

International Journal of Agriculture Extension and Social Development

Volume 9; Issue 7; July 2026; Page No. 889-894

Received: 17-04-2026
Accepted: 21-05-2026

Indexed Journal
Peer Reviewed Journal

Impact of the rural agricultural work experience (RAWE) programme on farmers in Shivamogga district

¹Sahana S, ²Pradeep Kumar TL and ³Prashanth B

¹Professor and Head, Department of Agricultural Extension Education, College of Agricultural Sciences, Iruvakkki, Keladi Shivappa Nayaka University of Agricultural and Horticultural Sciences, Shivamogga, Karnataka, India

²Assistant Professor, Department of Agricultural Extension Education, College of Agricultural Sciences, Iruvakkki, Keladi Shivappa Nayaka University of Agricultural and Horticultural Sciences, Shivamogga, Karnataka, India

³Assistant Professor, Department of Agricultural Extension Education, College of Agricultural Sciences, Iruvakkki, Keladi Shivappa Nayaka University of Agricultural and Horticultural Sciences, Shivamogga, Karnataka, India

DOI: <https://www.doi.org/10.33545/26180723.2026.v9.i7l.3970>

Corresponding Author: Sahana S

Abstract

The Rural Agricultural Work Experience (RAWE) programme serves as a vital experiential learning tool in agricultural higher education. This study evaluated the impact of RAWE on the knowledge levels and perceptions of host farmers in Shikaripura taluk, Shivamogga district. Using a descriptive research design, baseline and post-intervention data were collected via structured questionnaires from 260 farmers attached to 65 B.Sc. (Hons.) Agriculture students. Post-intervention results demonstrated a significant increase in overall high knowledge levels rising from 23.85% to 37.69% (a 37.25% rate of change) along with a sharp decline in low knowledge levels. Marked improvements were observed in recommended practices such as compost production, biofertilizers, seedbed preparation, and pest management. Additionally, farmers displayed strong positive shifts in perception regarding the profitability, sustainability, and efficiency of technologies like mushroom cultivation, apiculture, and vermicomposting. The study highlights RAWE's effectiveness as a participatory extension approach that enhances technology dissemination, strengthens farmer awareness, and promotes sustainable agricultural practices.

Keywords: RAWE programme, agricultural extension, experiential learning, technology adoption, farmer perception, knowledge level, Shivamogga district, and sustainable agriculture

1. Introduction

India has witnessed the most spectacular changes in the field of agriculture. From being a "Begging basket to a saturated granary", the era of self-sufficiency was achieved through together termed as Indigo revolution (Kumar *et.al*, 2020)^[4,6]. All these requisites necessitated the remodelling and development of new pedagogic tools in griculture education, which is a foundation of agricultural for future development. In Indian scenario socio-economic status of the farmers has vital role in agriculture. It was found that socio-economic, psychological, situational factors are the major causes of suicides of farmers in India. In Indian scenario 72.00 per cent of farmers like farming and out of them 60.00 per cent of them traditional occupation was agriculture. At the same time 36.00 per cent of farmers feel that agriculture does not give a good income. Land holdings of the farmers have strong association with economic motivation of the farmers (Singh *et.al*, 2016)^[15]. Agricultural education is an important tool in ensuring increased agriculture productivity, sustainability, environmental and ecological security. The committee on Agricultural Education in secondary schools in the year 1988 emphasized the need for change in vocational agriculture education, in order to meet the needs of the communities

(Iverson and Bachtel, 1989)^[3]. The committee recommended that instruction be provided both in developing agriculture skills and in promoting general knowledge in agriculture. In the past four decades Indian agriculture education system has worked within the gamut of transfer of technology from scientist to extension functionary and to farmer. Experiential learning approach in agriculture was first initiated by Prof. Richard Bawden in the year 1978 at the University of Western Sydney, Hawkesbury in Australia (Kannayan *et.al.*, 1998). In India, Randhawa committee recommended the Rural Agricultural Work Experience Programme (RAWEP) for imparting quality, practical and production oriented education for the agriculture degree programme (ICAR, 1992).

