



Plant Archives

Journal homepage: <http://www.plantarchives.org>

DOI Url : <https://doi.org/10.51470/PLANTARCHIVES.2025.v25.no.1.110>

BRIDGING THE GAP: THE ROLE OF AGRICULTURAL EXTENSION IN KNOWLEDGE TRANSFER AND RURAL DEVELOPMENT

Neelam Jaiswal¹, Pallabi Phukan^{2*}, P.A. Ramsem³, Dileep Vyas⁴, Geeta S. Tamgale⁵, Atul Kumar Verma⁶, Gurpreet Singh⁷, Rajni Kumari⁸, Nilay Kantilal Ribadiya⁹ and Jaspreet Singh¹⁰

¹ICAR-National Institute of Biotic Stress Management, Baronda, Raipur, Chhattisgarh, India.

²ICAR-KVK Longleng, Nagaland - 798 625, India.

³ICAR-KVK, Ukhrul, Hungpung, ICAR RC for NEH Region, Manipur Centre, India.

⁴Department of Agricultural Extension Education, C.S.A.U.A. & T., Kanpur, Uttar Pradesh, India.

⁵College of Community Science, University of Agricultural Sciences, Dharwad - 580 005, Karnataka, India.

⁶Department of Agricultural Extension, Prof. Rajendra Singh (Rajju Bhaiya) University, Prayagraj, U.P., India.

⁷Department of Agriculture, Bhai Gurdas Degree College, Sangrur, Punjab, India.

⁸Department of Extension Education & Communication Management, COCS, CCS HAU, Hisar - 125 004, Haryana, India.

⁹Department of Animal Science, College of Agriculture, Junagadh Agricultural University, Junagadh, Gujarat, India.

¹⁰Guru Kashi University Talwandi Sabo, Bathinda - 151 302, Punjab, India.

*Corresponding author E-mail : pallabi.phukan83@gmail.com

(Date of Receiving-19-01-2025; Date of Acceptance-20-03-2025)

ABSTRACT

Agricultural extension services have been major information services relating to feeding knowledge between research institutions and farmers, rural development, and proper sustainable agricultural practices. The paper places emphasis on the historical development, core functions, and current relevance of agricultural extension systems. In that respect, it makes an in-depth assessment of the mechanisms through which knowledge is diffused, capacity built, and technologies transferred, focusing on their impacts on productivity, food security, and rural livelihoods. The paper reviews the challenges faced by extension services in terms of resourcing, divides in digital terms, and policies, and suggests strategies for strengthening them toward agricultural development that is inclusive as well as resilient. Cross-regional case studies are able to bring out successful consulting models that have strong emphases on social engagement, public-private partnerships, and digital tool integration.

Key words : Agricultural Extension, Knowledge Transfer, Rural Development, Technology Dissemination, Farmer Empowerment, Sustainable Agriculture, Capacity Building, Digital Agriculture, Public-Private Partnerships, Community Development.

Introduction

Agricultural extension is thus characterized as the diffusion path for knowledge in rural regions and connects research with the farming community to make better agricultural practice and improve the livelihood of those involved in farming. This, therefore, has to play a role in the rapidly changing world characterized by global climate change, high population and changing market requirements. Scientific and sustainable agricultural practices and technologies that improve productivity and make agricultural production resilient are how agricultural

extension plays its role to bring improved conditions to farmers, especially to those in developing countries, in a period when there is more variability in climatic conditions and increasing pressure on the natural resources that sustain farming output and livelihood. Additionally, agricultural extension supports farmers by introducing innovative farming tools, improved crop varieties, pest management strategies, and soil fertility enhancement techniques that collectively contribute to increased agricultural efficiency and profitability (Kilelu, 2011).

The development of agricultural extension services can be traced back to the early 19th century, when informal knowledge-sharing practices were institutionalized to address the needs of rural farming communities. Over time, governments and international organizations established structured extension systems to promote scientific farming and enhance food production. Historically, extension services have evolved from face-to-face knowledge transfer and printed materials to more dynamic approaches that incorporate digital platforms, audiovisual tools, and mobile applications. The integration of technology into extension services has transformed traditional methods of knowledge dissemination, allowing real-time interaction between extension agents and farmers, even in remote areas. However, despite these advancements, extension services still face numerous challenges, including a lack of adequate funding, limited human resources, and difficulties in reaching smallholder farmers who form the backbone of global agricultural production.

One of the key functions of agricultural extension is to bridge the gap between scientific research and on-the-ground farming practices. Research institutions and universities continuously develop improved agricultural techniques, disease-resistant crop varieties, and advanced irrigation systems, but without effective extension services, these innovations often fail to reach farmers who need them the most. Agricultural extension serves as a conduit for translating complex scientific research into practical, easy-to-implement solutions that enhance productivity and sustainability. Furthermore, extension services empower farmers by equipping them with technical knowledge, decision-making skills and access to market information that enables them to optimize their farming operations. Through continuous training programs, demonstration farms and farmer field schools, extension agents create interactive learning environments where farmers can observe, experiment and adopt best practices suited to their specific agro-ecological conditions (Katzy, 2013).

Rural development is intrinsically linked to the effectiveness of agricultural extension services, as improved agricultural practices lead to better livelihoods, economic stability, and enhanced food security. By equipping farmers with knowledge on sustainable farming methods, efficient water use and soil conservation, extension services contribute to long-term rural development that benefits entire communities. Moreover, extension programs facilitate the formation of farmer cooperatives, self-help groups and local agribusiness networks, fostering social cohesion and economic

resilience. When farmers work collectively, they gain better access to credit facilities, bulk input purchases, and improved bargaining power in markets, which ultimately strengthens their economic position. In addition, extension services promote value-added agricultural activities such as agro-processing, organic farming, and diversified cropping systems, which create new income streams and employment opportunities in rural areas (Ison, 2000).

