
school schedules and an interdisciplinary preparation before and after the visits (Selig & Van Elsen 2007).

6.4 Elderly people on farms

The demographic development in Germany shows - due to decrease of birth, longevity through better health care and living conditions - an increase of the inhabitants older than 60 years up to one third of the inhabitants in 2030 (Wietheger 2003: 8). The time of "age" lasts about two or three decades and is therefore longer than childhood. ‘The demographic change will be present in society on multiple levels: in cultural offers, things of daily use, in the media or at the pension payments’ (Wietheger 2003: 9). To react on the requirements of the demographic change and the prognoses on missing care different initiatives try to find new solutions. Even in the press the topic is "in". Some projects are gathered in the following.

- On a gathering of gardening therapists in Grünberg Alfred Vollmer explained that the Caritas association in Köln plans to establish therapeutic gardens in all institutions for elderly people that belong to the Caritas social service in order to enhance quality of life for their residents.

- Besides Caritas association (in cooperation with the College for technique and economics of the Saarland, the catholic College for social work in Saarbrücken (KHSa) and the CEB Academy in Merzig) offers an interdisciplinary and job accompanying study for different professions and honorary workers to get qualified and certificated in the gardening therapeutic initiatives.

- Along with that a network called MEGA (people gardening activity) gets established (www.garten-therapie.de, Zugriff am 23.3.2007).

There is a growing interest of elderly people to spend their life on farms. Despite the growing demand there is little information available about projects; no network exists so far. Two diploma thesis from Wiechmann (2006) and Wietheger (2003) were written at the University of Kassel/Witzenhausen about the integration of elderly people on farms.

6.4.1 Services for elderly people on farms

People entering the retiring age are agile, positive; self-determined and wish to serve a meaningful job i.e. as honorary worker today. Many try to find alternative forms of living where they may participate instead of being excluded for the time between getting retired and needing care. The interest of integrating old people into farms derives from senior citizens and also from farming side. Wietheger (2003: 12) quotes an aid- magazine from 1995 named „Rural services for elderly people” where services of farms for senior citizens are listed: offer of (holiday–) housing space, providing lunch, day- or short term care up to assisted living. Wiechmann (2006: 57) separated the diverse services of farms in the sections catering, laundry service, basic care, transports, co- working, leisure activities and other. Care is a prerequisite that the elderly people might be able to die on the place they live and is often provided by mobile care services or trained farmers wives (Wiechmann 2006: 61).

6.4.2 Goal of the integration and distribution

Goal of the integration is the economic gain additional to the agricultural enterprise through more or less needed shift of the farm’s main emphasis. Wietheger (2003:12) writes that she could not be find out how many farms already established those offers. Wiechmann (2006) found through research on associations of organic farming, chamber of agriculture, associiations of women in rural areas and social service three farms in different places in Germany who since 2 to 8 years integrate 6 to 12 elderly people (in comparison to 73 seniors living in the average home for elderly people in Germany, Wiechmann 2006: 85). They work on 15 to 26 ha as part time farmers as well as on a 140 ha organic farm. Wiechmann (2006)
found three additional farms who currently adapt their farmsteads according to the new requirements to integrate elderly people. In Swiss and Austria, where currently 13 farms are running a pilot project she found the idea more spread than in Germany. Five of the eight investigated farms of WIECHMANN (2006: 40) depleted their farming activities to release working capacity in order to care and attend the elderly.

6.4.3 Results of a single case study

Although there are good conditions of farms to integrate old people – mostly living space is available, diverse working possibilities, mutual encouragement of young and old people, family like environment, possibilities for recovery and silence – the concrete realisation often faces a group dynamic, psychological and social difficulty (WIETHEGER 2003: 23) because the elderly people as well as the farmers have requirements and conseivabilities that have to agree with each other. WIETHEGER (2003) worked out these requirements and conseivabilities on the single case she found in Germany.

