Perception of Students and Teachers on Achievement of Rural Agricultural Work Experience Programme Objectives

K. Shivaramu[1*], K. Venkataranga Naika[1] and D. K. Suresh[1]

[1]Directorate of Extension, University of Agricultural Sciences, Bengaluru, India.

Authors' contributions

*This work was carried out in collaboration between all authors. All authors read and approved the final
manuscript.*

Article Information

Original Research Article

ABSTRACT

The study was conducted in College of Agriculture (COA), Gandhi Krishi Vigyana Kendra,
Bengaluru and College of Agriculture (COA), Vishveswaraiah Canal (V C) Farm, Mandya, in order
to analyse the perception of students and teachers on Rural Agricultural Work Experience
Programme (RAWEP) in 12 weeks village stay. In total 80 students and 30 teachers constituted
sample size of the study. The ex-post facto research design was employed. Results revealed that
47.50 per cent of students and 46.67 per cent of teachers had a higher level of perception on the
achievement of RAWEP objectives. Majority of both students and teachers have perceived that
RAWEP objectives, helps the students to understand rural problems, rural institutions, and get
familiar with rural life were fully achieved in 12 weeks village stay. Further, majority of both students
and teachers also perceived that on-campus factors viz., orientation provided in the beginning and
advance planning by teachers; off-campus factors viz., season during which village stay is
conducted, teachers visits to villages, cooperation within students group and cooperation from
farmers; General factors viz., students own interest in RAWEP, knowledge on subject matter and

_____

Corresponding author: E-mail: sisuasb@gmail.com;

stipend provided to students were the highly influencing factors on the performance of RAWEP in 12 weeks village stay. RAWEP was helping the students to get more practical knowledge of rural life, crops and cropping season, the skills in identification of problems and providing solutions to the farmers. Therefore, proper planning, guidance, monitoring and evaluation of RAWEP work is very much necessary coupled with providing sufficient funds and a stipend to the students for achieving RAWEP objectives to a greater extent.

1. INTRODUCTION

Since independence, India has witnessed the most spectacular changes in the field of agriculture. From being a 'begging basket' to a saturated granary', the era of self-sufficiency was achieved through together termed as 'Indigo revolution'. All these requisites necessitated the remodeling and development of new pedagogic tools in agricultural education, which is a foundation for future agricultural development. This led to the development of a rigorous field programme which emphasis on practical reorientation of farm students to the rural agricultural operation system and totally of farm life. Rural Agricultural Work Experience Programme (RAWEP) was introduced in the Agricultural Universities in our country, which is viewed as the best opportunity, which can orient and equip the required potential among the students of agricultural science.

Few decades back the farm graduates used to come from rural background and had prior experience on agriculture, rural life and village situations. But, now sizable numbers are coming from urban background [1]. The Third Deans committee under the chairmanship of Keerti singh [2] advocated the introduction of RAWEP in all the State Agricultural Universities (SAU's) in India and laid down specific objectives for the programme. Almost all the state agricultural universities in India started implementing RAWEP keeping local situations, resources, infrastructure facilities available.

In accordance with Third Deans committee with slight modification to suit local cropping season, University of Agricultural Sciences (UAS), Bangalore introduced RAWEP in VII semester instead of VIII semester, increased duration of students village stay from four weeks to 12 weeks. The students were divided into batches. Each batch consists of 8-10 students and works in one RSK. The students allotted to each RSK selects one nearby village in the ambit of RSK

and stay in that village and on a rotation basis every week two student's work in RSK. The teachers from the department of Agricultural Extension are the coordinator and Associate coordinators of RAWEP. With this background the present study was undertaken with following specific objectives.

To assess the perception of students and teachers on the extent of achievement of RAWEP objectives in 12 weeks village stay; and to know the perception of students and teachers on the factors influencing the performance of RAWEP in 12 weeks village stay.

2. METHODOLOGY

The present investigation was carried out in the two colleges of University of Agricultural Sciences, Bengaluru viz., College of Agriculture (COA), Bengaluru and College of Agriculture (COA), VC Farm, Mandya, providing bachelors' degree in agriculture. From each selected college 40 final year B.Sc. (Agriculture) students undergone RAWEP and 15 teachers involved in carrying out the RAWEP activities in the colleges were selected by using random sampling technique. In total 80 students and 30 teachers constituted sample for the study. The ex-post facto research design was employed in the present study.