Despite their significance, agricultural extension services encounter several challenges that hinder their effectiveness. Limited financial resources often constrain the ability of governments to hire and train enough extension personnel to reach all farmers. In many developing countries, the extension-to-farmer ratio remains low, making it difficult for agents to provide personalized guidance and follow-up support. Additionally, gender disparities in extension services remain a pressing issue, as female farmers—who make up a substantial portion of the agricultural workforce—often receive less extension support compared to their male counterparts (Adesina, 2020). Addressing these gender imbalances through targeted training programs, women-led extension initiatives, and inclusive policies is essential for ensuring that agricultural knowledge benefits all segments of the farming population (Ison, 2010). Furthermore, the digital divide presents another challenge, as smallholder farmers in remote areas may have limited access to the internet, smartphones, or digital literacy skills necessary to fully benefit from online extension services (Kirkels, 2010). To overcome these barriers, extension programs must adopt a hybrid approach that combines traditional face-to-face interactions with digital innovations to ensure that information reaches all farmers, regardless of their technological capabilities. To enhance the effectiveness of agricultural extension, various strategies must be implemented. Leveraging digital tools such as mobile-based advisory services, e-learning platforms, and artificial intelligence-driven decision-support systems can revolutionize knowledge transfer. Public-private partnerships play a crucial role in expanding extension services by integrating private sector expertise, financial investment and technological advancements (Hubert, 2004). Collaboration between governments, research institutions, agribusinesses and non-governmental organizations fosters a multi-stakeholder approach that enhances the reach and quality of extension programs. Additionally, participatory extension methods that actively involve farmers in research, decision-making and feedback mechanisms ensure that extension services are demand-driven and contextually relevant. Investing in the

continuous professional development of extension personnel through capacity-building workshops, certifications and exposure visits is also essential to maintain high service standards and adaptability to emerging agricultural challenges (Howells, 2006). Several case studies from around the world illustrate successful extension models that have significantly improved agricultural productivity and rural development. In India, the Krishi Vigyan Kendras (KVKs) have played a vital role in knowledge transfer by providing on-the-ground training, demonstrations and adaptive research tailored to local farming conditions. Kenya's Digital Green Initiative has leveraged video-based learning to enhance farmer engagement and knowledge retention. Brazil's EMATER program showcases how government-led extension services, coupled with technological integration, can drive sustainable agricultural transformation. The Philippines' Rice Competitiveness Enhancement Fund (RCEF) has demonstrated how targeted extension programs focused on a specific crop can optimize production and boost farmers' incomes. These case studies underscore the importance of well-structured, inclusive and technologically advanced extension models in fostering agricultural growth and rural empowerment (Hoppe, 2005).

Historical Evolution of Agricultural Extension

Early Informal Knowledge Exchange and Traditional Practices : Agricultural extension traces its roots to traditional farming communities where knowledge was passed down through generations. Early extension efforts were informal, relying on peer-to-peer learning, apprenticeships and community elders. Farmers experimented with techniques and shared successful practices through word-of-mouth. In many cultures, agricultural wisdom was deeply embedded in folklore, rituals, and customary practices, forming the foundation of sustainable farming before formal extension services were established (Hjorth, 2002).

Institutionalization and the Land-Grant University Model : The 19th century saw the institutionalization of agricultural extension, particularly with the establishment of the Land-Grant University system in the United States through the Morrill Act of 1862. This system linked research institutions with practical farming needs, fostering collaboration between scientists and farmers. The Hatch Act of 1887 further strengthened this by funding agricultural experiment stations to generate region-specific solutions. This model laid the groundwork for global extension systems, emphasizing research-based knowledge dissemination to improve agricultural productivity (Klerkx, 2012).

Global Expansion and Adaptation to Regional needs : Agricultural extension services expanded worldwide, adapting to diverse agroecological conditions and cultural contexts. In India, the introduction of the Training and Visit (T&V) system in the 1970s helped disseminate Green Revolution technologies, improving crop yields. African countries like Kenya integrated extension with cooperative movements, empowering smallholder farmers. Brazil's Embrapa (Brazilian Agricultural Research Corporation) pioneered an innovation-driven approach, making agricultural research a key pillar of extension services. These adaptations reflect the evolving nature of extension to meet localized challenges (Hjorth, 2006).

Modern Trends and Digital Transformation in Agricultural Extension : The 21st century has witnessed a paradigm shift in agricultural extension, driven by digital technologies and participatory approaches. Mobile applications, AI-driven advisory systems, and precision agriculture tools have revolutionized information delivery, making extension more accessible to remote farmers (Alexopoulos, 2009). Interactive platforms, video tutorials, and farmer-led extension programs enhance knowledge exchange beyond traditional government services. Climate-smart agriculture and sustainability-focused extension efforts now emphasize resilience-building, addressing contemporary challenges such as climate change, resource management and food security.

Core Functions of Agricultural Extension

Agricultural extension plays a critical role in enhancing the productivity, sustainability, and resilience of farming systems worldwide. By facilitating knowledge transfer, skill development and innovation adoption, extension services contribute significantly to rural development, food security and environmental conservation. The core functions of agricultural extension can be categorized into four main areas: knowledge dissemination, capacity building, technology transfer, and policy advocacy (Klerkx, 2012). Each of these functions plays a pivotal role in shaping modern agricultural practices and ensuring the well-being of farming communities.

Knowledge Dissemination

One of the fundamental roles of agricultural extension is to bridge the gap between research institutions and farmers by translating complex scientific knowledge into practical, user-friendly information. Knowledge dissemination involves various methods such as field demonstrations, printed materials, digital platforms and farmer-to-farmer interactions. Scientific research conducted in agricultural universities and research centers

produces valuable insights into soil health, pest control, irrigation efficiency and climate adaptation. However, these findings often remain inaccessible to farmers due to technical language barriers. Agricultural extension services play a crucial role in simplifying, contextualizing, and communicating these research outputs in ways that farmers can understand and apply. Through field demonstrations, workshops, mass media, mobile apps, and Farmer Field Schools (FFS), knowledge flows from researchers to farmers, enabling informed decision-making. For example, in India, Krishi Vigyan Kendras (KVKs) serve as knowledge hubs, providing location-specific agricultural knowledge through field visits, advisory leaflets and ICT-based solutions (Hermans, 2013).

Capacity Building

Capacity building in agricultural extension focuses on enhancing farmers' skills, knowledge and decision-making capabilities. It involves continuous learning, exposure to new practices and the development of leadership qualities among farmers. With rapid advancements in agricultural technologies, farmers must adapt to new farming techniques to remain competitive and sustainable (Hekkert, 2011). Capacity-building initiatives equip farmers with the necessary skills to adopt climate-smart agriculture, integrated pest management, and precision farming methods. This is achieved through farmer training programs, demonstration plots, participatory rural appraisal and initiatives that empower women and youth in agriculture. For instance, the Agricultural Sector Development Support Programme (ASDSP) in Kenya has successfully trained thousands of farmers in agribusiness, climate-smart agriculture, and post-harvest handling, improving both income and food security (Hemmati, 2002).

