Perception of the farmers regarding KisanMela organized at CCS Haryana Agricultural University, Hisar, Haryana, India

Abstract

This study investigated the impact and effectiveness of the Haryana Agricultural University (HAU) Kisan Mela as a platform for farmers' engagement and knowledge exchange. Using an ex-post facto research design, data were collected from 30 farmers who attended the Kisan Mela in March 2024. The study focused on various socio-economic factors, farmers' perceptions and satisfaction levels, participation in extension activities, and problems faced during the event. The findings revealed a diverse participation of farmers across different age groups, family structures, educational backgrounds, and occupations. The majority of participants reported positive experiences and high satisfaction levels with the services, information quality, and infrastructure provided at the Mela. While minimal problems were reported, they highlight areas for improvement to enhance farmers' experiences further. Overall, the study concludes that the HAU Kisan Mela plays a crucial role in disseminating agricultural information, fostering innovation, and facilitating community networking among farmers, contributing significantly to the advancement of agriculture in the region.

Keywords: farmers, kisan mela, perception, satisfaction

Introduction

Krishi Melas serve as a crucial method for widespread agricultural extension education, offering an extensive showcase of improved farming technologies and inputs for the benefit of farmers. This integrated approach employs individual, group, and mass contact methods, incorporating audio-visual aids for effective communication. Both public and private entities collaborate annually to organize these events, investing substantial funds to transfer agricultural technologies to the target audience.Various public and private agencies organize these programs annually, investing significant funds to transfer technologies to the target audience (Manjula and Sheikh, 2010).

The Melas feature a variety of engaging activities to motivate participants, including field demonstrations, agro-industrial exhibitions, and displays of agricultural implements by

commercial firms, produce competitions, seed sales, film screenings, question-answer sessions, and rural life museums. Multiple functional committees are established to ensure the successful execution of these events, with active participation from all university departments (Sekhon, 1995).The active participation of university colleges is integral to the success of these fairs. The College of Agriculture contributes significantly by providing seeds, plants, agricultural demonstrations, quality literature, expert advice at stalls, and interactive sessions. The College of Basic Science focuses on disseminating information about field rodents, insects, and the economic aspects of agriculture. The College of Agricultural Engineering & Technology educates visitors on the safe and efficient use of agricultural machinery, with practical demonstrations.

Departments within the College of Home Science offer demonstrations for farm women, covering topics such as child care, time-saving home appliances, nutritious recipes, and family clothing. Beyond attracting visitors, these exhibitions provide a unique opportunity for companies to expand their business. The events facilitate direct interaction between exhibiting companies and visitors, buyers, and dealers, allowing for a swift comparison of products. Drawing on personal experience in organizing such exhibitions, the authors emphasize the potency of these events as powerful tools for market positioning and brand image creation.This approach fosters interaction between technology suppliers and farmers, allowing for feedback on demand and the provision of technical information. This process helps farmers evaluate new technologies more effectively and encourages the adoption of these technologies in their production systems (Gardner and Rousser, 2000).

Objectives

- To ascertain the reason for visiting the Kisan Mela.
- To study the perceptions of the farmers regarding various components of HAU Kisan Mela.
- To study the problems faced by the farmers during HAU Kisan Mela.

Literature Review

Kumar and Suhag (2003) evaluated cattle fairs in Haryana, highlighting inefficiencies due to declining turnover and rising expenditures, but lacked an analysis of socioeconomic impacts. Rydholm and Kirkhorn (2005) showed Farmer Health Fairs improved work safety and

lifestyles among participants, yet didn't explore long-term impacts. Manjula and Sheikh (2010) reported high satisfaction with KrishiMelas but didn't address long-term benefits. Oladele (2010) found high awareness and attendance of agricultural fairs among Botswana students but didn't examine their influence on career choices. Milin*et al*. (2014) emphasized economic benefits of fairs in Timis County but missed participant challenges. Shirur (2014) noted positive experiences with mushroom melas but lacked analysis of beneficial technologies. Ivkov*et al*. (2015) identified motives for attending hybrid agricultural fairs in Serbia but didn't explore long-term engagement. Gaps identified include the need for studies on long-term impacts, socioeconomic analysis, participation barriers, technological adoption, and educational influence. Addressing these gaps will enhance the understanding of agricultural fairs' roles and impacts.