2.1 Development of Perception Scale

2.1.1 <u>The steps followed in the development of scale are as follows</u>

1. Identification of statements: The List of statements related to Perception were based on objectives of RAWEP and review of literature. As many 40 statements related to perception were listed and each statement was carefully scrutinized to avoid duplication. Then each statement was edited and modified as perception statements as per the 14 criteria suggested and finally, 30 statements were retained as perception statements and 10 were rejected.

These statements were found to be non-ambiguous and non- factual.

2. Relevancy analysis: The statements were given to 60 judges. Judges were RAWEP teachers comprising of various disciplines of Agriculture to critically evaluate the relevancy of each statement on a five-point continuum viz., Most Relevant (MR), Relevant (R), Some What Relevant (SWR), Least Relevant and Not Relevant (NR) with the score of 5, 4, 3, 2, and 1 respectively. The judges were also requested to make necessary modifications and additions or deletion of statements, if they desired too. A total of 40 judges returned the questionnaires duly completed and these were considered for further processing. From the data gathered, percentage relevancy score was worked out for all the statements.

2.2 Selection of Statements

The responses of the judges were tabulated and data was analyzed to work out Relevancy Percentage (RP) for all the statements as follows.

Relevancy Percentage (RP)

It was obtained by adopting the standard formula as;

Relevancy Percentage (RP) =

$$\frac{(MR \times 3) + (R \times 2) + (NR \times 1)}{\text{Maximum possible score (i.e. 30 x 5 = 150)}} \times 100$$

Mean Relevancy Score =

$$\frac{((MR\times5)+(R\times4)+(SWR\times3)+(LR\times2)+(NR\times1))}{(\text{Number of Judges responded})}$$

Where,

MR = Most relevant
R = Relevant
SWR= Some What relevant
LR = Least relevant
NR = Not relevant
Maximum possible score = (40x5=200)
Number of Judges = (40).

Adopting Most Relevant (MR), Relevant (R), Some What Relevant (SWR), Least Relevant and Not Relevant (NR) criteria, the statements were screened for their relevancy. Accordingly, the statements having relevancy percentage of 80 and Mean relevancy score of 4.0 and above were considered for further processing and suitably modified as per the comments of experts wherever applicable. Finally, 16 statements were isolated in the first stage for development of perception scale.

2.3 Reliability of the Scale Developed

Reliability in its true sense refers to precision of the scale constructed for any purpose. It is otherwise called the extent to which repeated measure produces the same results. In any social science research, newly constructed scale has to be tested for its reliability before it is used. In the present study, the reliability of perception scale was determined by split-half method. Further, pre-testing was conducted among 30 respondents in non-sample area to measure perception. Split half method developed by Brown prophecy was employed to study the reliability of the tool.

2.4 Split-Half Method

In the present study, for testing reliability, scores of two halves are correlated to find out reliability coefficient. Split-half method of reliability is used with instrument that has many statements and where pairs of statements can be considered equivalent. Equivalence indicates the internal consistency of measuring device. The scales developed for the study was administered to 30 students and teachers in the non-sample area. Reliability coefficient was calculated for each half ($r\frac{1}{2}$) by using Pearson-product moment correlation coefficient formula.

The reliability co-efficient of the perception scale was found to be 0.8214, which is higher than the standard of 0.70, indicating higher reliability of the scales. The reliability scales was calculated using the following formula.

$$r_{1/2} = \frac{N(\sum XY - (\sum X)(\sum Y))}{\sqrt{[(N\sum X^2 (\sum X)^2 (\sum Y^2 - (\sum Y)^2]}}$$

Half - test reliability

Where,

$\sum x$= Sum of the scores of the odd number statements
$\sum y$= Sum of the scores of the even number statements

∑x2 = Sum of the squares of the odd number statements

∑y2 = Sum of the squares of the even number statements

Further, scores of two halves were correlated to find out reliability coefficient and reliability coefficient for whole test was estimated by applying spearman-brown prophecy formula,

rII = Spearman-brown prophecy reliability coefficient

r½ = Pearson-product moment correlation coefficient

Reliability coefficients thus obtained indicate high internal consistency of perception scale developed for the study.