Technology Transfer

Technology transfer is an essential function of agricultural extension, ensuring that innovations reach farmers and are effectively implemented to increase productivity and sustainability. Technological advancements in seed varieties, irrigation systems, pest management and mechanization can significantly improve agricultural output. However, without effective extension services, many of these innovations remain underutilized (Haga, 2005). Extension services bridge this gap by introducing high-yielding, climate-resilient crops, promoting smart irrigation systems, training farmers in the use of digital tools and encouraging sustainable practices like organic farming. Brazil's Embrapa (Brazilian Agricultural Research Corporation) exemplifies this, as

it has developed and transferred innovative agricultural technologies, such as biofortified crops and precision agriculture tools, which have been widely adopted by farmers, enhancing productivity and environmental sustainability (Heemskerk, 2011).

Policy Advocacy

Agricultural extension agents serve as intermediaries between farmers and policymakers, ensuring that farmers' voices are heard in decision-making processes. Policy advocacy involves conveying farmers' concerns regarding land tenure, input subsidies, market access, and climate change adaptation to government agencies and policymakers. Extension agents help shape agricultural policies that align with ground realities and improve rural livelihoods (Faure, 2011). They achieve this by identifying farmer needs through surveys, advising policymakers with evidence-based recommendations, promoting sustainable policies, and monitoring policy impacts. In the European Union, for example, extension services have influenced policies like the Common Agricultural Policy (CAP), which provides subsidies and sustainability incentives to farmers. Extension agents have played a key role in educating farmers on policy changes and ensuring compliance with environmental standards, creating a positive feedback loop between policy and practice (Geels, 2004).

The Role of Extension in Rural Development

Agricultural extension services play a vital role in transforming rural landscapes by empowering farmers, fostering social cohesion and driving economic growth. By linking research with practical farming practices, extension services not only enhance agricultural productivity, but also promote sustainable development and resilience within rural communities. Let's explore how extension contributes to rural development across key dimensions.

Enhancing Productivity : One of the primary contributions of agricultural extension to rural development is the enhancement of productivity. Extension services introduce farmers to high-yielding crop varieties, advanced irrigation systems and integrated pest management techniques. By disseminating research-based knowledge, extension agents help farmers adopt practices that optimize resource use and increase yields. For example, training farmers in precision agriculture enables them to apply fertilizers and water more efficiently, reducing costs while boosting output. In many developing regions, access to improved seeds and climate-resilient crops through extension services has been pivotal in improving harvests and lifting communities out of

poverty (Klerkx, 2010).

Promoting Food Security : Extension services play a crucial role in safeguarding food security by equipping farmers with climate-smart agricultural practices. In the face of unpredictable weather patterns and environmental degradation, extension agents provide guidance on crop diversification, soil conservation, and water management strategies. These practices help farmers maintain stable food production despite external shocks, ensuring a reliable food supply for rural populations. Additionally, extension services often promote post-harvest management techniques, such as proper storage and value addition, reducing food losses and enhancing nutritional availability within communities (Knight, 2013).

Fostering Community Development: Beyond individual farms, extension services contribute to the broader development of rural communities by strengthening social networks and local institutions. Through farmer groups, cooperatives and participatory learning platforms, extension programs facilitate collective problem-solving and knowledge sharing. These community-based approaches not only build social capital but also enhance farmers' bargaining power in markets. For instance, cooperatives can negotiate better prices for inputs and collectively market produce, increasing farm income. Extension services also encourage leadership development and gender inclusivity, empowering women and youth to take active roles in community decision-making and agricultural innovation (Koutsouris, 2003).

Driving Economic Growth and Diversification: Extension services stimulate rural economies by promoting agribusiness development and market integration. By providing training on value chain development, entrepreneurship, and financial literacy, extension agents help farmers move beyond subsistence farming to commercial agriculture. This shift not only increases household income, but also creates employment opportunities in related sectors, such as agro-processing and rural transport. In regions where extension services have supported diversification into high-value crops or livestock enterprises, rural economies have experienced significant growth, reducing migration to urban areas and sustaining local development (Landry, 2013).

Participatory approaches in Extension Services

Incorporating local knowledge and involving farmers in the decision-making process is crucial for the success and sustainability of agricultural extension programs. Participatory approaches ensure that farmers are not just passive recipients of information but active contributors to knowledge creation and innovation (Allahyari, 2009).

Methods like Participatory Rural Appraisal (PRA) and Farmer Field Schools (FFS) have proven to be highly effective in empowering farmers to experiment, learn, and share knowledge collaboratively, leading to more locally adapted and sustainable farming practices.

Participatory Rural Appraisal (PRA): PRA is a set of participatory techniques that enable farmers and extension agents to jointly analyze agricultural challenges and design context-specific solutions. Through tools like resource mapping, seasonal calendars, and problem-ranking exercises, farmers can articulate their needs, identify constraints, and prioritize interventions. This bottom-up approach not only validates local knowledge but also fosters a sense of ownership over extension activities, increasing the likelihood of successful implementation. For instance, in many African villages, PRA has helped communities develop sustainable water management plans by integrating scientific knowledge with traditional irrigation practices (Altalb, 2015).

Farmer Field Schools (FFS) : FFS is a group-based learning approach where farmers meet regularly to observe, discuss, and experiment in real-world farming situations. These schools create a platform for experiential learning, where farmers test new techniques, monitor results and refine practices through collective decision-making. Extension agents act as facilitators rather than instructors, guiding discussions and helping farmers interpret their findings. FFS has been widely adopted for integrated pest management, where farmers learn to identify beneficial insects and reduce pesticide use, leading to safer, more sustainable crop production (Fadeeva, 2005).

Participatory approaches enhance the relevance and effectiveness of extension services in several ways. They build farmers' confidence and analytical skills, enabling them to adapt to evolving agricultural challenges. These approaches also strengthen social capital by fostering collaboration and knowledge exchange within communities. Moreover, they ensure that extension interventions are culturally appropriate and aligned with local realities, reducing resistance to change and accelerating technology adoption. In Southeast Asia, FFS programs for rice farmers have successfully reduced pesticide use and increased yields by promoting ecological literacy and group experimentation. Farmers who participated in these programs became local resource persons, spreading knowledge to neighbouring communities and amplifying the impact of extension efforts (Auvine, 2002).

Digital Transformation in Agricultural Extension

The advent of information and communication technologies (ICTs) has revolutionized agricultural extension services, breaking down barriers to knowledge and connecting farmers with timely, relevant information. Digital tools — including mobile apps, SMS alerts, online platforms, and social media channels — enable real-time information dissemination, empowering farmers to make informed decisions, optimize resource use, and enhance productivity. This digital shift has been particularly transformative in remote and underserved areas, bridging the gap between research institutions, extension agents, and farming communities (Drennon, 2006).