Methodology

The study employed an ex-post factor research design, as the phenomenon under investigation had already occurred, aligning with Robinson's (1976) definition of systematic empirical inquiry without direct manipulation of independent variables. Conducted at CCS Haryana Agricultural University, Hisar, Haryana, India, the research targeted 30 farmers who attended the Kisan Mela in March 2024. The independent variables included age, education, marital status, occupation, type and size of family, land holding, annual family income, and social participation. Dependent variables focused on the reactions of the farmers, their perceived purpose, and the problems they faced. Data were collected through structured interviews, with clear explanations provided to assure participants that the information would be used solely for research purposes. The collected data were analyzed using statistical techniques such as frequencies and percentages to ensure comprehensive and accurate insights into the variables of interest.

Results

Table 1: Socio economic profile of respondents (N=30)

Sr. No.	Variables	Frequency (%)
1.	**Age (years)**	
	Young (25-40)	13(43.33)

	Middle (40-55)	14(46.66)
	Old (55 and above)	3(10.00)
2.	**Family profile**	
	Type of Family	
	• Nuclear	12(40.00)
	• Joint	18(60.00)
	Size of Family	
	• Small(2-4 members)	7(23.33)
	• Medium(5-7 members)	10(33.33)
	• Large (more than 7)	13(43.33)
3.	**Education of respondents**	
	Secondary	5(16.66)
	Higher	16(53.33)
	Graduation and above	9(30.00)
6.	**Total family income (annual)**	
	3 - 8 lakh	11(56.66)
	8 - 14 lakh	15(30.00)
	14 - 20 lakh	4(13.33)
7.	**Occupation of the respondents**	
	Government Service	7(23.33)
	Private Service	2(6.66)
	Farming	21(70.00)
8.	**Type of farming**	
	Traditional farming	15(50.00)
	Progressive farming	15(50.00)
8.	**Land holding**	
	5-12 acre	13(43.33)

	12-20 acre	14(46.66)
	20-28 acre	3(10.00)

*Source: Primary Data Collection

Table 1 revealed that among the 30 participants, the majority were in the middle age group (40-55 years) with 14 individuals (46.66%), followed by 13 (43.33%) in the young age group (25-40 years), and 3 (10.00%) aged 55 and above. Family structure showed a predominance of joint families, comprising 18 respondents (60.00%), while 12 (40.00%) were from nuclear families.Similar findings were depicted by (Singh 2015). In terms of family size, 13 respondents (43.33%) had large families with more than seven members, 10 (33.33%) had medium-sized families with 5-7 members, and 7 (23.33%) had small families with 2-4 members.

Educationally, a significant portion of the respondents, 16 (53.33%), had completed higher education, 9 (30.00%) were graduates or had higher qualifications, and 5 (16.66%) had completed secondary education. The total annual family income varied, with the majority earning between 8-14 lakh (56.66%), followed by 11 (36.66%) earning between 3-8 lakh, and 4 (13.33%) earning 14-20 lakh. Occupationally, 21 respondents (70.00%) were engaged in farming, 7 (23.33%) were in government service, and 2 (6.66%) were in private service.

Regarding the type of farming practiced, the respondents were evenly split, with 15 (50.00%) involved in traditional farming and the other 15 (50.00%) engaged in progressive farming. Land holdings also varied, with 14 respondents (46.66%) owning 12-20 acres, 13 (43.33%) owning 5-12 acres, and 3 (10.00%) owning 20-28 acres.

Table 2: Farmer's participation in KisanMela (N=30)

Sr. No.		**Frequency (%)**
1.	**Source of information about Kisan Mela**	
	Newspaper	5(16.66)
	Local leaders	7(23.33)
	Friends or relatives	18(60.00)
2.	**Purpose of visiting**	
	To discover new agricultural technologies and practices	8(26.66)
	To purchase high quality seed/nursery plants	16(53.33)
	To gather information about innovations showcased through exhibitions/demonstrations	6(20.00)
	To enjoy various activities	11(36.66)
	To visit the HAU campus	7(23.33)
	To buy educational/informational literature	17(56.66)
3.	**Frequency of attending Kisan Mela**	
	Every year	22(73.33)

	Every few years	7(23.33)
	Rarely	1(3.33)
4.	**Most beneficial aspects of Kisan Mela**	
	Display and demonstrations of products	14(46.66)
	Expert advice and consultations	11(36.66)
	Networking opportunities	5(16.66)
5.	**Specific information sought at Kisan Mela**	
	Latest advancements in agricultural technologies	13(43.33)
	Techniques for crop management	9(30.00)
	Methods for pest and disease control	6(20.00)
	Market trends and pricing details	11(36.66)
6.	**Recommend Kisan Mela to others farmer**	
	Yes, absolutely	26(86.66)
	May be, depending on their needs	4(13.33)