Rural Agricultural Work Experience Programme (RAWEP) was introduced in the agricultural universities in our country, which is viewed as the best opportunity, which can orient and equip the required potential among farmers through the students of agricultural science. The Third Deans committee under the chairmanship of Keerti Singh advocated the introduction of RAWEP in all the State Agricultural Universities (SAU's) in India and laid down specific objectives for the programme (Shivaramu, 2018)^[12]. In order

to sharpen the knowledge and skills of agricultural students, RAWE is offered in final year of the B.Sc. (Agri) degree programme which includes, training, demonstration, observation, practice and participation in purposeful activities and to orient our agricultural graduates for participation in various rural developmental programme. This programme aim is to provide work experience to the students in rural areas. This experiential system in agricultural education has a strong potential to prepare a better agricultural technocrat with high level of skill in combination with the modern out-look and management capacity. However, RAWE is one of the best that means to produce well trained agricultural graduates with broad based knowledge and techniques to meet the emerging challenges for the welfare of farmers (IGKVR, 2014).

2. Methodology

The present study was carried out in five villages, namely Kallamane, Issuru, Chikkajogihalli, Hittala and Churchigundi in Shikaripura taluk of Shivamogga district. A total of 65 students of B.Sc. (Hons.) Agriculture were allotted to these villages during the RAWEP programme in the academic year 2025-26 at the College of Agricultural Sciences, Iruvakk. Thus, 260 farmers were selected, with whom the students were attached to study various aspects of agricultural technologies in farm enterprises. A descriptive research design was followed to carry out the study in Shivamogga district. Further, data were collected with the help of a structured questionnaire through face-to-face interaction with the farmers. The RAWE period (Village placement) was from 29.09.2025 to 21.12.2025. Data were collected before the start of the RAWE programme and after its completion to assess the impact in terms of changes in knowledge and perception of different agricultural technologies. The RAWE programme was conducted under the College of Agricultural Sciences (CAS), Iruvakk, Keladi Shivappa Nayaka University of Agricultural and Horticultural Sciences (KSNUAHS), Shivamogga.

3. Results and discussion

3.1. Distribution of farmers according to their profile characteristics

The profile characteristics of farmers presented in Table 1 provide important insights for understanding the effectiveness of the Rural Agricultural Work Experience (RAWE) programme implemented during village placement. With respect to age, more than half of the farmers (51.54%) belonged to the middle age group (36-50 years), followed by nearly one-third (33.08%) in the young age group (18-35 years), while about one-sixth (15.38%) were in the old age group (>50 years). Middle-aged farmers are generally more active and responsive to extension interventions like RAWE. These findings are in conformity with the findings of Reddy *et al.* (2018) and Kumar *et al.* (2020) [4, 6, 11].

In terms of education, about one-fourth (25.77%) of the farmers were illiterate, while nearly one-fourth (22.69%) had primary education. Less than one-fifth (18.85%) had middle school education and only about one-tenth (11.15%) had high school education, with very few having higher education. This highlights the importance of practical and demonstrative approaches under RAWE. These findings align with the

findings of Singh and Sharma (2017) [13]. Regarding family type, nearly two-thirds (65.38%) of the farmers belonged to nuclear families, while about one-third (34.62%) belonged to joint families. Nuclear families may facilitate quicker decision-making. These findings are in conformity with the findings of Patel *et al.* (2019) [10]. With respect to family size, nearly half (49.62%) of the respondents had small families, followed by about one-third (29.62%) with large families and about one-fifth (20.77%) with medium sized families. Smaller family size may encourage adoption of improved technologies. These findings align with the findings of Verma *et al.* (2016) [16].

In terms of marital status, nearly two-thirds (64.62%) of the farmers were married, while about one-third (35.38%) were unmarried. Married farmers tend to have greater responsibility toward improving their livelihood. These findings are in conformity with the findings of Chauhan *et al.* (2018) [1]. Regarding annual income, nearly one-third (32.31%) of farmers earned between Rs.40, 000-Rs.80, 000, followed by about one-third (28.85%) earning Rs.20, 000-Rs.40, 000. About one-fourth (24.23%) earned above Rs.80, 000, while nearly one-seventh (14.62%) earned less than ₹20,000, indicating moderate income levels. These findings are in conformity with the findings of Meena and Singh (2019) [7].

With respect to farming experience, nearly half (46.92%) of the farmers had 10-20 years of experience, followed by about one-third (28.08%) with less than 10 years and one-fourth (25.00%) with more than 20 years of experience. These findings are in conformity with the findings of Yadav *et al.* (2017) [17].