Mobile technology has become a cornerstone of modern extension services, providing farmers with instant access to critical information. Mobile apps offer features like crop calendars, pest identification tools, and soil health recommendations, while SMS alerts deliver weather forecasts, market prices and disease outbreak warnings directly to farmers' phones. For example, India's "Kisan Suvidha" app provides real-time weather updates, market trends, and expert advice, enabling farmers to plan their activities more effectively. Similarly, in Kenya, the "iShamba" platform sends personalized SMS alerts to farmers, offering insights on planting times, fertilizer application, and livestock health (EU-SCAR, 2012).

Digital platforms have emerged as virtual knowledge hubs, consolidating research findings, training materials, and best practices into accessible formats. Farmers can join online communities, attend webinars, and participate in virtual training sessions to learn from experts and peers alike. Platforms like "Plant Village" use artificial intelligence to diagnose crop diseases through uploaded images, while services like "AGMARKNET" provide real-time market intelligence, helping farmers make strategic selling decisions. These platforms democratize access to agricultural knowledge, reducing dependence on physical extension visits and empowering farmers with self-learning opportunities (Leal, 2007).

Social media has transformed agricultural extension into a two-way conversation, fostering peer-to-peer knowledge sharing and collective problem-solving. Platforms like Facebook, WhatsApp and YouTube host farmer groups, where participants exchange tips, troubleshoot challenges, and showcase innovations. Extension agents and agronomists use social media to broadcast live demonstrations, answer farmer queries, and share educational videos, expanding their outreach beyond geographical constraints. For instance, in Southeast Asia, YouTube channels featuring organic

farming tutorials and soil regeneration techniques have garnered millions of views, illustrating the immense potential of social media for scaling knowledge dissemination (LEARN Group, 2000).

The future of agricultural extension lies in the integration of cutting-edge technologies like artificial intelligence, big data analytics and satellite imagery. AI-powered chatbots can provide farmers with instant, customized advice, while satellite-based tools can offer precision agriculture insights on soil moisture, crop health, and yield predictions. Furthermore, blockchain technology could enhance supply chain transparency and facilitate direct farmer-to-consumer transactions, boosting profitability and trust. As internet connectivity and smartphone penetration continue to grow globally, digital extension services will become even more inclusive and impactful, accelerating agricultural transformation worldwide (Malhan and Rao, 2007).

Gender and Youth Inclusion in Extension

Gender-responsive and youth-focused extension services are essential for fostering equitable and inclusive rural development. Women and young people play pivotal roles in agriculture, yet they often face systemic barriers to accessing resources, training and decision-making platforms. Tailoring extension programs to address their unique needs — such as providing flexible training schedules for women with caregiving responsibilities or integrating digital tools that resonate with tech-savvy youth — can enhance their participation and leadership in agricultural innovation (Marikyan, 2023). Programs that promote women-led cooperatives, support youth agripreneurship and encourage intergenerational knowledge exchange not only strengthen local food systems but also inject vitality and resilience into rural economies. By actively involving women and youth in research trials, policy dialogues and value chain development, extension services can unlock diverse perspectives, catalyze innovation and build a more sustainable agricultural future. Prioritizing gender and youth inclusion isn't just a matter of fairness — it's a strategic imperative for global food security and rural prosperity (Moschitz, 2015).

Public-Private Partnerships in Extension

Collaborations between government agencies, private agribusinesses, research institutions and non-governmental organizations (NGOs) enhance the reach, effectiveness, and sustainability of agricultural extension services. Public-private partnerships (PPPs) enable shared resource mobilization, co-funding initiatives, and the development of innovative, context-specific solutions

to agricultural challenges. These partnerships leverage the strengths of each stakeholder, creating synergies that improve knowledge dissemination, technology adoption, and market linkages for farmers. Below are five key ways PPPs contribute to the advancement of extension services:

- **Expanding Access to Knowledge and Technology :** PPPs bridge the gap between research institutions and farmers by facilitating the dissemination of cutting-edge agricultural technologies. Private companies contribute expertise in seed development, precision agriculture, and digital tools, while government and NGO partners ensure that these innovations reach smallholder farmers in an accessible and affordable manner. For example, partnerships between agribusinesses and public extension agencies have led to the widespread adoption of drought-resistant crop varieties and climate-smart farming techniques (Dirimanova and Radev, 2017).
- **Co-Funding and Infrastructure Development :** Financial constraints often limit the effectiveness of public extension programs, but PPPs help mitigate this by pooling resources from various stakeholders. Private companies may co-fund training programs, demonstration farms and ICT-based extension platforms, while governments provide policy support and regulatory frameworks. This collaborative funding approach ensures long-term sustainability and enhances the scalability of extension interventions, reaching a broader audience of farmers (Dredge, 2006).
- **Enhancing Farmer Market Linkages :** PPPs facilitate better integration of farmers into value chains by creating direct linkages with markets, reducing reliance on intermediaries and increasing profitability. Private agribusinesses provide farmers with contracts, fair pricing structures, and quality standards, while extension agents train them on post-harvest handling and certification processes. This collaboration empowers farmers with market intelligence, improving their competitiveness and income stability (Nerbonne, 2003).
- **Capacity Building and Skill Development :** Through joint training initiatives, PPPs strengthen the technical knowledge and business skills of farmers. Private companies and research institutions contribute expertise in sustainable agriculture, mechanization, and financial literacy, while public extension services ensure that this knowledge is tailored to local needs.

Programs that involve hands-on training, digital learning platforms and mentorship for youth and women in agriculture create long-term impacts on rural livelihoods (Bakici, 2023).

- **Strengthening Resilience and Sustainability :** PPPs support resilience-building strategies by promoting sustainable farming practices, climate adaptation measures and risk management solutions. Insurance companies, financial institutions and agricultural cooperatives collaborate with extension services to provide weather-based insurance, credit access, and climate advisory services. These initiatives help farmers withstand economic shocks, environmental stressors, and market fluctuations, securing their livelihoods for the future (Oliver, 2003).