*Source: Primary Data Collection

Table 2 provided detailed insights into the respondents' interactions with the Kisan Mela. Friends and relatives were the primary sources of information about the event for 60% of the participants, followed by local leaders (23.33%) and newspapers (16.66%). Most attendees visited to purchase high-quality seeds or nursery plants (53.33%) and to buy literature (56.66%). Other reasons included exploring new agricultural technologies (26.66%), enjoying various activities (36.66%), gaining information through exhibitions (20.00%), and visiting the HAU campus (23.33%).

A significant majority attended the Kisan Mela annually (73.33%), with fewer attending every couple of years (23.33%) or rarely (3.33%). The most valued aspects were product displays and demonstrations (46.66%), expert advice (36.66%), and networking opportunities (16.66%). Specific information sought included the latest agricultural technologies (43.33%), crop management techniques (30.00%), pest and disease control methods (20.00%), and market trends and pricing information (36.66%).

Finally, 86.66% of respondents would definitely recommend the Kisan Mela to other farmers, while 13.33% would recommend it depending on the needs of the others.

Table 3: Extension contactsof farmers (N=30)

Contacts	**Always Frequency (%)**	**Sometimes Frequency (%)**	**Never Frequency (%)**	**WMS**
• **Village level worker**	27(90.00)	3(10.00)	---	2.90
• **Agriculture development officer**	13(43.33)	17(56.66)	---	2.43
• **Horticulture development officer**	9(30.00)	14(46.66)	7(23.33)	2.06

• **Dairy development officer**	5(16.66)	19(63.33)	6(20.00)	1.96
• **Block development officer**	2(6.66)	21(70.00)	7(23.33)	1.83
• **Scientists of HAU**	8(26.66)	3(10.00)	19(63.33)	1.63
• **Scientists of KVK**	12(40.00)	15(50.00)	3(10.00)	2.30

*Source: Primary Data Collection

Table 3 revealed significant disparities in the frequency of extension contacts among respondents, highlighting critical gaps in support and accessibility. Village-level workers were the most frequently contacted, with 90% of farmers always engaging with them (WMS 2.90). Agriculture development officers had inconsistent contact, with 56.66% sometimes engaging and 43.33% always contacting them (WMS 2.43). Horticulture development officers were contacted sometimes by 46.66%, always by 30%, and never by 23.33% (WMS 2.06). Dairy development officers had lower engagement, with 63.33% sometimes, 16.66% always, and 20% never reaching out (WMS 1.96). Block development officers were rarely contacted, with 70% sometimes, 6.66% always, and 23.33% never engaging with them (WMS 1.83). HAU scientists were the least engaged, with 63.33% never, 26.66% always, and 10% sometimes contacting them (WMS 1.63). KVK scientists showed better engagement, with 50% sometimes, 40% always, and 10% never contacting them (WMS 2.30).Similar findings were reported by Kakkar (2011).

Table 4: Participation of farmers in extension activities (N=30)

Activities	Always Frequency (%)	Sometimes Frequency (%)	Never Frequency (%)	WMS
• **Various activities at KVK, field day, demonstration**	17(56.66)	11(36.66)	2(6.66)	2.50
• **Training activities at HAU, Hisar**	---	3(10.00)	27(90.00)	1.10
• **Kisan Mela/ Regional Mela**	23(76.66)	7(23.33)	---	2.76
• **Block level training camps**	3(10.00)	18(60.00)	9(30.00)	1.80
• **District level training camps**	---	16(53.33)	14(46.66)	1.53

*Source: Primary Data Collection

Table 4 examined the participation of respondents in various extension activities, revealing varying levels of engagement. Participation in activities at KVK, field days, and demonstrations was high, with 56.66% of respondents always participating, 36.66% sometimes participating, and 6.66% never participating, resulting in a Weighted Mean Score (WMS) of 2.50. Training activities at HAU, Hisar, saw lower engagement, with 90.00% of respondents sometimes participating and only 10.00% always participating, yielding a WMS

of 1.10. The Kisan Mela/Regional Mela had the highest participation, with 76.66% of respondents always participating and 23.33% sometimes participating, leading to a WMS of 2.76. Block-level training camps had mixed participation, with 60.00% sometimes attending, 10.00% always attending, and 30.00% never attending, resulting in a WMS of 1.80. District-level training camps saw 53.33% of respondents sometimes participating and 46.66% never participating, leading to a WMS of 1.53.