2.5 Validity of the Scale

Validity refers to the ability of the instrument to measure what it proposed to measure. Validity of a scale is the property which ensures that the test scores obtained measure the variable they are supposed to measure. Content validity or construct validity and criterion validity are the methods generally followed to know the validity of the scale. In the present investigation, the statistical validity was found to be 0.903 for attitude scale which is greater than the standard of 0.70. Hence, the validity co-efficient was also found to be most appropriate. The validity of the scales was calculated according to below formula.

$$\text{Validity} = \sqrt{r_{11}}$$

Where

r11 = Test reliability

Data was collected by personnel interview method and analyzed using percentages and chi-square test was employed to check the significant difference in the perception of students and teachers on achievement level.

2.5.1 Operational definition

2.5.1.1 Perception

In the present study perception is operationally defined as clear understanding of the meaning and usefulness of the RAWEP in 12 weeks village stay by students and teachers.

2.5.1.2 Achievement

In the present study achievement is operationally defined as process of professional recognition and ability of academic achievement by students and teachers during RAWEP in 12 weeks village stay.

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

3.1 Overall Perception of Students and Teachers on Achievement of RAWEP Objectives

The data in Table 1 revealed the similarity in overall perception level of students and teachers on extent of achievement of RAWEP objectives. An equal percentage of students (47.50%) and teachers (46.67%) had higher level of perception. On the other hand, 36.25 per cent of students and 40.00 per cent of teachers had medium level of perception. Further, 16.25 per cent of students and 13.33 per cent of teachers had lower level of perception on achievement of RAWEP objectives in 12 weeks village stay. This gets the support of non-significant results of chi-square test.

The above results may be attributed to the fact that new pattern of RAWEP of 12 weeks village stay provided more time to understand rural life and situation, to carryout series of extension education activities, crops and cropping pattern when compared to 4 weeks village stay in old pattern of RAWEP. The results are in line with the studies conducted by [3,4,5,6,7,8,9] and [10].

3.2 Perception of Students on Extent of Achievement of RAWEP Objectives in 12 Weeks Village Stay

Results in Table 2 reveals that majority of students have perceived that the RAWEP objectives, helped the students to understand the socio-economic conditions of farmers (88.75%), to understand farmers problems (86.25%), understand rural institutions (82.50%), to get familiar with rural life (81.25%), to understand village situation (81.25%), to understand farming and farming systems (80.00%), provided practical training to students on crop production (80.00%), helped to improve students' communication skills (77.50%), improve students' leadership qualities (75.00%), to improve students diagnostic skills (73.75%), developed confidence and professional competence among students to solve field

Table 1. Overall perception of students and teachers on extent of achievement of RAWEP objectives

Perception level	Students (n=80)		Teachers (n=30)		Total (n=110)	
	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	No.	Percent
Low	13	16.25	4	13.33	17	15.46
Medium	29	36.25	12	40.00	41	37.27
High	38	47.50	14	46.67	52	47.27
Total	**80**	**100.00**	**30**	**100.00**	**110**	**100.00**

X^2= 0.20223^{NS}, NS: Non- Significant at 5 % level of probability

problems (73.75%), helped the students to understand adoption patterns and adoption gaps (72.50%), provided an opportunity to work with various agro-based institutions (68.75%), improved students competency to prepare farm plans / projects for individual farm families(65.00%), provided opportunity for students to meet role models in agriculture and increased students confidence (65.00%) and helped the students to get acquainted with ongoing TOT programmes in agriculture (61.25%) were fully achieved in 12 weeks village stay. Further, the students also perceived the RAWEP objectives helps the students to get acquainted with ongoing Transfer of Technology (TOT) programmes in agriculture (32.50%) and increases the students' competency to prepare farm plans / projects for individual farm families (30.00%) were achieved to some extent. In addition, the students perceived the RAWEP objective provided an opportunity for students to meet role models in agriculture and increased students' confidence (11.25%) was not achieved in 12 weeks village stay.

The observed pattern of results may be due to the fact that students might have gained clear understanding of socio-economic status of farmers by staying with them for one crop season. The longer duration of village stay helped them to understand the farming systems and farming in a better way. This implies if the duration is too long people will not have sustained interest. Therefore, as phillip catllor says 'small is beautiful, short staying in villages yielded good results. The results are in line with the studies conducted by [3,4,5,6,7,8,9] and [10].