Policy Frameworks and Institutional Support

Strong policy frameworks and institutional backing are essential for the sustainability and effectiveness of agricultural extension systems. Well-defined policies ensure that extension services are adequately funded, strategically planned, and efficiently implemented to meet the diverse needs of farmers (Botes, 2013). Governments, in collaboration with research institutions, private sector actors, and non-governmental organizations, play a crucial role in shaping these policies. Below are key ways in which policy frameworks and institutional support contribute to strengthening agricultural extension:

- **Adequate Budget Allocation and Funding Mechanisms:** A well-functioning extension system requires sustained financial investment to support personnel training, infrastructure development and digital innovations. Governments must allocate sufficient budgets for extension services and explore diverse funding mechanisms, including public-private partnerships, donor support and farmer cooperatives (Botes, 2002).
- **Establishing Clear Mandates and Governance Structures:** A strong institutional framework with well-defined roles and responsibilities enhances coordination and efficiency in extension services. Decentralized extension systems, where responsibilities are shared between national and local governments, can improve responsiveness to region-specific agricultural needs (Parker, 2014).
- **Promoting Inter-Sectoral Coordination:** Agricultural extension intersects with education, finance, infrastructure and environmental sectors. Effective policy frameworks promote

Table 1 :

Country	Program/Initiative	Key Features	Impact
India	Krishi Vigyan Kendras (KVKs)	A network of decentralized agricultural extension centers providing location-specific training, demonstrations, and advisory services.	Improved access to knowledge, enhanced farm productivity, and increased adoption of modern agricultural practices.
Kenya	Digital Green Initiative	Uses video-based learning and participatory approaches to educate farmers on best practices in agriculture, health, and livelihoods.	Strengthened farmer-to-farmer knowledge sharing, increased adoption of sustainable farming techniques.
Brazil	EMATER Program	An integrated rural development strategy combining agricultural extension, environmental management and socio-economic support.	Enhanced rural livelihoods, improved sustainability, and strengthened community engagement in agriculture.
Philippines	Rice Competitiveness Enhancement Fund (RCEF)	Supports rice farmers through training programs, mechanization, seed distribution, and market access initiatives.	Increased rice productivity, reduced production costs, and improved farmer incomes.
United States	Land-Grant University System	Public universities providing research-based agricultural education and extension services to farmers.	Advanced scientific farming methods, improved rural economies, and widespread adoption of agricultural innovations.
China	Agricultural Technology Extension Centers	Government-led initiative to disseminate modern agricultural technologies, fertilizers, and best practices to farmers.	Increased agricultural productivity, enhanced rural incomes, and food security improvements.
Bangladesh	Integrated Pest Management (IPM) Program	Educates farmers on non-chemical pest control methods, reducing dependence on pesticides and promoting sustainable farming.	Reduced pesticide use, improved environmental health, and enhanced crop yields.
Ethiopia	Farmer Training Centers (FTCs)	Community-based extension hubs offering training on climate-smart agriculture, livestock management and soil conservation.	Increased resilience to climate change, improved food security and strengthened community cooperation.
Vietnam	Sustainable Rice Platform (SRP)	Encourages environmentally friendly rice production practices while enhancing farmer profitability.	Reduced environmental impact, increased rice quality, and improved market access for smallholders.
Ghana	Planting for Food and Jobs (PFJ)	Government initiative providing subsidized fertilizers, improved seeds, and extension support to farmers.	Increased agricultural productivity, boosted food self-sufficiency, and improved farmer incomes.
Uganda	National Agricultural Advisory Services (NAADS)	Public-private partnership offering technical support, agribusiness training, and market linkages for smallholder farmers.	Improved access to markets, increased adoption of improved farming techniques, and higher incomes for rural farmers.

Table 1 continued...

Table 1 continued...

Mexico	MasAgro Program	A research-backed initiative promoting conservation agriculture, soil health management, and improved maize varieties.	Increased maize productivity, enhanced soil fertility, and reduced production costs for farmers.
Indonesia	Farmer Field Schools (FFS)	Interactive learning approach where farmers test and implement best practices under guided supervision.	Enhanced knowledge-sharing, increased farmer independence, and improved agricultural productivity.
Tanzania	Building Rural Incomes through Entrepreneurship (BRIE)	Focuses on agribusiness training, cooperative development and financial literacy for smallholder farmers.	Strengthened rural economies, improved market access, and increased financial stability for farmers.
Senegal	AgriTech Mobile Extension Services	Provides farmers with real-time agricultural advice, weather forecasts, and market prices via mobile platforms.	Improved decision-making, reduced losses due to climate variability, and increased agricultural efficiency.

collaboration between ministries of agriculture, rural development, science and technology, and trade, enhancing the overall impact on farmers' livelihoods (Ray, 2017).

- **Capacity Building and Professional Development :** Continuous training and capacity-building initiatives for extension agents and institutions improve service delivery. Governments should invest in education and skill development programs, equipping extension personnel with knowledge in modern farming techniques, digital tools and participatory approaches (Boari, 2014).
- **Strengthening Digital and ICT-Enabled Extension Services:** Policies that support the integration of digital tools into extension services can significantly expand outreach and efficiency. Investments in rural connectivity and digital literacy programs ensure that farmers can fully utilize technological advancements (Rivera, 2002).
- **Ensuring Inclusivity and Equity in Extension Services :** Agricultural policies should emphasize gender and youth inclusion, ensuring that extension services cater to the needs of diverse farming communities. Special initiatives targeting women farmers, young agripreneurs and marginalized groups help bridge knowledge gaps and promote equitable access to resources.
- **Monitoring, Evaluation and Impact Assessment :** A robust monitoring and evaluation (M&E) framework helps track the

effectiveness of extension services and informs policy adjustments. Governments should establish mechanisms for collecting and analyzing data on farmer engagement, adoption rates of new technologies and productivity improvements (Robinson, 2002).

Monitoring and Evaluation of Extension Programs

Regular assessment of extension initiatives through impact evaluations, feedback loops and performance indicators is crucial for enhancing effectiveness and ensuring accountability. Monitoring and evaluation (M&E) frameworks enable extension services to measure progress, identify challenges and refine strategies based on real-time data (Bawden, 2005). By collecting quantitative and qualitative information, extension agencies can track farmer adoption rates, changes in productivity, and improvements in livelihoods. Feedback mechanisms, such as farmer consultations and participatory evaluations, ensure that programs remain responsive to the needs of the target communities (Taylor and Bhasme, 2018). Additionally, performance indicators help optimize resource allocation by identifying the most effective extension methods, whether through field demonstrations, digital advisory services, or farmer training workshops. Governments, research institutions, and funding agencies rely on M&E outcomes to justify investments in extension, promote data-driven decision-making, and scale successful interventions. Strengthening monitoring and evaluation systems fosters transparency, enhances learning and contributes to the continuous improvement of agricultural extension services, ultimately leading to greater impact on rural development and food security (Birner, 2009).

