

AGRICULTURAL EXTENSION SERVICES AND FARMER DECISION-MAKING

Dr. Lopamudra Mohapatra

Assistant Professor

Department of Extension Education

Punjab Agricultural University, Ludhiana

Punjab, India

Abstract

Agricultural extension services play an important role in helping farmers interpret technical information, assess production risks, and make decisions about crops, livestock, inputs, markets, and natural-resource management. Farmers routinely decide when to plant, which varieties to use, how to manage soil fertility, whether to adopt pest-control measures, and how to respond to weather or price uncertainty. These decisions are rarely based on information alone. They are influenced by experience, household resources, risk tolerance, local institutions, market access, social networks, and the perceived credibility of advisory sources.

This paper examines how agricultural extension services shape farmer decision-making through the delivery of practical knowledge, demonstrations, peer learning, digital messages, advisory visits, and linkages with input suppliers, markets, financial institutions, and farmer organisations. The study uses a structured review and conceptual analysis of agricultural-extension literature, with attention to the transition from one-way technology transfer toward participatory, farmer-centred, and pluralistic advisory systems. It considers the role of information quality, timeliness, trust, local relevance, trialability, and follow-up support in converting advice into farm-level action.

The review indicates that extension is most effective when recommendations are adapted to local agroecological conditions and household constraints. Demonstration plots, farmer field schools, producer groups, mobile-based advisory services, and repeated interaction with trusted agents can improve awareness and confidence. However, advice may not lead to adoption where farmers lack credit, irrigation, inputs, land security, labour, insurance, or reliable market opportunities. Information must therefore be linked with feasible options rather than presented as a universal prescription.

The paper concludes that extension services should strengthen farmers capacity to evaluate alternatives, not merely promote a predefined technology. Effective systems combine technical expertise with participatory learning, transparent communication, inclusive outreach to women and marginal farmers, digital accessibility, and feedback from farmers to research and policy institutions. Such an approach can improve the quality, resilience, and sustainability of farmer decision-making while respecting diverse production conditions and livelihood goals.

Keywords: Agricultural Extension, Farmer Decision-Making, Advisory Services, Technology Adoption, Digital Agriculture, Farmer Field Schools, Social Learning, Rural Innovation, Sustainable Agriculture, Farm Management

1. INTRODUCTION

Agriculture requires a continuous series of decisions that affect farm productivity, household income, food security, and environmental sustainability. Farmers decide which crops or livestock enterprises to pursue, which practices to retain or change, how much seed or fertiliser to purchase, when to manage pests, and where to sell their produce. These decisions are made under uncertainty because weather patterns, pest outbreaks, input availability, prices, labour conditions, and

policy incentives can change rapidly. Reliable agricultural knowledge is therefore a central production resource, particularly for small and medium farmers whose ability to absorb costly mistakes may be limited.

Agricultural extension services are designed to connect farmers with relevant knowledge, skills, technologies, and institutional support. Traditionally, extension was often organised as a public system through which research recommendations were transmitted to farmers. Contemporary extension has expanded beyond

this model. Public agencies, universities, private firms, cooperatives, non-governmental organisations, agri-tech platforms, lead farmers, producer organisations, and media channels may all provide advice. This broader arrangement is frequently described as a pluralistic extension and advisory system because farmers receive information from multiple sources rather than from a single government agency.

The value of extension lies not only in the amount of information delivered but also in the quality of decision support it provides. Farmers may receive advice on seed selection, nutrient management, water conservation, integrated pest management, livestock health, market planning, post-harvest handling, and climate adaptation. Yet an advisory message will influence behaviour only when it is understandable, credible, timely, relevant to the farm, and compatible with available resources. A recommendation that performs well under research-station conditions may not be suitable for a rainfed smallholder farm facing labour shortages, cash constraints, or uncertain market access.