Table 5: Extent of satisfaction/perception of farmers regarding various components of HAU Kisan Mela(N=30)

Services provided	Fully satisfied Frequency (%)	Somewhat satisfiedFrequency (%)	Not satisfied Frequency (%)	WMS
• **Access to seeds and seed varieties**	18(60.00)	12(40.00)	---	2.60
• **Size of packaging of seeds**	28(93.33)	2(6.66)	---	2.93
• **Availability of nursery plants**	23(76.66)	7(23.33))	---	2.76
• **Quality of seeds and nursery plants**	26(86.66)	4(13.33)	---	2.86
• **Elucidation of queries at stalls**	25(83.33)	5(16.66)	---	2.83
• **Access to agriculture-related literature**	24(80.00)	6(20.00)	---	2.80
• **Presentation and demonstration at stalls**	22(73.33)	8(26.66)	---	2.73
• **Placement of stalls**	28(93.33)	2(6.66)	---	2.93
• **Enquiry stall by department of extension education**	27(90.00)	3(10.00)	---	2.90

*Source: Primary Data Collection

Table 5 assessed the extent of satisfaction and perception among farmers regarding various components of the HAU Kisan Mela. In terms of the services provided, the availability of seeds and seed varieties garnered mixed responses, with 60.00% of farmers fully satisfied and 40.00% somewhat satisfied (WMS 2.60). The size of packaging of seeds received high

satisfaction, with 93.33% fully satisfied and only 6.66% somewhat satisfied (WMS 2.93). Similarly, the availability of nursery plants was well-received, with 76.66% fully satisfied and 23.33% somewhat satisfied (WMS 2.76).

Farmers were highly satisfied with the quality of seeds and nursery plants, with 86.66% fully satisfied and 13.33% somewhat satisfied (WMS 2.86). Clarification of queries at stalls was also positively perceived, with 83.33% fully satisfied and 16.66% somewhat satisfied (WMS 2.83). Availability of required literature related to agriculture was satisfactory, with 80.00% fully satisfied and 20.00% somewhat satisfied (WMS 2.80). Presentation and demonstration at stalls received moderate satisfaction, with 73.33% fully satisfied and 26.66% somewhat satisfied (WMS 2.73).

The location of stalls was highly satisfactory, with 93.33% fully satisfied and only 6.66% somewhat satisfied (WMS 2.93). The enquiry stall by the Department of Extension Education was also well-received, with 90.00% fully satisfied and 10.00% somewhat satisfied (WMS 2.90). These findings indicate generally positive perceptions and high levels of satisfaction among farmers regarding various aspects of the HAU Kisan Mela.

Table 6: Problems faced by the farmers during Kisan Mela(N=30)

Services	**Yes Frequency (%)**	**No Frequency (%)**
• Quantity and size of packaging of seeds	---	30(100.00)
• Issuing of the chits for seed	---	30(100.00)
• Availability of nursery plants	---	30(100.00)
• Answers to the queries at stalls	---	30(100.00)
Participation of farmers		
• Interaction with HAU Scientists	---	30(100.00)
• Seeking information about new practices and innovations	---	30(100.00)
• Timing of entertainment programme	---	30(100.00)
Physical facilities		
• Seating arrangement	---	30(100.00)
• Drinking water outlets	---	30(100.00)
• Getting the eatables	---	30(100.00)
• Parking facility	---	30(100.00)
• Toilet facility	---	30(100.00)

*Source: Primary Data Collection

Table 6 reflected that all farmers reported positive experiences across various aspects of services, participation, and physical facilities during their engagement in the HAU Kisan Mela. They did not encounter any challenges with the quantity and size of packaging of seeds, issuing of chits for seeds, availability of nursery plants, obtaining answers to queries at stalls, interaction with HAU scientists, gaining information about new practices and

innovations, timing of entertainment programs, seating arrangements, access to drinking water outlets, availability of eatables, parking facilities, and toilet amenities. These findings reflect the overall satisfaction of farmers with the services and infrastructure provided during the event.