The farm is located in the north 2 km from the Baltic Sea in a touristic affected region. The idea to integrate old people developed initially on economic considerations in 1997. In the year 2001 ten seniors from six different federal states in Germany moved into the rebuild barn. The age difference between the seniors amounts to 20 years. The farmers hoped to create a stronger community on the farm with social and cultural enrichment and help in easy works. The aim was to add a missing old generation on farm. The old people's motivation was to find an alternative to usual old people's homes and increased quality of life (WIECHMANN 2006: 42). They want to live in a family like community, have a right (but no duty) to participate work in meaningful tasks, live self- determined and in a rural areas they sometimes remember from childhood. Some also want to bring along their pets (WIECHMANN 2006). Also health considerations are of importance.

The elderly people contributed in financing the reconstruction of the farm barn and rent the flat from the association. WIECHMANN (2006: 68) notes that through high leasing rates some people with small pension budget get excluded from the offer. There is no care provided by the farm personal, when care will be necessary later on it will be done by mobile care services. All farm members say that the old people contribute positively to farm life. They help voluntarily with works like house keeping, in the farm shop, in keeping small animals, in care for children and they contribute to order and arrangement of the farm (i.e. planting an orchard, constructing a bicycle stand etc.) Through their contribution and living on farm the turnover in the farm shop increased and the positive public awareness is raised in the village. Nevertheless the cooperation does not work only smooth and a form of community must still be found. Through the financial expenses spent on the reconstruction of the barn there was no economic benefit for the farm (WIETHEGER 2003).

6.5 Social farming and integration of “difficult” young people

The client group of young people is inhomogeneous with different ages and diverse problems such as drug addiction, crime, poverty, learning disabilities, eating disorders, migration, abuse; socially weak family’s etc. The term “Jugendhilfe - young people’s aid” describes all tasks and measurements of social services in Germany (see 4.2.) that are done in order to help children, young people and their families. Young people’s aid deals with different activities such as extracurricular support, support for families (i.e. advice in case of divorce), children’s day care, educational help, tutelage and protection of young people. There is a working group dealing with those topics in the internet (www.agj.de) that publishes a quartal paper at topical issues (“Forum Jugendhilfe”).

There are no recordings on the distribution of young people's aid in connection with social farming in Germany and no exchange or network is known that connects the stakeholders. Many prisons maintain gardens or farms where young people with criminal background can get some training or therapy. Furthermore there are agricultural Institutions that integrate
former drug addicts (i.e. Suchthilfe Fleckenbühl) as well as hospitals, psychiatric institutions (i.e. www.hof-sondern.de) and institutions of young people’s aid (i.e. www.therapiehof.de) where young people with eating disorders and other malfunctions can get some help and possibility to work on farms. We also know some cases, where individuals are integrated privately into families on farms (i.e. www.down-up.de).

7. The integration of learning disabled people in agriculture as an opportunity for landscape development – case studies in Germany

The integration of physically and mentally disabled people into agriculture is a combination of social work and farming which aims to make use of the multifunctional potential of agriculture demanded by society and politics. Both agriculture and social work can profit from cooperation. Can there be beneficial effects for landscape and wildlife too? The following chapter describes a study of the potential of three farms for the integration of disabled people with work on the landscape (Kalisch et al. 2007).

7.1 Starting point of the investigation

The starting point of the investigation was a study carried out on behalf of Federal Agency for Nature Conservation entitled “practical approaches and nature conservation potential on organic farms for the development of the cultural landscape” (Van Elsen et al. 2003). This study investigated 16 chosen organic farms whose farmers showed exceptional commitment to the development of the cultural landscape through the “social character” of their farms, thus providing additional sources of income and labour (“more helping hands”). An example of landscape work on a care farm in France is described by Van Elsen et al. (2006b).

Focusing on three examples of these kinds of farms with social goals, the following case study aims to investigate the possible synergies between agriculture, integration of disabled people and landscape work. The main questions asked were: What has already been done? Which aims have been followed? What are the conditions restricting or supporting the implementation of landscape work?