Farmer decision-making is also shaped by learning processes. Farmers observe neighbours, compare outcomes, participate in demonstrations, discuss options in groups, and draw on their own experience. Extension agents can support this learning by facilitating trials, helping farmers interpret evidence, explaining trade-offs, and connecting them to specialised expertise. In this way, extension can reduce information gaps and perceived risk, while still allowing farmers to make choices that fit their own goals and constraints. The process is especially important for innovations that require new skills, seasonal timing, or coordinated action across a community.

The objective of this paper is to examine how agricultural extension services influence farmer decision-making and to identify the features of advisory systems that support informed, feasible, and sustainable choices. The paper synthesises major theoretical and empirical contributions, defines the object of study, presents a review-based methodology, and analyses the pathways through which

extension affects adoption, adaptation, risk management, and farm-level decision quality.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

The literature on agricultural innovation has long recognised that farmers do not adopt technologies simply because they are technically available. Early diffusion studies emphasised communication channels, perceived relative advantage, compatibility with existing practices, complexity, trialability, and observability. Economic studies of technology adoption further showed that expected returns, credit access, land size, labour availability, risk, and market conditions influence whether farmers can act on new information. Extension is therefore most useful when it helps farmers assess both the technical and economic suitability of an option.

A second theme in the literature concerns the changing role of extension institutions. Public extension remains important for reaching remote and resource-constrained communities, but its performance can be weakened by limited staffing, broad mandates, and insufficient local feedback. Participatory approaches such as farmer field schools, group learning, and on-farm demonstrations seek to address this limitation by treating farmers as active experimenters and knowledge holders. Pluralistic systems also recognise that different actors may provide complementary services, including input guidance, market intelligence, weather information, veterinary support, and financial advice.

Recent research gives increasing attention to digital advisory services. Mobile phones, voice messages, applications, call centres, video platforms, and remote-sensing-enabled tools can increase the speed and reach of information. However, digital delivery does not automatically replace personal interaction. The usefulness of a digital message depends on language, literacy, device access, trust, network coverage, local calibration, and the ability of farmers to ask questions or verify recommendations. The literature increasingly views extension as an interactive innovation system in which knowledge flows between farmers, researchers, service providers, and markets.

TABLE 1: SUMMARY OF KEY LITERATURE ON AGRICULTURAL EXTENSION SERVICES AND FARMER DECISION-MAKING

S. No.	Author(s) / Year	Extension / Decision Mechanism	Study Context	Key Contribution
1	Rogers (2003)	Diffusion of innovations	Innovation communication	Explains how communication channels, perceived attributes, and social systems influence adoption decisions.
2	Feder, Just & Zilberman (1985)	Economic adoption framework	Farm technology adoption	Shows that profitability, risk, credit, farm resources, and information affect technology adoption.
3	Anderson & Feder (2004)	Extension system performance	Public advisory services	Examines the practical strengths and limitations of agricultural extension institutions.
4	Birner et al. (2009)	Best-fit institutional design	Pluralistic extension	Argues that extension structures should be matched to local governance and farmer needs.
5	Godtland et al. (2004)	Participatory learning	Farmer field schools	Finds that experiential learning can improve knowledge and farm-management practice.
6	Conley & Udry (2010)	Social learning	Farmer networks	Shows that farmers learn from the observed experiences and outcomes of peers.
7	Duflo, Kremer & Robinson (2011)	Timing and behavioural support	Fertiliser use	Demonstrates that small changes in timing and incentives can influence input-use decisions.
8	Fafchamps & Minten (2012)	Mobile information	Indian farmers	Evaluates how SMS-based agricultural information can support farmer knowledge and choices.
9	Fabregas, Kremer & Schilbach (2019)	Digital advisory interaction	Agricultural advice	Highlights the potential and design challenges of digital agricultural advisory services.
10	Ruzzante, Labarta & Bilton (2021)	Technology adoption meta-analysis	Developing countries	Reports that access to extension services is positively associated with adoption across many contexts.
11	Beaman et al. (2021)	Network targeting	Technology diffusion	Shows that well-targeted social networks can improve the spread of agricultural information.
12	FAO (2023)	Digital extension capacity	Smallholder advisory	Emphasises digital skills, inclusion, and locally relevant design for effective advisory delivery.