Conclusion

Agricultural extension remains a cornerstone of rural development, playing a critical role in addressing the challenges of modern agriculture. As climate change, population growth and resource constraints continue to reshape the agricultural landscape, strengthening extension systems becomes increasingly vital. The future of extension services lies in leveraging innovative technologies such as digital platforms, artificial intelligence and data-driven advisory systems to enhance outreach and efficiency. Collaborative frameworks involving public-private partnerships, research institutions and farmer organizations will be key to ensuring inclusive, demand-driven and scalable extension models. Furthermore, strong policy support, adequate funding and capacity-building initiatives are necessary to sustain and expand extension efforts. By fostering knowledge exchange, promoting sustainable farming practices and empowering farmers with the tools needed for adaptation and resilience, agricultural extension will continue to drive transformation in the sector. Ensuring that extension services remain dynamic, inclusive and responsive to emerging challenges will be instrumental in achieving long-term food security, rural prosperity and global agricultural sustainability.

References

- Adesina, A.O. and Ocholla D.N. (2020). The SECI Model in Knowledge Management Practices: Past, Present and Future. *Mousaion: South Afr. J. Inform. Stud.*, **37**(3), 1–34.
- Alexopoulos, G., Koutsouris A. and Tzouramani E. (2009). The Financing of Extension Services: a Survey Among Rural Youth in Greece. *The J. Agricult. Educ. Ext.*, **15**, 175–188.
- Allahyari, M., Chizari M. and Mirdamadi S. (2009). Extension-Education Methods to Facilitate Learning in Sustainable Agriculture. *J. Agricult. Soc. Sci.*, **5**, 27–30.
- Altalb, A.A.T., Filipek T. and Skowron P. (2015). The Role of Agricultural Extension in the Transfer and Adoption of Agricultural Technologies. *Asian J. Agricult. Food Sci.*, **3**(5), 500–507.
- Auvine, B., Densmore B., Extrom M., Poole S. and Shanklin M. (2002). What Do We Mean by Facilitation. *Group Facilitation: A Research and Applications J.*, **4**, 53–55.
- Bakici, T., Almirall E. and Wareham J. (2013). The Role of Public Open Innovation Intermediaries in Local Government and the Public Sector. *Technology Analysis & Strategic Management*, **25**, 311–327.
- Bawden, R. (2005). Systemic Development at Hawkesbury: Some Personal Lessons from Experience. *Syst. Res. Behav. Sci.*, **22**, 151–164.
- Birner, R., Davis K., Pender J., Nkonya E., Anandajayasekaram P., Ekboir J., Mbabu A., Spielman D.J., Horna D., Benin S. and Cohen M. (2009). From Best Practice to Best Fit: A Framework for Designing and Analyzing Pluralistic Agricultural Advisory Services Worldwide. *The J. Agricult. Educ. Ext.*, **15**, 341–355.
- Boari, C. and Riboldazzi F. (2014). How Knowledge Brokers Emerge and Evolve: The Role of Actors' Behaviour. *Research Policy*, **43**, 683–695.
- Botes, L. and van Rensburg D. (2000). Community Participation in Development: Nine Plagues and twelve commandments. *Community Development J.*, **35**, 41–58.
- Brunori, G., Barjolle D., Dockes A.C., Helmle S., Ingram J., Klerkx L., Moschitz H., Nemes G. and Tisenkopfs T. (2013). CAP Reform and Innovation: The Role of Learning and Innovation Networks. *EuroChoices*, **12**, 27–33.
- Burt, R.S. (2005). *Brokerage and Closure*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Collinson, M. (ed). (2000). *A History of Farming Systems Research*. Wallingford: FAO, IFSA and CABI.
- Cooke, B. and Kothari U. (eds). (2001). *Participation: The New Tyranny?* London: Zed-s.
- Corsaro, D., Cantù C. and Tunisini A. (2012). Actors' Heterogeneity in Innovation Networks. *Industrial Marketing Management*, **41**, 780–789.
- Cristóvão, A., Koutsouris A. and Kügler M. (2012). Extension Systems and Change Facilitation for Agricultural and Rural Development. In: *Farming Systems Research into the 21st Century: The New Dynamic*. Darnhofer, I., Gibbon D., and Dedieu B. (eds.). 201–227. Dordrecht: Springer Science.
- Cristóvão, A., Ferrao P., Madeira R., Tibério M.L., Rainho M.J. and Teixeira M.S. (2008). Circles and Communities, Sharing Practices and Learning: Looking at Old and New Extension Education Approaches. In: *Empowerment of Rural Actors: A Renewal of Farming Systems Perspectives*. Didieu, B. and Zasser-Bedoya S. (ed). 797–807. Montpellier: INRA-SAD.
- Dalal-Clayton, B. and Bass S. (2002). *Sustainable Development Strategies*. London: Earthscan (OECD and UNDP).
- Darnhofer, I., Gibbon D. and Dedieu B. (eds) (2012). *Farming systems research into the 21st century: The new dynamic*. Dordrecht: Springer.
- Devaux, A., Andrade-Piedra J., Horton D., Ordinola M., Thiele G., Thomann A. and Velasco C. (2010). *Brokering Innovation for Sustainable Development: The Papa Andina Case*. ILAC Working Paper 12. Rome: Institutional Learning and Change (ILAC) Initiative.
- Dhanaraj, C. and Parkhe A. (2006). Orchestrating Innovation Networks. *The Acad. Manage. Rev.*, **31**, 659–669.
- Dirimanova, V. and Radev T. (2017). The Knowledge Transfer in the Agricultural Sector in the South-Central Region of Bulgaria. *Bulgarian J. Agricult. Sci.*, **23** (3), 505–511.
- Dredge, D. (2006). Policy Networks and the Local Organisation of Tourism. *Tourism Management*, **27**, 269–280.
- Drennon, C. and Cervero R. (2002). The Politics of Facilitation in Practitioner Inquiry Groups. *Adult Education Quarterly*, **52**, 193–209.
- EU-SCAR (2012). *Agricultural Knowledge and Innovation Systems in Transition - a reflection paper*. Brussels: Standing Committee on Agricultural Research (SCAR), Collaborative Working Group AKIS.