Scientific orientation was medium among nearly two-fifths (43.85%) of farmers, followed by about one-third (30.38%) with high and about one-fourth (25.77%) with low orientation. These findings are in conformity with the findings of Patel and Desai (2018) [9]. Risk orientation was low among nearly half (45.77%) of the farmers, followed by about one-third (28.46%) with high and about one-fourth (25.77%) with medium risk orientation. These findings are in conformity with the findings of Mehta *et al.* (2016) [8].

Social participation was medium among about two-fifths (40.77%) of the farmers, followed by about two-fifths (37.31%) with low and about one-fifth (21.92%) with high participation. These findings are in conformity with the findings of Kumar and Patel (2019) [5, 10]. Extension orientation was medium among about two-fifths (37.31%) of the farmers, followed by about one-third (34.23%) with low and about one-third (28.46%) with high orientation. These findings are in conformity with the findings of Singh *et al.* (2020) [14].

Overall, the findings indicate that farmers possess moderately favourable socio-economic and psychological characteristics and the RAWE programme plays a significant role in enhancing their knowledge and adoption behaviour through practical exposure and direct interaction.

3.2. Impact of RAWE programme on knowledge levels of farmers regarding recommended agricultural technologies

The data presented in Table 2 revealed that change in knowledge level of farmers regarding various agricultural

technologies before and after the implementation of the RAWE programme. Before the intervention, a majority of farmers possessed low knowledge across most of the technologies. For instance, more than half of the farmers had low knowledge regarding compost production (60.00%), vermicomposting (58.85%), use of biofertilizers (61.54%) and microbial biocontrol agents (63.46%). In contrast, only about one-sixth to one-fourth of the respondents had high knowledge on these aspects. After the RAWE programme, there was a noticeable shift in knowledge levels from low to moderate and high categories. In most of the statements, nearly half of the farmers moved into the moderate

knowledge category. About one-half (50.77%) of the respondents had moderate knowledge regarding compost production, while about one-fourth (21.92%) had high knowledge after the programme. Similarly, in the case of vermicomposting, more than half (51.54%) of the farmers had moderate knowledge and about one-fourth (24.23%) had high knowledge after the intervention, compared to a majority having low knowledge before the programme. A similar trend was observed in knowledge related to biofertilizers, azolla cultivation, mushroom cultivation and seed treatment practices.

Table 1: Distribution of farmers according to their profile characteristics

Sl. No	Variables	Category	No	%
1.	Age	Young (18 to 35 years)	86	33.08
		Middle (36-50 years)	134	51.54
		Old (>50 years)	40	15.38
2.	Education	Illiterate	67	25.77
		Primary school	59	22.69
		Middle School	49	18.85
		High school	29	11.15
		PUC (11th to 12th standard)	36	13.85
		Degree	12	4.62
		Pg and above (Any degree)	8	3.08
3.	Family Type	Nuclear	170	65.38
		Joint	90	34.62
4.	Family size	Small family (<4)	129	49.62
		Medium family (4-6)	54	20.77
		Large family (>6)	77	29.62
5.	Marital status	Married	168	64.62
		Unmarried	92	35.38
6.	Annual Income	< 20,000	38	14.62
		20,000-40,000	75	28.85
		40,000-80,000	84	32.31
		>80,000	63	24.23
7	Farming Experience	(<10 years)	73	28.08
		(10-20 years)	122	46.92
		(>20 years)	65	25.00
8	Scientific Orientation	Low(<16.62)	67	25.77
		Medium(16.60-21.80)	114	43.85
		High(>21.80)	79	30.38
9	Risk Orientation	Low(<14.63)	119	45.77
		Medium(16.60-19.80)	67	25.77
		High(>19.80)	74	28.46
10	Social participation	Low(<6.63)	97	37.31
		Medium(6.63-8.45)	106	40.77
		High(>8.45)	57	21.92
11	Extension Orientation	Low(<7.63)	89	34.23
		Medium(7.63-9.45)	97	37.31
		High(>9.45)	74	28.46

Knowledge regarding green manuring, organic waste utilization, soil and water conservation also showed considerable improvement, with nearly three-fifths of farmers shifting to moderate knowledge levels after the programme. This indicates that farmers gained better understanding through practical demonstrations and field

exposure provided by RAWE students.

In the case of advanced practices such as budding, grafting and microbial biocontrol agents, there was a clear improvement from low to moderate knowledge levels, though high knowledge levels remained comparatively lower. This suggests that while awareness increased, mastery of technical skills may require longer or repeated

interventions. Knowledge related to organic farming principles and kitchen gardening also improved significantly. For instance, nearly half of the farmers already had moderate knowledge about organic farming before the programme (48.85%), which further strengthened after the intervention with increased proportions in both moderate and high categories.