3. OBJECT OF STUDY

The object of this study is agricultural extension services viewed as a source of decision support for farmers. The analysis focuses on how farmers obtain, interpret, verify, and use advice when making choices about production, input use, risk management, marketing, and resource conservation. It

considers both conventional face-to-face extension and newer channels such as mobile advisories, videos, call centres, farmer producer organisations, community radio, and digital platforms.

The study examines how the characteristics of advisory services interact with farm and household conditions. Key service

characteristics include the relevance of recommendations, frequency of contact, timing, clarity, language, trustworthiness, accessibility, feedback opportunities, and links with demonstrations or follow-up support. Farm conditions include landholding, crop pattern, irrigation, income, debt, labour, gender roles, education, prior experience, access to inputs, and exposure to weather or market risk.

In addition, the study considers decision outcomes rather than treating technology adoption as the only measure of success. Farmers may decide to adopt, adapt, postpone, test on a small area, combine advice with local knowledge, or reject a recommendation for valid reasons. The aim is to develop a balanced framework that recognises farmer agency, local knowledge, and economic feasibility while evaluating how extension can improve access to actionable and trustworthy information.

KEY POINTS OF OBJECT OF STUDY

- To examine how access to extension services affects awareness, knowledge, and farm-level decision-making.
- To analyse the relevance, clarity, and timeliness of technical advice provided to different categories of farmers.

- To assess how demonstrations, field visits, farmer groups, and peer learning influence confidence in new practices.
- To investigate the role of digital advisory tools, mobile communication, and local-language information in rural decision support.
- To consider how credit, input access, land tenure, labour, and market conditions affect the feasibility of acting on advice.
- To compare decisions related to crop production, pest management, soil health, water use, livestock care, and marketing.
- To study how social networks, producer organisations, and local leadership shape the circulation and verification of information.
- To evaluate the inclusion of women farmers, marginal farmers, young farmers, and remote communities in extension outreach.
- To identify risks associated with generic, commercially biased, untimely, or insufficiently localised recommendations.
- To develop a conceptual framework for extension systems that strengthen informed, resilient, and sustainable farmer choices.

TABLE 2: OBJECT OF STUDY FRAMEWORK

S. No.	Study Component	Description	Purpose
1	Extension Access	Contact with public, private, cooperative, community, and digital advisory channels	Assess the reach and accessibility of decision-support services
2	Advice Quality and Relevance	Technical accuracy, local fit, clarity, timing, and language of recommendations	Examine whether information is usable in real farm conditions
3	Farmer Knowledge and Skills	Understanding of practices, risks, costs, and expected outcomes	Evaluate decision readiness and capacity to compare options
4	Farm Decision-Making	Choices related to crops, inputs, pest control, water, livestock, and marketing	Identify how advice influences actual managerial action
5	Learning and Experimentation	Demonstrations, trials, observation, group discussion, and feedback	Understand how confidence and evidence are built over time
6	Resource and Risk Conditions	Income, credit, land, irrigation, labour, weather, and price uncertainty	Recognise constraints that may limit feasible adoption
7	Social and Institutional Context	Peer networks, producer groups, trust, market links, and public support	Assess external influences on information use and verification

S. No.	Study Component	Description	Purpose
8	Decision Outcomes	Adoption, adaptation, productivity, resilience, and sustainability	Connect extension support with farm and livelihood outcomes

4. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

This paper uses an explanatory and integrative review design. Rather than collecting a new farmer survey, it synthesises theoretical contributions, peer-reviewed studies, policy reports, and established evidence on agricultural extension and advisory services. The approach is appropriate because the research question concerns the pathways through which information, learning, institutional support, and service design influence farmer decision-making across diverse agricultural systems.

The review is organised around four analytical domains: access to advisory services; quality and relevance of agricultural information; learning through demonstration and social interaction; and the economic and institutional conditions that shape the feasibility of action. Sources are evaluated for the type of extension channel studied, the decision area addressed, the farmer group or production context, and the implications for inclusive and sustainable service design. Particular attention is given to whether advice supports informed choice rather than promoting adoption without sufficient local assessment.