Table 7: Varied Perspectives: Assessing the Impact and Value of the Kisan Mela (N=30)

STATMENTS	Always Frequency (%)	Sometimes Frequency (%)	Never Frequency (%)	WMS
Attending the Kisan Mela was a valuable experience, providing insights into the latest agricultural practices and technologies	27(90.00)	3(10.00)	---	2.90
Kisan Mela found to be a waste of time, as it did not offer any significant information or solutions for my farming challenges	2(6.66)	5(16.66)	23(76.66)	1.30
Kisan Mela helped in discovering innovative farming techniques that have significantly improved my crop yield	24(80.00)	6(20.00)	0	2.80
Feel that the Kisan Mela could have been more organized and focused on addressing specific issues faced by farmers	2(6.66)	7(23.33)	21(70.00)	1.36
The networking opportunities at the Kisan Mela were beneficial, allowing to connect with other farmers and industry experts	28(93.33)	2(6.66)	---	3.00
Believe that the Kisan Mela needs to include more interactive workshops and	---	11(36.66)	19(63.33)	1.36

demonstrations to engage attendees effectively				
Despite some shortcomings, Appreciate the efforts put into organizing the Kisan Mela and providing a platform for agricultural discussions	27(90.00)	3(10.00)	---	2.90
The Kisan Mela provides valuable resources and contacts that have positively impacted the farming business	26(86.66)	4(13.33)	---	2.86
Attending the Kisan Mela was a great opportunity to learn about government schemes and subsidies available for farmers	29(96.66)	1(3.33)	---	2.96
Feel that the Kisan Mela was overcrowded and chaotic, making it difficult to fully benefit from the experience	3(10.00)	8(26.66)	19(63.33)	1.46
Kisan Mela exceeded my expectations, offering a comprehensive overview of the latest trends and advancements in agriculture	25(83.33)	3(10.00)	2(6.66)	2.76

*Source: Primary Data Collection

Table 7 provided an in-depth assessment of the impact and value of the Kisan Mela, based on responses from 30 participants.

Valuable Experience: A significant majority (90%) reported that attending the Kisan Mela was a valuable experience, providing insights into the latest agricultural practices and technologies.

Perceived Waste of Time: Only a small fraction (6.66%) felt that the Kisan Mela was a waste of time, with 76.66% strongly disagreeing with this statement.

Innovative Techniques: 80% of respondents discovered innovative farming techniques that significantly improved their crop yield, while 20% found it sometimes beneficial.

Event Organization: Some attendees (23.33%) felt that the event could have been better organized and more focused on specific farmer issues, though 70% did not share this sentiment.

Networking Opportunities: The networking opportunities were highly valued, with 93.33% finding it beneficial to connect with other farmers and industry experts.

Interactive Workshops: There was a call for more interactive workshops and demonstrations, with 36.66% wanting more engagement, while 63.33% did not feel the need for this.

Appreciation for Efforts: Despite some shortcomings, 90% appreciated the efforts put into organizing the Kisan Mela and providing a platform for agricultural discussions.

Valuable Resources: The Kisan Mela was seen as providing valuable resources and contacts, positively impacting farming businesses for 86.66% of respondents.

Government Schemes Information: A vast majority (96.66%) found the event a great opportunity to learn about government schemes and subsidies available for farmers.

Overcrowding Issues: Some attendees (26.66%) felt that the event was overcrowded and chaotic, which hindered their ability to benefit fully from the experience.

Exceeding Expectations: Lastly, 83.33% felt that the Kisan Mela exceeded their expectations, offering a comprehensive overview of the latest trends and advancements in agriculture.

Table 8: Correlation between Independent and Dependent Variable

Services provided	**Age**	**Education**	**Total Income**
Access to seeds and seed varieties	0.19	0.47**	0.39*
Size of packaging of seeds	0.23	0.14	0.08
Availability of nursery plants	0.09	0.36*	0.36*

Quality of seeds and nursery plants	0.26**	0.39*	0.25*
Elucidation of queries at stalls	0.15	0.22	0.17
Access to agriculture related literature	0.06	0.48*	0.11
Presentation and demonstration at stalls	0.21	0.20	0.03
Placement of stalls	0.04	0.07	0.10
Enquiry stall by department of extension education	0.28**	0.42*	0.12

**Significant at 0.01 level of significance

* Significant at 0.05 level of significance

Table 8 illustrated the positive correlations between independent variables (age, education, and total income) and various services provided at the Kisan Mela. The study found that education is significantly correlated with the availability of seeds and seed varieties (0.47) and the availability of nursery plants (0.36), indicating that educated farmers are more aware of and better able to access these resources. Similarly, higher total income is positively correlated with both the availability of seeds and seed varieties (0.39) and nursery plants (0.36), suggesting that wealthier farmers can invest more in diverse and quality agricultural inputs.

