



Editing tool for agricultural technology communication

Good communication creates opportunities to better understand agricultural science and open effective dialogue. This qualitative review tool is designed to help writers edit their work by using a research-based approach for more effective communication.

As you evaluate your writing, there may be sections of your document that meet research recommendations and others that do not. We encourage you to use ✓, ✓, ✗ throughout your text where the piece meets or does not meet the criteria below. The final assessment for each of the categories below will be the rating (✓, ✓, ✗) which appears most often for that category throughout the text. You're encouraged to use the editing tool to assess areas where you can improve the use of language for increased understanding.

For more information on making communication around agricultural technology more effective please view [Best practices for agricultural technology communication](#), a companion piece for this editing tool.

Openness and transparency

1. Present both risks and benefits

Both risks and benefits are clearly stated

Either risks or benefits are stated

It is explicitly stated that no risks or benefits are present

2. Avoid exaggeration and emotive language

Language used is neutral. Extent of risk and benefit is clear

Some hyperbole and emotive language are used and text contains many parts with neutral wording

Language used is mostly hyperbolic and overly emotive

3. Manage risks

Safety precautions are addressed and a clear link is made as to how they address unintended consequences

Safety precautions are addressed but a clear link is not made as to how they address unintended consequences

Safety precautions are not addressed

4. Use consumer friendly language

Language used is at a Grade 10 comprehension level similar to that used in newspapers and magazines. If scientific terms are used, their meaning should be explained without the use of acronyms

Scientific terms are explained. Language remains technical

Scientific terms are not explained and vocabulary used is unnecessarily complicated

5. Avoid anthropomorphisms

Processes explained without using human or animal metaphors

6. Add back familiarity

Below are three ways to effectively add familiarity to your writing.

Process or risk explanations are equated with examples from everyday life

Agricultural practices are humanized by naming individuals responsible for specific tasks, including quotes and relevant personal details

Highlight familiar aspects of novel or unfamiliar processes

Additional Consideration

Pictures are included, depicting the faces of the people behind the work or product. Technical aspects of the workplace are not exaggerated and when realistic, people are shown without personal protective gear.

Message context

1. Relevance

Benefits shown to have a direct impact on the target audience or a group the audience identifies with

Benefits indirectly affect the individual or only benefit society as a whole

Benefits framed in context not relevant to the consumer or as a benefit to companies or producers

Additional Consideration

Outcomes that are not relevant to the target audience are made relatable

2. Credible and influential sources

Credible and/or influential sources are cited



Use storytelling to humanize the challenges and discoveries of credible sources

3. Loss framing

Risks associated with not adopting new technology are presented in a loss frame. Most effective when referring to a specific case

For more information contact:

Alexandra Grygorczyk
Consumer Insights, Vineland Research
and Innovation Centre
alexandra.grygorczyk@vinelandresearch.com

Andreas Boecker
Food, Agricultural & Resource Economics
Department, University of Guelph
aboecker@uoguelph.ca