To preserve conceptual clarity, the paper distinguishes between information receipt, knowledge gain, trial behaviour, sustained practice change, and broader farm outcomes. A farmer who receives an advisory message may not have the resources to apply it, while a farmer who tests a practice may adapt it rather than adopt it in its original form. This distinction is important when interpreting evidence from extension contact, digital messaging, farmer training, and demonstration programmes.

4.1 RESEARCH DESIGN

- Study Type: Explanatory and literature-based research.
- Approach: Integrative review and conceptual synthesis.
- Unit of Analysis: Farmer and farm-household decision-making.
- Primary Extension Domains: Advisory access, information quality,

demonstration, peer learning, and digital communication.

- Context Variables: Farm size, resource endowment, credit, market access, gender, climate risk, and institutional support.
- Outcome Variables: Knowledge, trial, adoption, adaptation, decision confidence, resilience, and sustainable practice use.
- Ethical Position: No personal or human-subject data were collected for this study.

4.2 METHODOLOGICAL STEPS

- Step 1: Define farmer decision-making as a repeated process involving production, financial, market, and resource-management choices.
- Step 2: Identify major extension channels and advisory mechanisms discussed in the literature.
- Step 3: Review evidence from public extension, farmer field schools, producer organisations, digital platforms, and on-farm demonstrations.
- Step 4: Classify findings according to information quality, trust, learning process, timing, and local relevance.
- Step 5: Compare reported outcomes for awareness, knowledge, trial, adoption, adaptation, and sustained practice use.
- Step 6: Interpret findings in relation to farmer heterogeneity, especially farm resources, gender, location, and exposure to risk.
- Step 7: Identify limitations, including the risk of assuming that extension contact alone causes positive farm outcomes.
- Step 8: Develop practical implications for advisory systems that are participatory, inclusive, transparent, and locally responsive.

5. DATA ANALYSIS

The data analysis is based on qualitative synthesis of the reviewed literature. The evidence is interpreted by tracing how extension services affect a farmers likelihood of receiving relevant information, understanding available options, testing a practice, and integrating it into farm management. The analysis does not report

newly collected farm observations; it consolidates recurring patterns and identifies the conditions under which extension support is most likely to influence decision quality and practical action.

Across the reviewed studies, the most consistent message is that agricultural advice is useful when it is timely, credible, locally relevant, and linked to a feasible response. Farmers benefit when information can be discussed, demonstrated, verified, and adapted to their circumstances. The following sections organise the analysis around four mechanisms that are particularly influential in the relationship between extension services and farmer decision-making.

5.1 INFORMATION QUALITY, TIMELINESS, AND LOCAL RELEVANCE

Extension services influence decisions first by reducing information gaps. Advice on crop varieties, fertiliser timing, pest diagnosis, disease prevention, irrigation scheduling, and post-harvest handling can help farmers identify options that they may not otherwise consider. However, information has limited value when it is generic, delayed, poorly explained, or inconsistent with local agroecological conditions. Farmers are more likely to use advice when it clearly explains the problem, the expected benefit, the required resources, and the potential trade-offs.

Timeliness is particularly important in agriculture because many decisions are seasonal and cannot be easily reversed. A warning about pest pressure is useful only when it reaches farmers before damage becomes severe; a market advisory is useful only when producers can still alter selling, storage, or transport arrangements. Extension agents and digital systems can improve relevance by combining technical recommendations with local weather, soil, crop-stage, and market information. Nevertheless, advice should communicate uncertainty and avoid presenting complex biological or economic outcomes as guaranteed.

KEY OBSERVATION:

- Farmers are more likely to act on advice that is specific to their crop stage, location, and production objective.

- Timely delivery can be as important as technical accuracy because planting, pest, and marketing windows are often short.
- Clear explanation of costs, risks, and expected benefits supports informed choice rather than blind compliance.