Additionally, the quality of seeds and nursery plants is positively correlated with age (0.26), education (0.39), and total income (0.25). This indicates that older farmers, educated farmers, and those with higher incomes tend to prioritize and invest in high-quality seeds and plants, likely due to their experience, knowledge, and financial capacity.

The study also found that older farmers (0.28) and educated farmers (0.42) are more likely to seek assistance from the enquiry stalls by the Department of Extension Education. This suggests that these groups are more proactive in seeking information and support, leveraging available resources to enhance their agricultural practices. Overall, these correlations highlight the critical role of education and income in accessing and utilizing agricultural services, as well as the impact of age on seeking quality and support.

Conclusion

It can be concluded that results collectively paint a picture of the HAU Kisan Mela as a valuable platform for farmers' engagement and knowledge exchange. The socio-economic

profile indicates a diverse and active participation from farmers across different sectors of agriculture, showcasing the Mela's inclusive reach. Farmers' overall positive experiences and high satisfaction levels with various Mela components, such as seed availability, nursery plants, and information quality, underscore the event's effectiveness in disseminating agricultural information and practices.

While minimal problems were reported in specific areas like packaging of seeds or seating arrangements, these serve as opportunities for continuous improvement to enhance farmers' experiences further. The high attendance rates and positive feedback reflect the Mela's role in fostering agricultural development, innovation, and community networking among farmers.

The varying levels of engagement with agricultural officers in extension activities suggest the need for targeted outreach strategies to ensure all farmers benefit from expert guidance and support. Overall, the findings highlight the HAU Kisan Mela's importance in facilitating knowledge dissemination, addressing farmers' needs, and contributing to the advancement of agriculture in the region.

Disclaimer (Artificial intelligence)

Option 1:

Author(s) hereby declare that NO generative AI technologies such as Large Language Models (ChatGPT, COPILOT, etc) and text-to-image generators have been used during writing or editing of manuscripts.

Option 2:

Author(s) hereby declare that generative AI technologies such as Large Language Models, etc have been used during writing or editing of manuscripts. This explanation will include the name, version, model, and source of the generative AI technology and as well as all input prompts provided to the generative AI technology

Details of the AI usage are given below:

1.

2.

3.

References

Gardner, B. and Rousser, G. (2000). Handbook of Agricultural Economics.Elsevier Science, Amsterdam.Pp 574-96.

Ivkov, M., Blesic, I., Raljic, J. P., Dzigurskj, A. I., Pivac, T. and Jovanovic, T. (2015). Visitors'

motives for attending a hybrid event: a case study of agricultural fair.*Economics of Agriculture,***62**:9-28.

Kakkar, N. (2011). Reactions of farmers regarding agricultural subsidies provided by state department of agriculture under National Food Security Mission in Ludhiana district. M.Sc. Thesis, Punjab Agricultural University, Ludhiana, India.

Kumar, A. and Suhag, K. S. (2003).Role of cattle fairs in livestock marketing in Haryana. *Agricultural Market,* **46:**11-14.

Manjula, N. and Sheikh, M. K. (2010). Impact of Krishi Mela on Participating Farmer. *Agricultural Update,***5:**54-58.

Milin., I. A., Gordean, R., Merce, I. I. and Iancu, T. (2014). Issues relating to agricultural markets and trade fairs held in Timisoara. *Animal Science Bio-Technology,***47:**318-20.

Oladele, I. O. (2010).Students knowledge and attitudes towards agricultural shows and fairs in Botswana. *North American Colleges and Teachers of Agriculture,* **54:**123-29.

Rydholm, L. and Kirkhorn, S. R. (2005).A study of the impact and efficacy of health fairs for farmers. *J Agric Safety Hlth,***11:**441-48.

Sekhon, G. K. (1995). *Reactions of Rural Women towards KisanMelaorganised by Punjab Agricultural University (PAU) Ludhiana*. M.Sc. Thesis, Punjab Agricultural University, Ludhiana, India.

Shirur, M. (2014). Regional Mushroom *Mela* and *KisanGoshti*: Enabling Farmers to Access Technology and Advisory Services. *Proc 8th International Conference Mushroom Biology Mushroom Products.* pp 67-69. ICAR-Directorate of Mushroom Research, Solan, India.

Singh, D. (2015). An evaluative study of Agricultural Technology Information Centre (ATIC) run by Punjab Agricultural University, Ludhiana. M.Sc. Thesis, Punjab Agricultural University, Ludhiana, India.