Overall, the results clearly indicate that the RAWE programme had a positive impact on farmers knowledge levels. There was a consistent decrease in the proportion of farmers under the low knowledge category and a corresponding increase in moderate and high knowledge categories across all the statements.

This improvement can be attributed to the participatory approach adopted under RAWE, including demonstrations, group discussions and regular interaction between students and farmers, which helped in better understanding and retention of knowledge. These findings are in conformity with the findings of Singh *et al.* (2020) ^[14], Kumar *et al.* (2019) ^[5] and Meena *et al.* (2018), who reported significant improvement in farmers knowledge levels after extension interventions and training programmes.

Impact of RAWE intervention on farmers overall knowledge of agricultural practices

The overall knowledge of farmers regarding recommended agricultural technologies showed a marked improvement following the RAWE programme (Table. 3). Prior to the intervention, the majority of farmers exhibited moderate to low knowledge levels. Low knowledge was observed in 38.85 per cent of farmers, moderate knowledge in 37.30 per cent, and only 23.85 per cent of respondents possessed high knowledge. This indicates that a substantial proportion of farmers lacked sufficient understanding of improved agricultural practices. Post-intervention, high knowledge increased to 37.69 per cent, representing a rate of change of 37.25 per cent. Moderate knowledge slightly decreased to 33.84%, while low knowledge decreased significantly to 28.47 per cent. This shift demonstrates that a considerable proportion of farmers transitioned from low and moderate knowledge levels to higher knowledge due to the RAWE programme.

The significant increase in high knowledge levels and the reduction in low knowledge levels indicate the effectiveness

of participatory training, demonstrations, and hands-on interactions facilitated by the RAWE programme. Farmers gained a better understanding of compost production, biofertilizers, seed treatment, grafting, and other recommended practices, contributing to an overall enhancement in knowledge. These results are in conformity with the findings of Singh *et al.* (2020) ^[14], Kumar *et al.* (2019) ^[5] and Meena *et al.* (2018), who reported significant improvements in farmers overall knowledge following structured extension interventions and experiential learning programmes.

3.3 Impact of RAWE programme on perception of farmers regarding recommended agricultural technologies

The findings revealed that the RAWE Programme brought about a positive change in farmers attitudes towards recommended agricultural technologies. After the intervention, a higher proportion of respondents expressed strong agreement with most of the statements compared to the pre-intervention stage. A majority of the respondents strongly agreed that mushroom cultivation is a profitable enterprise for rural households (54.62%), followed by vermicomposting being more beneficial than traditional composting (50.38%), microbial biocontrol agents being safer than chemical pesticides (50.38%) and apiculture providing additional income and enhancing crop pollination (50.38%). Similarly, nearly half of the respondents strongly agreed that compost production improves soil fertility (46.92%), scientific seedbed preparation ensures better germination (46.92%), budding is effective for quality planting material production (46.92%), Azolla cultivation is useful for livestock feed and soil fertility (46.54%), soil and water conservation practices improve productivity and reduce erosion (46.54%).

The proportion of respondents strongly agreeing that scientific seedbed preparation ensures better germination increased from 18.85 per cent to 46.92 per cent. Similarly, strong agreement regarding the importance of seed treatment increased from 24.62 per cent to 41.15 per cent. These changes may be attributed to demonstrations showing their role in improving crop establishment and disease management.

Table 2: Impact of RAWE programme on knowledge levels of farmers regarding recommended agricultural technologies

Sl.No	Statements	Before						After					
		High	%	Moderate	%	Low	%	High	%	Moderate	%	Low	%
1.	Do you know the recommended methods of compost production	43	16.54	61	23.46	156		57	21.92	132	50.77	71	27.31
2.	Do you know about vermicomposting and its benefits	44	16.92	63	24.23	153		63	24.23	134	51.54	63	24.23
3.	Do you know the importance of green manuring in soil fertility	53	20.38	60	23.08	147		45	17.31	151	58.08	64	24.62
4.	Do you know how to enrich FYM using weeds or additives	52	20.00	62	23.85	146		63	24.23	135	51.92	62	23.85
5.	Do you know how to utilize organic wastes effectively in farming	62	23.85	54	20.77	144		47	18.08	152	58.46	61	23.46
6.	Do you know about the use of biofertilizers in crop production	41	15.77	59	22.69	160		64	24.62	135	51.92	61	23.46
7.	Do you know the method of mushroom cultivation	45	17.31	50	19.23	165		47	18.08	152	58.46	61	23.46
8.	Do you know the method of cultivating Azolla	47	18.08	56	21.54	157		64	24.62	135	51.92	61	23.46
9.	Do you know microbial biocontrol agents	41	15.77	54	20.77	165		48	18.46	150	57.69	62	23.85