- Fadeeva, Z. (2005). Translation of Sustainability Ideas in Tourism Networks: Some Roles of Cross-Sectoral Networks in Change Towards Sustainable Development. *J. Cleaner Prod.*, **13**, 175–189.
- Faure, G., Rebuffel P. and Violas D. (2011). Systemic Evaluation of Advisory Services to Family Farms in West Africa. *The J. Agricult. Educ. Ext.*, **17**, 325–339.
- Geels, F. (2004). From Sectoral Systems of Innovation to Socio-Technical Systems. Insights about Dynamics and Change from Sociology and Institutional Theory. *Research Policy*, **33**, 897–920.
- Haga, T. (2005). Action Research and Innovation in Networks, Dilemmas and Challenges: Two Cases. *Artificial Intelligence & Society*, **19**, 362–383.
- Harvey, G., Loftus-Hills A., Rycroft-Malone J., Titchen A., Kitson A., McCormack B. and Seers K. (2002). Getting Evidence into Practice: The Role and Function of Facilitation. *J. Advanced Nursing*, **37**, 577–588.
- Heemskerk, W., Klerkx L. and Sitima J. (2011). Brokering Innovation. In: *Putting Heads Together: Agricultural Innovation Platforms in Practice*. Nederlof, S., Wongtschowski M. and van der Lee F. (eds.), 43–54. Amsterdam: KIT Publishers.
- Hekkert, M.P., Suurs R.A.A., Negro S.O., Kuhlmann S. and Smits R.E.H.M. (2007). Functions of Innovation Systems: A new approach for Analysing Technological Change. *Technological Forecasting and Social Change*, **74**, 413–432.
- Hemmati, M. (2002). *Multi-stakeholder Processes for Governance and Sustainability - Beyond Deadlock and Conflict*. London: Earthscan.
- Hermans, F., Stuiver M., Beers P.J. and Kok K. (2013). The Distribution of Roles and Functions for Upscaling and Outscaling Innovations in Agricultural Innovation Systems. *Agricultural Systems*, **115**, 117–128.
- Hjorth, P. and Bagheri A. (2006). Navigating Towards Sustainable Development: A System Dynamics Approach. *Futures*, **38**, 74–92.
- Hogan, C. (2002). *Understanding Facilitation: Theory and Practice*. London: Kogan Page Limited.
- Hoppe, H., and Ozdenoren E. (2005). Intermediation in Innovation. *Int. J. Indust. Org.*, **23**, 483–503.
- Howells, J. (2006). Intermediation and the Role of Intermediaries in Innovation. *Research Policy*, **35**, 715–728.
- Hubert, B., Ison R. and Röling N. (2000). The “Problematic” with Respect to Industrialised Country Agricultures. In: *Cow Up a Tree, Knowing and Learning for Change in Agriculture – Case Studies from Industrialised Countries*. ed. LEARN Group, 13–30. Paris: INRA.
- Ison, R. (2010). *Systems Practice: How to Act in a Climate-Change World*. London: Springer and The Open University.
- Ison, R. and Russel D. (eds). (2000). *Agricultural Extension and Rural Development: Breaking Out of Traditions*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Katzky, B., Turgut E., Holzmann T. and Sailer K. (2013). Innovation Intermediaries: A Process View on Open Innovation Coordination. *Technol. Anal. & Strategic Manage.*, **25**, 295–309.
- Keen, M., Brown V. and Dyball R. (2005). Social Learning: A New Approach to Environmental Management. In: *Social Learning in Environmental Management – Towards a Sustainable Future*. Keen, M., Brown V. and Dyball R. (eds.), 3–21. London: Earthscan.
- Kilelu, K., Klerkx L., Leeuwis C. and Hall A. (2011). *Beyond Knowledge Brokerage: An Exploratory Study of Innovation Intermediaries in an Evolving Smallholder agricultural System in Kenya*. RIU Discussion Paper 13. London: DFID.
- Kirkels, Y. and Duysters G. (2010). Brokerage in SME Networks. *Research Policy*, **39**, 375–385.
- Klerkx, L. and Leeuwis C. (2008a). Balancing Multiple Interests: Embedding Innovation Intermediation in the Agricultural Knowledge Infrastructure. *Technovation*, **28**, 364–378.
- Klerkx, L. and Gildemacher P. (2012). The Role of Innovation Brokers in Agricultural Innovation Systems. In: *Agricultural Innovation systems: An investment source*. 221–230. Washington: The World Bank.
- Klerkx, L., Van Mierlo B. and Leeuwis C. (2012). Evolution of System Approaches to Agricultural Innovations: Concepts, Analysis and Interventions. In: *Farming Systems Research into the 21st Century: The New Dynamic*. Darnhofer, I., Gibbon D. and Dedieu B. (eds.), 457–483. Dordrecht: Springer Science.
- Klerkx, L., Aarts N. and Leeuwis C. (2010). Adaptive Management in Agricultural Innovation Systems: The Interactions between Innovation Networks and their Environment. *Agricultural Systems*, **103**, 390–400.
- Knight, C. and Lyall C. (2013). Knowledge Brokers: the Role of Intermediaries in Producing Research Impact. *Evidence & Policy*, **9**, 309–316.
- Koutsouris, A. (2008). Higher Education Facing Sustainability: The Case of Agronomy. *Int. J. Learning*, **15**, 269–276.
- Koutsouris, A. and Papadopoulos D. (2003). What is ‘Social’ about Social Learning? *The J. Agricult. Educ. Ext.*, **9**, 75–82.
- Landry, R., Amara N., Cloutier J.S. and Halilem N. (2013). Technology Transfer Organizations: Services and Business Models. *Technovation*, **33**, 431–449.
- Leal, P. (2007). Participation: The Ascendancy of a Buzzword in the neo-Liberal Era. *Development in Practice*, **17**, 539–548.
- LEARN Group (2000). *Cow up a Tree: Learning and Knowing Processes for Change in Agriculture; Case Studies from Industrialised Countries*. Paris: INRA Editions.
- Leeuwis, C. (2000). Learning to be Sustainable. *The J. Agricult. Educ. Ext.*, **7**, 79–92.
- Leeuwis, C. and Pyburn R. (eds.) (2002). *Wheelbarrows full of Frogs – Social Learning in Rural Resource Management: International Research and Reflections*. Assen: Van Gorcum.
- Ljung, M. and Emmelin A. (2000). The Development of Farmers; Dialogue: The Decision Making Process behind a Facilitated Learning Process in Swedish Agriculture. In: *European Farming and Rural Systems Research and Extension into the Next Millennium: Environmental, Agricultural and Socio-economic Issues*. Koutsouris, A. and Omodei-Zorini L. (eds.), 336–357. Athens: Papazisis Editions.