7.2 What does "landscape work" mean?

Working in the Landscape is another term for including nature protection measures into sustainable land use systems. Landscapes in Central Europe are cultural landscapes today. The forest as the final stage of natural succession was displaced in favour of earlier stages of succession. In contrast to the natural landscape this cultural landscape is not stable on its own, but depends on human intervention. The diversity of use led to an increase in diversity of biotopes and species and to a differentiation of the landscape. Depending on different intensities of use and different site factors specific plant communities developed. Weeds from the Near East and the Mediterranean region found a habitat on the regularly tilled arable fields. Agriculture produced landscape without exploiting it. Cultural modification of the landscape remained compatible with the natural environment and rather enhanced qualities of nature than made them disappear.

With the decrease in employment of people in agriculture, the standardised product quality and economic measures that demand mechanisation, specialisation and growing size of fields the development of diverse landscapes came to a turning point. In favourable areas (high yields) agriculture becomes intensified, in other regions agriculture is abandoned. The rapid change in intensity and use, eutrophication, increasing environmental pollution, fragmentation and isolation of habitats and climatic changes have the biggest impact on the diversity of species. Today many species are threatened and wildlife cannot find conditions to survive.

With this in mind we want to understand "landscape work” as measures that arrest or redress the tendencies described in order to bring back or maintain features and habitats for wildlife
and landscape. Landscape work includes the integration of nature conservation measures in sustainable landuse systems.

Examples of such measures are the creation or conservation of biotopes (e.g. copses, hedges, solitary trees, wetlands); the harvest of orchards, mowing of meadows, special grazing management with the aim of keeping the landscape open and supporting rare species, the promotion of beneficial insects and birds such as installing nest boxes for birds, creating hiding places for insects or planting strips of flowering plants. To find adequate measures a participatory process of landscape development might be suitable.

Today, even in organic farming, diverse landscapes only develop if they are consciously wanted, when landscape development is integrated into the goals of farming. The development of cultural landscapes can be understood and realised as a process where interested individuals participate in order to collect and share perceptions and thus come to a common conclusion of what the landscape consists of and what its special character is. Through conscious activity and a communication process the "right" measures can be found, that on the one hand aim to fit all the interests of the people concerned who live in the landscape, and on the other hand "fit" harmoniously into the landscape and express its uniqueness.

A big challenge for the future is finding combinations of wildlife habitats which at the same time create value for agriculture. One problem to be solved is how to implement features that can either maintain themselves or provide income. Measures like the production of leaf hay and the installation of living fences point in this direction.

7.3 The studied farms and their role in the landscape

In order to describe the history and the characteristics of the landscapes, features and integration of disabled people in the study farms, several methods were combined such as visiting the farm for one week to experience the daily work, conversations, interviews, reconnaissance walks and observation of the landscape as well as the analysis of aerial photographs for better description of measures and changes in the landscape (KALISCH 2006).

![Figure 8: Bedding the pigs in Bingenheim](image)
7.3.1 Community Bingenheim

The community Bingenheim is an anthroposophical institution established in 1950 situated north of Frankfurt with a school and workshops for more than 200 learning disabled people (WfbM). The Demeter-certified farm includes 12 disabled people with a ratio of supervision of 1:3. On about 100 ha with 55 ha arable, cereals, forage crops and potatoes are grown. There are 40 milking cows with offspring and 5 sows producing young for fattening to be looked after (figure 6).

The landscape in Bingenheim is well structured with an average field size of 2 ha and diverse because it lies in the transition zone between mountainside and valley. The land around the farm is shallow and dry and pastures with low yields are grazed. In the past there was a strong awareness of landscape work especially regarding the concept of the farm as an "organism" with planting of two kilometres of hedges and individual trees and care for about 5 ha apple orchards. Because of a new generation of farmers the future development is unclear at present.

7.3.2 Community Gut Sambach

The community Gut Sambach is situated in the former eastern part of Germany (Thuringia) and was established in 1991. It is also an anthroposophical venture but not as big as Bingenheim, is independent from WfbM and integrates 24 disabled people into its agriculture with a ratio of supervision between 1:3 and 1:6. The farm is Demeter-certified and has 530 ha of which 380 ha is arable land. Here too cereals, forage crops and potatoes are grown. There are about 150 milking cows and the offspring are raised and fattened. The pig stock consists of 200 fattening pigs and sows.