10.	Do you know the scientific method of seed bed preparation	57	21.92	49	18.85	154	66	25.38	133	51.15	61	23.46
11.	Do you know the importance and method of seed treatment	41	15.77	59	22.69	160	45	17.31	155	59.62	60	23.08
12.	Do you know budding techniques for plant propagation	50	19.23	61	23.46	149	47	18.08	152	58.46	61	23.46
13.	Do you know grafting techniques for plant propagation	62	23.85	54	20.77	144	64	24.62	135	51.92	61	23.46
14.	Do you know soil and water conservation practices	73	28.08	60	23.08	127	46	17.69	153	58.85	61	23.46
15.	Do you know improved post-harvest technologies	49	18.85	57	21.92	154	64	24.62	135	51.92	61	23.46
16.	Do you know about apiculture	67	25.77	42	16.15	151	47	18.08	152	58.46	61	23.46
17.	Do you know the principles and benefits of organic farming	73	28.08	127	48.85	60	63	24.23	135	51.92	62	23.85
18.	Do you know the benefits of kitchen gardening for household nutrition	51	19.62	64	24.62	145	48	18.46	150	57.69	62	23.85

Table 3: Overall Impact of RAWE programme on knowledge levels of farmers regarding recommended agricultural technologies

Category	Before		After		Rate of change
	f	%	f	%	
High	62	23.85	98	37.69	37.25
Moderate	97	37.30	88	33.84	
Low	101	38.85	74	28.47	

Regarding horticultural technologies, strong agreement towards budding as an effective propagation technique increased from 16.92 per cent to 46.92 per cent, while strong agreement towards grafting increased from 24.62 per cent to 34.62 per cent. The improvement may be due to practical exposure provided on plant propagation techniques.

The percentage of respondents strongly agreeing that soil and water conservation practices improve productivity and reduce erosion increased from 17.31 per cent to 46.54 per cent. This favourable attitude is due to increased awareness of sustainable natural resource management. Similarly, strong agreement towards the adoption of post-harvest technologies increased from 22.31 per cent to 43.08 per cent, indicating better appreciation of their role in reducing losses and increasing farm income. The proportion of respondents strongly agreeing that apiculture provides additional income and enhances crop pollination increased from 18.85 per cent to 50.38 per cent. This is attributed to the promotion of

beekeeping as a viable supplementary enterprise.

Strong agreement regarding organic farming ensuring safe food, soil health and sustainability increased from 24.62 per cent to 45.77 per cent. This favourable attitude had developed due to growing awareness of the adverse effects of excessive chemical use and the benefits of organic agriculture. Finally, the percentage of respondents strongly agreeing that kitchen gardening contributes to household nutrition and food security increased substantially from 14.62 per cent to 43.08 per cent. This is due to awareness programmes emphasizing nutritional security and self-sufficiency in vegetable production. The positive attitude developed among farmers is due to the awareness programmes, demonstrations, field visits, training programmes and continuous interactions conducted by RAWE students, which enhanced farmers understanding of the benefits of these technologies and encouraged favourable perceptions towards their adoption.

Table 4: Impact of RAWE programme on perception of farmers regarding recommended agricultural technologies