5.2 TRUST, DEMONSTRATION, AND EXPERIENTIAL LEARNING

Trust is a central bridge between information and action. Farmers often assess advice by considering the credibility of the source, the experience of peers, and visible results under local conditions. Demonstration plots, field days, farmer field schools, and supervised trials are important because they allow farmers to observe a practice, ask questions, compare it with their current method, and evaluate whether the expected outcome appears realistic. Such learning reduces the uncertainty associated with unfamiliar practices and can make technical guidance more meaningful.

Experiential learning also recognises that farmers possess valuable knowledge about local soils, varieties, weather patterns, labour arrangements, and consumer preferences. Extension is more effective when agents engage with this knowledge rather than treating it as an obstacle. Participatory diagnosis and collaborative experimentation can identify how a recommendation should be modified for different farm sizes or resource conditions. This process may lead to adaptation rather than uniform adoption, but adaptation can be a sign of informed decision-making and practical innovation.

KEY OBSERVATION:

- Visible demonstration and peer discussion can reduce perceived risk and strengthen confidence in a new practice.
- Farmer participation improves the relevance of recommendations and helps identify local implementation barriers.
- Adaptation of a practice to farm conditions should be assessed as a decision outcome, not automatically treated as failure.

5.3 DIGITAL EXTENSION, ACCESS, AND PARTICIPATION

Digital extension has expanded the range of tools available to farmers and advisory institutions. SMS messages, voice calls, video lessons, chat-based support, weather alerts, digital pest diagnosis, and online market

information can reach many users at relatively low marginal cost. These tools can be valuable where extension-worker coverage is limited or where farmers need frequent updates. Digital services can also create records of advisory interactions and enable service providers to tailor content according to crop, location, or seasonal stage.

At the same time, digital access is uneven. Ownership of phones, control over devices, data costs, network reliability, literacy, language, age, gender norms, and confidence with technology affect who can use digital advisory services. A digital message may raise awareness but still be insufficient for a complex diagnosis or high-cost decision. Hybrid systems that combine digital information with local agents, farmer groups, call centres, and opportunities for follow-up can therefore be more inclusive and reliable than a digital-only approach.

KEY OBSERVATION:

- Digital tools can improve speed and reach, especially for weather, pest, and market information.
- Accessibility depends on language, device control, digital skills, network coverage, and the ability to seek clarification.
- Blended advisory models can combine the scale of digital channels with the trust and problem-solving capacity of local interaction.

5.4 RESOURCE CONSTRAINTS, RISK, AND FARMER HETEROGENEITY

Extension cannot be separated from the material conditions in which farmers operate. A technically sound recommendation may require cash, credit, labour, irrigation, tools, secure land access, or a market outlet that some households do not possess. Smallholders may be especially cautious about practices that increase upfront costs or exposure to price and weather risk. Farmers facing irregular income or debt may prioritise low-cost and reversible adjustments even when a higher-investment option promises greater returns over time.

A farmer-centred extension approach therefore requires segmentation and flexibility. Farmers with irrigated commercial farms may benefit from precision information and market forecasting, while rainfed or marginal farmers may need low-risk soil-health measures,

diversified cropping options, water conservation, and reliable public support. Women farmers and tenant farmers may face additional constraints in accessing land, credit, training, or digital devices. Equitable extension should identify these differences, avoid one-size-fits-all targets, and help farmers assess options according to their own resource base and livelihood priorities.

KEY OBSERVATION:

- Information can improve decisions, but it cannot remove structural barriers such as credit shortages, input failure, or weak market access.
- Risk-sensitive and low-cost options are important for farmers who cannot absorb large losses from experimentation.
- Inclusive extension requires targeted outreach and service design for diverse farm types, women farmers, youth, and remote communities.

6. DISCUSSION

The reviewed literature demonstrates that agricultural extension services influence farmer decision-making through more than information transfer. Extension can reduce uncertainty, improve technical understanding, facilitate peer learning, and connect farmers with institutions that make action more feasible. Traditional production advice remains important, but contemporary extension must also support decision-making related to climate variability, input quality, soil health, water use, market participation, financial planning, and digital technologies. This broader role requires advisory systems to work across disciplines and organisational boundaries.