Figure 9: Old coppiced willows in Sambach

The landscape in Sambach composed of fields up to 30 ha, tree-lined ditches and rows of trees (Fig. 9), very old coppiced willows provide especially valuable habitat, as well as 12 ha of apple, plum and pear orchards that are grazed. In the nineties many measures like planting of individual trees and two hedges were financed by the city community and nature conservation trust. At present a bad state of maintenance results from lack of money. There is no concept of landscape care. Sometimes unemployed people are hired for cutting the trees.
7.3.3 Hofgut Richerode

Hofgut Richerode belongs to the Church Institution Hephata Hessian Diakonie which is a big institution in the North of Hessia established in 1864 to care for people with social needs. Hofgut Richerode is only one of several farms that are run by the trust since 1915. About 20 disabled people are employed directly in the daily farm work with a ratio of supervision of 1:7. Furthermore 60 disabled people work in the garden, household and in the vegetable processing. The farm is Bioland - certified, organised in the form of a WfbM and cultivates about 90 ha of which 50 ha are arable. Cereals, potatoes and forage crops are grown, 50 bulls are fattened, 400 laying hens, 60 chickens, 150 ducks, 300 geese and 7 sows are kept, whose offspring are raised and fattened. A speciality is the potato peeling equipment that allows wholesale marketing and guarantees many people a job (figure 8).

Figure 10: Potato processing in Richerode

The landscape of Richerode is characterised by surrounding woodland, a stream and a main road that noisily divides the farm from the landscape. There is a lack of structural elements in the fields that are on average 7 ha in size. There is no visible history such as old trees or viewpoints. The animals are kept inside, only some of the poultry is free range. The present farmer tries to develop identity through landscape work and sees this as a task for the future.

7.4 Differences and similarities of the surveyed farms

The landscape in all three study farms has changed since the start of activity in general. Houses, sheds and stables have been built and the settlement has spread. It is difficult to compare the three farms because the circumstances are quite complex. The farms are differently organised, and differ in their main production areas, number of employees, area etc. The decisions of the farmer concerning landscape depend on eg. site factors, help and initiative from outside or financial support. Nevertheless the farmer and his guiding image have a great impact on the decisions which orientate the enterprise and measures in the landscape as became obvious in the interviews.

7.5 Farmers’ motivation and assessment

The three farmers were interviewed about their attitudes towards landscape, agriculture and work with disabled clients. They have worked on their farms for at least 15 years, were raised in the country, finished grammar school after 12 years and have an agricultural training and additional qualifications. Only some had any training in education. All have an
anthroposophical background that is shown in terms like “farm organism” or “farm individuality”. They attempt to run their farms economically, socially and in view of working methods “soundly” and reliably.

7.5.1 Estimation of the landscape
The three farmers rank landscape issues differently. One of them spent much of his enthusiasm, time, energy and money to organise the farmyard with beauty and harmony and thus realise his ideals. Another farmer sees landscape as something granted. The care and maintenance needs support from workers and finance from outside the farm. The third farmer intends to take up landscape work in the future. Although he has lived on his farm for 15 years his interest in the topic seems to be new and to result from and the unsatisfactory state of the landscape. Because his disabled co-workers are able to operate the farm machinery he particularly tries to include measures for landscape development that ease their work and make it more efficient. As an example he aims to make the fields rectangular. So far there is no concept for landscape design on the farm as a whole, except for individual plans for house building.

7.5.2 Competition for production resources
The farmers emphasise that agricultural production; practicability and utilisation have priority over all considerations for landscape measures. The financing from outside enables or at least accelerates these measures. Biotopes are seen as lost area that cannot be used. Agricultural production and landscape work compete for area, time and labour. There are no sufficient qualified workers who would also be necessary for guiding disabled co-workers in landscape work. The farmers mention the rising pressure of economical issues that make “investments without use” more difficult.

7.5.3 Missing support
The farmers feel a lack of support from politicians, nature conservation trusts and national institutions. Even co-workers are often not interested in activities besides their area of responsibility and their normal working time. Often their appreciation for the farm environment is missing. The farmers also report vandalism, such as theft in the orchards by passers by. On two farms the hunters supports landscape measures. If the farmers were to receive financial aid for landscape work, they would be willing to use it.