Sl.No	Statements	SA	A	UD	D	SDA	SA	A	UD	D	SDA
1.	Compost production is an effective way to recycle farm residues and improve soil fertility.	58 (22.31)	74 (28.46)	65 (25.00)	42 (16.15)	21 (8.08)	122 (46.92)	65 (25.00)	22 (8.46)	21 (8.08)	30 (11.54)
2.	Vermicomposting is more beneficial than traditional composting for soil health and crop yield	64 (24.62)	61 (23.46)	39 (15.00)	61 (23.46)	35 (13.46)	131 (50.38)	37 (14.23)	42 (16.15)	30 (11.54)	20 (7.69)
3.	Green manuring is a cost-effective and sustainable method to improve soil fertility.	44 (16.92)	59 (22.69)	69 (26.54)	46 (17.69)	42 (16.15)	119 (45.77)	65 (25.00)	22 (8.46)	33 (12.69)	21 (8.08)
4.	Enriching FYM with weeds or additives increases its nutrient value	49 (18.85)	79 (30.38)	42 (16.15)	28 (10.77)	62 (23.85)	90 (34.62)	65 (25.00)	42 (16.15)	31 (11.92)	30 (11.54)
5.	[Proper utilization of organic waste reduces farm input costs and environmental pollution	49 (18.85)	69 (26.54)	32 (12.31)	38 (14.62)	72 (27.69)	98 (37.60)	56 (21.54)	61 (23.46)	22 (8.46)	23 (8.85)
6.	Biofertilizers are a reliable	50	29	74	65	42	118	61	22	31	30

	and eco-friendly substitute for chemical fertilizers	(19.23)	(11.15)	(28.46)	(25.00)	(16.15)	(45.38)	(23.46)	(8.46)	(11.92)	(11.54)
7.	Mushroom cultivation is a profitable and suitable enterprise for rural households	49 (18.85)	69 (26.54)	32 (12.31)	38 (14.62)	72 (27.69)	142 (54.62)	65 (25.00)	22 (8.08)	21 (8.08)	10 (3.85)
8.	Azolla cultivation is an effective and low-cost method for livestock feed and soil fertility	49 (18.85)	59 (22.69)	50 (19.23)	29 (11.15)	73 (28.08)	121 (46.54)	66 (25.38)	22 (8.46)	21 (8.08)	30 (11.54)
9.	Microbial biocontrol agents are safer and more sustainable than chemical pesticides	50 (19.23)	49 (18.85)	54 (20.77)	65 (25.00)	42 (16.15)	131 (50.38)	64 (24.62)	33 (12.69)	11 (4.23)	21 (8.08)
10.	Scientific seed bed preparation ensures better germination and healthy seedlings.	49 (18.85)	69 (26.54)	32 (12.31)	38 (14.62)	72 (27.69)	122 (46.92)	59 (22.69)	23 (8.85)	26 (10.00)	30 (11.54)
11.	[Seed treatment is essential for preventing seed and soil-borne diseases	64 (24.62)	61 (23.46)	39 (15.00)	61 (23.46)	35 (13.46)	107 (41.15)	60 (23.08)	32 (12.31)	33 (12.69)	28 (10.77)
12.	Budding is an effective technique for producing quality planting materials in fruit crops.	44 (16.92)	59 (22.69)	69 (26.54)	46 (17.69)	42 (16.35)	122 (46.92)	64 (26.42)	22 (8.46)	30 (11.54)	22. (8.46)
13.	Grafting improves survival rate and productivity of horticultural plants	64 (24.62)	61 (23.46)	39 (15.00)	61 (23.64)	35 (13.46)	90 (34.62)	65 (25.00)	42 (16.15)	31 (11.92)	32 (12.31)
14.	Soil and water conservation practices improve soil productivity and reduce erosion	44 (17.31)	59 (22.69)	68 (26.35)	46 (17.69)	42 (16.35)	121 (46.54)	66 (25.38)	22 (8.46)	21 (8.08)	30 (11.54)
15.	Adoption of post-harvest technologies reduces storage losses and increases farmers' income	58 (22.31)	73 (28.08)	65 (25.00)	42 (16.15)	22 (8.46)	112 (43.08)	54 (20.77)	33 (12.69)	36 (13.85)	25 (9.62)
16.	Apiculture provides additional income and enhances crop pollination.	49 (18.85)	79 (30.38)	42 (16.15)	28 (10.77)	62 (23.85)	131 (50.38)	37 (14.23)	42 (16.15)	30 (11.54)	20 (7.69)
17.	Organic farming ensures safe food, soil health, and sustainability for future generations	64 (24.62)	61 (23.46)	39 (15.00)	61 (23.46)	35 (13.46)	119 (45.77)	65 (25.00)	22 (8.46)	33 (12.69)	21 (8.08)
18.	Kitchen gardening contributes to household nutrition and food security	38 (14.62)	41 (15.77)	74 (28.46)	65 (25.00)	42 (16.15)	112 (43.08)	50 (19.23)	37 (14.23)	30 (11.54)	31 (11.92)

Conclusion

The findings of the study revealed that the RAWE Programme had a significant positive impact on both the knowledge and perception levels of farmers regarding recommended agricultural technologies. The programme enhanced farmers knowledge on various aspects such as compost production, vermicomposting, green manuring, biofertilizers, mushroom cultivation, Azolla cultivation, seed treatment, plant propagation techniques, soil and water conservation, organic farming and allied agricultural enterprises. A substantial increase in the proportion of farmers with high knowledge levels was observed after the intervention.