The evidence also shows that the quality of interaction matters. A recommendation delivered as a one-time instruction may create awareness but does not necessarily support sustained practice change. Farmers are more likely to evaluate and use information when they can ask questions, observe demonstrations, discuss experiences with peers, and receive follow-up support. Trust is strengthened when extension agents communicate limitations honestly, respect local knowledge, and avoid recommendations that appear primarily driven by commercial sales objectives. In this sense, extension

quality includes both technical competence and the fairness of the advisory relationship.

Digital technologies create important opportunities for extending reach, personalising messages, and providing timely alerts. However, the digital transformation of extension should not be evaluated only by the number of messages sent or applications downloaded. Meaningful use depends on whether farmers can understand the advice, verify its relevance, and apply it safely. Digital systems should address data privacy, language inclusion, accessibility for low-literacy users, and mechanisms for human support. Public institutions have a particular responsibility to ensure that commercially motivated advice does not displace independent and transparent agricultural guidance.

For policy makers and service providers, the practical implication is to build pluralistic but coordinated advisory ecosystems. Public extension can provide impartial and inclusive support; research institutions can contribute scientific evidence; farmer organisations can strengthen peer learning and collective voice; private providers can offer specialised services; and digital platforms can improve reach and responsiveness. Coordination is necessary so that farmers are not overwhelmed by inconsistent messages. The most effective systems are likely to be those that combine locally accountable field support with accessible digital tools, demonstrations, feedback loops, and links to credit, inputs, insurance, and markets.

7. CONCLUSION

This paper examined agricultural extension services through the framework of farmer decision-making. The analysis shows that

extension can influence decisions about production, input use, pest management, water, livestock, and marketing by improving access to knowledge, reducing uncertainty, and supporting learning. Its impact depends not only on the presence of an advisory channel but also on the relevance, timing, clarity, credibility, and feasibility of the advice provided.

The evidence reviewed in this paper indicates that demonstrations, farmer field schools, producer groups, peer networks, local extension visits, and digital advisory tools can strengthen decision quality when they are responsive to local conditions. Their role should be to support informed choice and experimentation, not to impose uniform practices. Farmers may adopt, adapt, defer, or reject a recommendation based on valid assessments of risk, resources, labour, markets, and household priorities. Extension systems should therefore recognise heterogeneity and treat farmer knowledge as part of the innovation process.

The paper concludes that resilient and sustainable agriculture requires extension systems that are participatory, inclusive, transparent, and connected to practical support services. Technical advice must be combined with access to inputs, finance, markets, risk-management tools, and opportunities for feedback. Future research should examine the long-term effects of blended extension models across different farm sizes, gender groups, agroecological zones, and digital-access conditions, with attention to both productivity outcomes and farmer autonomy in decision-making.

8. REFERENCES

1. Aker, J. C. (2011). Dial A for agriculture: A review of information and communication technologies for agricultural extension in developing countries. *Agricultural Economics*, 42(6), 631-647.
2. Anderson, J. R., & Feder, G. (2004). Agricultural extension: Good intentions and hard realities. *The World Bank Research Observer*, 19(1), 41-60.
3. Bandiera, O., & Rasul, I. (2006). Social networks and technology adoption in northern Mozambique. *The Economic Journal*, 116(514), 869-902.
4. Beaman, L., BenYishay, A., Magruder, J., & Mobarak, A. M. (2021). Can network theory-based targeting increase technology adoption? *American Economic Review*, 111(6), 1918-1949.
5. Birner, R., Davis, K., Pender, J., Nkonya, E., Anandajayasekeram, P., Ekboir, J., Mbabu, A., Spielman, D. J., Horna, D., Benin, S., & Cohen, M. (2009). From best practice to best fit: A framework for designing and analyzing pluralistic agricultural advisory services. *Journal of Agricultural Education and Extension*, 15(4), 341-355.