7.5.4 The suitability of landscape work for disabled clients
The farmers value the suitability of landscape work for disabled clients differently. One of them asked if landscape work could be “eventually more suitable than farming” for them. Another farmer expressed doubts concerning the capabilities of the clients concerning orientation in an unstructured environment and the changing places and jobs in landscape work.

7.6 Conclusions: suitability of landscape work on farms with disabled people
From a theoretical point of view landscape work on farms with disabled people can be synergetic. It provides plenty of diverse manual work that can be combined with the daily routine work especially in winter or other times when there is not much agricultural work to do (fig. 11). The strong communities supporting the farms are not so dependent on profit in comparison to the ordinary family farm. By integrating disabled people the need to produce high yields is lower. Landscape work could be used as an advertisement for the institution and promote the farm. The philosophy of the community and identification with the location can thus be supported. Disadvantages lie in the additional need for resources that are barely
sufficient: There is a competition for time, space, workers and a shortage of professional staff. Landscape activities of the community should be supported by environmental schemes and from outside the institution. Another challenge might be the capabilities of the disabled people. The potential of landscape work depends on the following issues.


• People
  o capability and training of disabled people
  o capability, experience, motivation and education of the manager and staff
  o identification with location and work that might depend on contentment with and duration of the employment
  o importance of landscape, idealistic support from outside and inside the farm
  o communication and cooperation among the people

• Structural organisation
  o Organisational form and philosophy of the institution
  o The development of appropriate concepts is needed
  o Equipment with labour force, management of work such as peak work times, working place
  o Many clients provide a solid basis so that production and profit by selling cash crops becomes less important
  o Can the unstructured landscape work be changed or combined with a structured working place with rhythms and repetitions?

• Site requirements
  o Prerequisites concerning farming, landscape, history, finance, social impacts (such as locality, adjustments, possible ways of marketing etc.)
  o a dissatisfaction with landscape such as disharmony and ugliness can support the will to change

• Secure economy
  o long term or regular support for environmental measures by the state, trusts, donations or others (i.e. agri-environmental schemes)
  o support from outside
• Problems and questions to be solved and answered
  o Work should correspond to interests and needs of disabled people (such as order and cleanliness)
  o Can landscape provide a “therapeutic effect”? 
  o Competition for production resources: space, time, labour, money 
  o Finance: How can the sectors agriculture, clients and landscape work cooperate synergistically? How can landscape work be appreciated and valued (like tourism, sale of fire wood)? How should prices be calculated? 
  o Organisation: Can the unstructured landscape work be changed into a structured working place with rhythms and repetitions throughout the year? Which combination of sectors, size of working group, employer makes sense? Which grade of mechanisation and professionalism should be striven for?
  o Can strong and weak clients work together? Will only strong clients be able to work in the landscape group and therefore be missing in other sectors?

Figure 11: “Machine parking” in Bingenheim

The case study of sample farms shows that within WfbM (sheltered workshops for disabled people) – organised integrational institutions it is a challenge to find free spaces to do landscape work. The integration of disabled people in agricultural production and their workload with daily duties in animal care limit their commitment. The planting, care and harvest of shrubs, the processing of fruits, the cutting of fire wood and the production of leaf hay, the installation and maintenance of nesting boxes for birds and insects and even the mowing of meadows and the care for ponds and streams are possible fields of activity where disabled people can be employed according to their capabilities. The offer of landscape work as a commercial service through WfbM often competes with professional landscape care
enterprises that do not get government support and is therefore problematic. Another idea would be to offer landscape work as a service for other farms which do not have time and labour to care for their landscape themselves. A task to be solved in future is the remuneration of such services, because the payments for clients are limited and the low wages of the co-workers must be covered from farming business.

8. Prospects for social agriculture

The dictionary defines farming as ‘planned business of tillage and animal husbandry’; “social” means ‘common’ or ‘concerning the community’, ‘serve and belong to the community’, ‘charitable and non-profit’. “Health” at least is – according to the WHO – ‘the state of complete physical, mental and social well being and more than being without illness’ (http://www.euro.who.int/AboutWHO/20021122_3?language= German, access 27.04.2007). The term “social farming” is used for farming institutions which are frequented by certain people in order to participate into farm life and working in nature for different reasons (therapy, education, employment).