Similarly, the perception of farmers towards recommended agricultural technologies improved considerably following the programme. A larger proportion of respondents expressed favourable perceptions regarding the usefulness, profitability, sustainability and environmental benefits of the technologies introduced. Farmers increasingly recognized the importance of scientific and eco-friendly agricultural

practices in improving productivity, income, soil health and household nutritional security.

The positive changes in knowledge and perception may be attributed to the various extension activities carried out under the RAWE Programme, including demonstrations, training programmes, field visits, farmer meetings and regular interactions between students and farmers. Overall, the results indicate that the RAWE Programme served as an effective extension educational approach for strengthening farmers awareness, improving their perceptions and promoting the dissemination of recommended agricultural technologies at the village level.

References

1. Chauhan NB, Patel RC, Thakor RF. Socio-economic characteristics of farmers and their relationship with adoption behaviour. *Indian J Ext Educ.* 2018;54(2):45-49.
2. Indira Gandhi Krishi Vishwavidyalaya. Rural Agricultural/Horticultural Work Experience

- Programme: Practical Manual for B.Sc. (Agri./Horti.). Raipur: Indira Gandhi Krishi Vishwavidyalaya; 2014. p. 1.
3. Iverson JM, Bachtel CD. Grassroots information for planning in agricultural education. *Agric Educ Mag.* 1989;61(7):12-16.
 4. Kumar A, Mehta SK, Godara AK. Impact of Rural Agricultural Work Experience (RAWEX) programme on profile of host farmers in Haryana. *Indian J Pure Appl Biosci.* 2020;8(6):152-156.
 5. Kumar P, Patel MM. Social participation and its influence on adoption of agricultural technologies among farmers. *J Community Mobil Sustain Dev.* 2019;14(1):78-82.
 6. Kumar R, Singh AK, Meena BS. Profile characteristics of farmers and their impact on technology adoption. *Indian Res J Ext Educ.* 2020;20(1):92-96.
 7. Meena MS, Singh KM. Income distribution and livelihood status of farmers in rural areas. *Agric Econ Res Rev.* 2019;32(1):123-130.
 8. Mehta BM, Patel JK, Chauhan PS. Risk orientation of farmers and its relationship with adoption of improved practices. *Gujarat J Ext Educ.* 2016;27(2):56-60.
 9. Patel DP, Desai HK. Scientific orientation of farmers towards modern agricultural practices. *J Ext Educ.* 2018;30(3):6045-6048.
 10. Patel RC, Patel MM, Parmar AM. Family structure and decision-making behaviour of farmers. *Indian J Ext Educ.* 2019;55(3):67-71.
 11. Reddy AA, Kumar S, Rao PP. Age structure and its influence on farming decisions. *Indian J Agric Sci.* 2018;88(4):589-593.
 12. Shivaramu K, Venkataranga K, Naika, Suresh DK. Perception of students and teachers on achievement of Rural Agricultural Work Experience programme objectives. *Asian J Agric Ext Econ Sociol.* 2018;24(2):1-13.
 13. Singh D, Sharma RK. Educational status of farmers and its role in technology adoption. *J Rural Dev.* 2017;36(2):215-220.
 14. Singh P, Yadav VPS, Chauhan S. Extension contact and orientation of farmers towards improved agricultural practices. *Indian J Ext Educ.* 2020;56(1):34-38.
 15. Singh TP, Kumar V, Kumari S. Study of socio-economic status of farmers in drought-prone regions of Maharashtra, India: A case study. *Int J Curr Sci.* 2016;8(6):33304-33306.
 16. Verma S, Yadav K, Singh B. Family size and its impact on agricultural productivity. *Int J Agric Sci.* 2016;8(52):2361-2364.
 17. Yadav JP, Meena KC, Singh R. Farming experience and adoption of improved agricultural practices. *J Krishi Vigyan.* 2017;5(2):45-50.