- Malhan, I.V. and Rao S. (2007). Agricultural Knowledge Transfer in India: a study of Prevailing Communication Channels. *Library Philosophy and Practice* (e-journal). 110. Available: <https://digitalcommons.unl.edu/libphilprac/110>.
- Marikyan, D. and Papagiannidis S. (2023). Technology Acceptance Model: A review. In: Papagiannidis S. (ed.), *TheoryHub Book*. Available at <http://open.ncl.ac.uk/> ISBN: 9781739604400.
- Moschitz, H., Brunori G., Roep D. and Tisenkofs T. (guest eds). (2015). Learning and Innovation Networks for Sustainable Agriculture: Processes of Co-Evolution, Joint Reflection and Facilitation. *J. Agricult. Educ. Ext.*, **21**, 1–89.
- Nederlof, S., Wongtschowski M. and van der Lee F. (eds.) (2011). *Putting Heads Together: Agricultural Innovation Platforms in Practice*. Amsterdam: KIT Publishers.
- Nerbonne, J.F. and Lentz R. (2003). Rooted in Grass: Challenging Patterns of Knowledge Exchange as a Means of Fostering Social Change in a Southeast Minnesota Farm Community. *Agriculture and Human Values*, **20**, 65–78.
- Oliver, P. and Myers J. (2003). *Networks, Diffusion, and Cycles of Collective Action*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Packham, R. and Sriskandarajah N. (2005). Systemic Action Research for Postgraduate Education in Agriculture and Rural Development. *Syst. Res. Behav. Sci.*, **22**, 119–130.
- Parker, R. and Hine D. (2014). The Role of Knowledge Intermediaries in Developing Firm Learning Capabilities. *European Planning Studies*, **22**, 1048–1061.
- Quaghebeur, K., Masschelein J. and Nguyen H. (2004). Paradox of Participation: Giving or Taking Part? *J. Commun. Appl. Soc. Psychol.*, **14**, 154–165.
- Ray, G.L. (2017). *Extension Communication and Management*. Kalyani Publishers.
- Rivera, W. and Qamar M.K. (2013). *Agricultural Extension, Rural Development and the Food Security Challenge*. Rome: FAO.
- Rivera, W. and Zijp W. (2002). *Contracting for Agricultural Extension. International Case Studies and Emerging Practices*. Washington D.C: CABI Publishing.
- Rivera, W.M., Qamar M.K. and Mwandemere H.K. (2005). *Enhancing Coordination Among AKIS/RD Actors: An Analytical And Comparative Review of Country Studies on Agricultural Knowledge and Information Systems for Rural Development (AKIS/RD)*. Rome: FAO.
- Robinson, L. (2002). Participatory Rural Appraisal: A brief introduction. *Group Facilitation: A Res. Applic. J.*, **4**, 45–52.
- Rogers, E.M. (2003). *Diffusion of Innovations*. Fifth edition. New York, London, Toronto, Sydney.
- Röling, N. (2002). Beyond the Aggregation of Individual Preferences. Moving from Multiple to Distributed Cognition in Resource Dilemmas. In: *Wheelbarrows full of Frogs – Social Learning in Rural Resource Management: International Research and Reflections*. Leeuwis, C. and Pyburn R. (ed). 25–47. Assen: Van Gorcum.
- Roxas, S.A., Piroli G. and Sorrentino M. (2011). Efficiency and Evaluation Analysis of a Network of Technology Transfer Brokers. *Technol. Anal. Strat. Manage.*, **23**, 7–24.
- Sagar, M. (2018). *Fundamentals of Agricultural Extension Education*. Kalyani Publishers
- Savage, G. and Hilton C. (2001). A Critical View of Facilitating Labor-Management Collaboration. *Group Facilitation: A Res. Applic. J.*, **3**, 47–55.
- SECI Model (Nonaka & Takeuchi) SECI Model of Knowledge Dimensions - Toolshero.
- Shea, B. (2011). A Decade of Knowledge Translation Research - What has Changed? *J. Clin. Epidemiol.*, **64**, 3–5.
- SLIM (2004). Facilitation in policy processes: developing new professional skills. *Policy Briefing*, no. 4, <http://slim.open.ac.uk>.
- Sriskandarajah, N., Cerf M. and Noe E. (2006). Learning as a Process: Understanding One's Role in the New Learning Demands of Multifunctional Land Use Systems, Working with different Actors, Tools and Scales. In: *Changing European Farming Systems for a Better Future: New Visions for Rural Areas*. Langeveld, H. and Röling N eds.). 27–28. Wageningen: Wageningen Academic Press.
- Stetler, C.B., Legro M.W., Rycroft-Malone J., Bowman C., Curran G., Guihan M., Hagedorn H., Pineros S. and Wallace C.M. (2006). Role of “External Facilitation” in Implementation of Research Findings: A Qualitative Evaluation of Facilitation Experiences in the Veterans Health Administration. *Implementation Science*. <https://doi.org/10.1186/1748-5908-1-23>.
- Suvinen, N., Konttinen J. and Nieminen M. (2010). How Necessary are Intermediary Organizations in the Commercialization of Research? *European Planning Studies*, **18**, 1365–1389.
- Swaans, K., Boogaard B., Bendapudi R., Taye H., Hendrickx S. and Klerkx L. (2014). Operationalizing Inclusive Innovation: Lessons from Innovation Platforms in Livestock Value Chains in India and Mozambique. *Innovation and Development*, **4**, 239–257.
- Taylor, M. and Bhasme S. (2018). Model Farmers, Extension Networks and the Politics of Agricultural Knowledge Transfer. *J. Rural Studies*, 1-26.
- Theodorakopoulos, N., Bennett D. and Preciado D.J.S. (2014). Intermediation for Technology Diffusion and User Innovation in a Developing Rural Economy: A Social Learning Perspective. *Entrepreneurship & Regional Development: An Int. J.*, **26**, 645–662.
- Van Lente, H., Hekkert M., Smits R. and Van Waveren B. (2003). Roles of Systemic Intermediaries in Transition Processes. *Int. J. Innov. Manage.*, **7**, 1–33.
- Wals, A. (ed). (2007). *Social Learning Towards a Sustainable World*. Wageningen: Wageningen Academic Publishers.
- Winch, G. and Courtney R. (2007). The Organisation of Innovation Brokers: An International Review. *Technol. Anal. Strategic Manage.*, **19**, 747–763.
- World Bank (2006). *Enhancing Agricultural Innovation: How to go Beyond the Strengthening of Research Systems*. Washington DC: The World Bank.
- Ye, J. and Kankanhalli A. (2013). Exploring Innovation Through Open Networks: A Review and Initial research Questions. *IIMB Manage. Rev.*, **25**, 69–82.