6. Christoplos, I. (2010). Mobilizing the Potential of Rural and Agricultural Extension. Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations and Global Forum for Rural Advisory Services.
7. Conley, T. G., & Udry, C. R. (2010). Learning about a new technology: Pineapple in Ghana. *American Economic Review*, 100(1), 35-69.
8. Davis, K. (2008). Extension in sub-Saharan Africa: Overview and assessment of past and current models, and future prospects. *Journal of International Agricultural and Extension Education*, 15(3), 15-28.
9. Davis, K., Nkonya, E., Kato, E., Ayalew, D., Mekonnen, D. A., Odendo, M., Miiro, R., & Nkuba, J. (2012). Impact of farmer field schools on agricultural productivity and poverty in East Africa. *World Development*, 40(2), 402-413.
10. Duflo, E., Kremer, M., & Robinson, J. (2011). Nudging farmers to use fertilizer: Theory and experimental evidence from Kenya. *American Economic Review*, 101(6), 2350-2390.
11. Fafchamps, M., & Minten, B. (2012). Impact of SMS-based agricultural information on Indian farmers. *The World Bank Economic Review*, 26(3), 383-414.
12. Fabregas, R., Kremer, M., & Schilbach, F. (2019). Realizing the potential of digital development: The case of agricultural advice. *Science*, 366(6471), eaay3038.
13. FAO. (2014). *The State of Food and Agriculture 2014: Innovation in Family Farming*. Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations.
14. FAO. (2023). *Guide on Digital Agricultural Extension and Advisory Services*. Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations.
15. Feder, G., Just, R. E., & Zilberman, D. (1985). Adoption of agricultural innovations in developing countries: A survey. *Economic Development and Cultural Change*, 33(2), 255-298.
16. Foster, A. D., & Rosenzweig, M. R. (1995). Learning by doing and learning from others: Human capital and technical change in agriculture. *Journal of Political Economy*, 103(6), 1176-1209.
17. Global Forum for Rural Advisory Services. (2012). *The New Extensionist: Roles, Strategies, and Capacities to Strengthen Extension and Advisory Services*. GFRAS.
18. Godtland, E. M., Sadoulet, E., de Janvry, A., Murgai, R., & Ortiz, O. (2004). The impact of farmer field schools on knowledge and productivity: A study of potato farmers in the Peruvian Andes. *Economic Development and Cultural Change*, 53(1), 63-92.
19. Klerkx, L., & Leeuwis, C. (2009). Establishment and embedding of innovation brokers at the boundary of agricultural innovation systems. *Technological Forecasting and Social Change*, 76(6), 849-860.
20. Leeuwis, C., & van den Ban, A. (2004). *Communication for Rural Innovation: Rethinking Agricultural Extension*. Blackwell Science.
21. Mittal, S., & Mehar, M. (2016). Socio-economic factors affecting adoption of modern information and communication technology by farmers in India. *Agricultural Economics Research Review*, 29(1), 143-155.
22. Nakasone, E., Torero, M., & Minten, B. (2014). The power of information: The ICT revolution in agricultural development. *Annual Review of Resource Economics*, 6, 533-550.
23. Rogers, E. M. (2003). *Diffusion of Innovations* (5th ed.). Free Press.
24. Ruzzante, S., Labarta, R., & Bilton, A. (2021). Adoption of agricultural technology in the developing world: A meta-analysis of the empirical literature. *World Development*, 146, 105496.
25. Sulaiman, R. V., & Davis, K. (2012). *The New Extensionist: Roles, Strategies, and Capacities to Strengthen Extension and Advisory Services*. Global Forum for Rural Advisory Services.
26. Swanson, B. E. (Ed.). (2008). *Global Review of Good Agricultural Extension and Advisory Service Practices*. Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations.
27. Swanson, B. E., & Rajalahti, R. (2010). *Strengthening Agricultural Extension and Advisory Systems: Procedures for Assessing, Transforming, and Evaluating Extension Systems*. World Bank.
28. World Bank. (2007). *World Development Report 2008: Agriculture for Development*. World Bank.
29. World Bank. (2012). *Agricultural Innovation Systems: An Investment Sourcebook*. World Bank.
30. World Bank. (2021). *Enabling the Business of Agriculture 2021*. World Bank.