The review on social farming in Germany shows: central issue is the human being and the producing farm, historically developed from farms that performed additional social tasks or as a branch of institutions that integrated supplementary agricultural activities. The potential beneficiaries or clients of social farming are manifold, their spectrum was shown in the report.

The goal of integrating clients into agriculture is on the one hand care and therapy (pre- and post-operative treatment) and the goal of a (productive) occupation on the other hand. Respecting this there are farms with economically relevant production being open for social activities and institutions and farms where farming is used as a (therapeutic) instrument. There is a wide range of cases inbetween those polarities and the orientation depends i.e. on kind and severity of the handicap and disability of the client (group).

“Social” farming can be characterized by a bunch of standards resp. values: fair trade, social standards, fair payments, the climate between two persons, social embedding. One motivation can be to reactivate human resources for society. Does this serve the community, is this charitable and non-profit? Is there a contradiction? Does “profit” necessarily mean disprofit for the society – who gets exploited, who gains profit by the abuse of whom? How might the partaking be performed as social interaction, as exchange with nature? Which kind of goods are social farms providing their clients and what kind of goods do the clients give the farms in exchange? Is there an attempt in social farming to ‘interact socially’ with nature also – not just ‘use’ nature as place for occupation and therapy but contribute to the wellbeing of nature? This question was the starting point of an investigation on three farms where deficits but also potentials for development became apparent.

Furthermore the analysis of the status quo in gemany shows that there are obscurities and missing transparency on the level of responsible agencies and ministries, financiers and legislation concerning social farming. Excessive regulation in some partitions face vacuums in other parts. The support of social farming resp. this kind of workplaces aims not least to implement cheaper services in comparison to other therapeutic measurements.

Social commitment is recommended for farms to diversify and raise their income. But many actors have intrinsic motivations to be social farmers. If financial incentives (extrinsic) will support the establishment of social farms a quality assurance will be required. The situation resembles the situation in organic agriculture where initially some pioneers developed the idea and were displaced slowly by economically inspired pragmatists – who in the course of time might develop ‘intrinsic motivations’ resp. idealistic attitudes, of course.

There are specific opportunities and threats in the future of social farming. Its development is connected with the crisis of society, with the reduction of costs in social and health supply, with new life styles that create new capabilities and illnesses and not least with the demographic development, the care for livelihoods and the issues we set our values on.
Not for any reason social farming is a domain of social services (LENHARD et al. 197: 479). The inclusion of people in farming activities requires additional effort, it is a double function of food production and social task (vgl. LENHARD et al. 197: 479). These two goals are sometimes conflicting and must therefore be guided and adjusted professionally in order to let all participants succeed. A patent remedy cannot be provided, the local prerequisites, different client groups and different goals of the integration as well as diverse emphasises of business and interests have to be taken into account.

The best solution would be the step by step opening of farms for people to participate (and society) and counteract against the alienation from natural basics of life and against the artificial separation (vgl. LENHARD et al. 197: 482). The question how this idea could be achieved, financed and organised (i.e. higher prices for social compatibility, see LENHARD et al. 197: 483) should tried to be answered by each single person – especially farmers – through visionary ideas.

A still further moving perspective is the consideration of possible synergies and contributions of social farming and the task to develop and maintain cultural landscapes that were perceived historically through human labour. To manage a farm in a landscape means to ‘use ressources’. One attempt could be to try to shape the landscape according to the needs of the clients. The special management concept of the farm has an impact on the cultural landscape around the farm. Social farms are accumulations of nutrients, ideas, energies: A farm where many people live and work has another atmosphere and spirit compared to a farm that is managed rationalised with machines.

Again and again tasks are searched for and found for clients, mostly simple or routine works. Works in the landscape are different than many common works in agriculture and their integration into social farming is a challenge of development. Social farming and work in the cultural landscapes have joint intersections. In practice the tasks in the landscape and the specific capabilities of the clients and their carers must be brought together – a challenge of education.
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