3.3 Perception of Teachers on Extent of Achievement of RAWEP Objectives in 12 Weeks Village Stay

A keen observation of Table 3 denotes that majority of the teachers perceived the RAWEP objectives, helped the students to get familiar with rural life (86.67%), to understand village situations (86.67%), to understand rural institutions (83.33%),to understand adoption patterns and adoption gaps (83.33%),to understand farmers problems (80.00%), improved the students' communication skills (76.67%), provided opportunity to students to work with various agro-based institutions (76.67%), to understand socio-economic conditions of farmers (73.33%), to understand farming and farming systems (73.33%), provided opportunity for students to meet role models in agriculture to increase student's confidence (70.00%), developed confidence and professional competence in students to solve field problems (70.00%), provided practical training to students on crop production (70.00%), to improve diagnostic skills (70.00%), improved students' leadership qualities (66.67%), to get acquainted with ongoing TOT programmes in agriculture (66.67%) and improved students competency to prepare farm plans / projects for individual farm families (63.34%) were fully achieved in 12 week village stay. Further, teachers perceived the RAWEP objectives viz., to get acquainted with ongoing TOT programmes in agriculture (33.33%) and provides opportunity for students to meet role models in agriculture and increases student's confidence (30.00 %) were achieved to some extent in 12 weeks village stay. In addition, the teachers perceived the RAWEP objectives viz., improved the students' competency to prepare farm plans / projects for individual farm families (13.33%) and improved students' leadership qualities (10.00%) were not achieved in 12 weeks village stay.

The obtained pattern of results may be attributed to the fact that teachers might have felt that 12 weeks village stay helped to get familiarity with farming, farming community, farming situations. Also provided opportunities to develop and practice leadership qualities and to understand adoption pattern and adoption gaps in recommended technologies. The results are in line with the studies conducted by [3,4,5,6,7,8,9] and [10].

3.4 Perception of Students on Factors Influencing the Performance of RAWEP in 12 Weeks Village Stay

Results from Table 4 indicates that majority of students were perceived the following factors as highly influenced the performance of RAWEP in 12 weeks village stay.

3.4.1 On- campus factors

The on-campus factors viz., advance planning by teachers (88.75%), orientation provided in the beginning (81.25%), guidance from teachers (78.75%), basic information about village provided to the students (77.50%), selection of groups by students choice (72.50%), allocation of RSK's according to areas of students familiarity (68.75%) were highly influences the performance of RAWEP work.

3.4.2 Off campus factors

The off- campus factors viz., season during which village stay was conducted (90.00%), cooperation within students groups (88.75%), cooperation from farmers (88.75%), security feeling in villages (85.00%), food facility in villages (80.00%), teachers visits to villages (80.00%), basic facilities available in villages (78.75%),convenience and availability of farmers (78.75%), guidance provided to students by subject matter specialists in villages (77.50%), building informal relation with farmers in villages (75.00%),good cooperation from agro-based institutions(75.00%), constant monitoring by teachers (75.00%), farmers choice or preference of subjects (72.50%) and farmers interest in subject matter covered by students(71.25%) were highly influenced the performance of RAWEP in 12 weeks village stay.

3.5   General Factors

The general factors viz., grade points of RAWEP (86.25%), stipend provided to students (85.00%), students interest in RAWEP (81.25%), duration of stay in village (80.00%), knowledge on subject matter (80.00%), preparation for other competitive exams like Junior Research Fellow (JRF), Common Aptitude Test (CAT) etc.,(77.50%), cooperation from line department officials (77.50%), number of students per group (75. 00%), availability of enough teaching aids for students (75.00%), number of students per group

(75.00%) and getting exposure to one village only (70.00%) were highly influenced the performance of RAWEP work.

The revealed results may be due to the fact that students might have perceived that there are many factors which contributed for better performance of RAWEP work. The success of RAWEP depends on the on campus activities like proper advance planning by the teachers like selection of RSKs, village, the cropping season etc., Further, orientation to the students by teachers is also very much important for the students to prepare for work in villages.   Similarly, the students also felt that the factors like grade point and stipend were also highly associated factors with the performance of RAWEP. The higher grades and more stipends motivated the students to work hard for the success of RAWEP.The results are in line with the studies conducted by [3,4,5,6,7,8,9] and [10].

3.6   Perception of Teachers on Factors Influencing Performance of RAWEP in 12 Weeks Village Stay

A keen observation of Table 5 reveals that majority of teachers perceived the following factors were highly influences the performance of RAWEP in 12 weeks village stay.

3.6.1 On- campus factors

The on-campus factors viz., orientation provided in the beginning (93.33%), advance planning by teachers (86.67%), guidance from teachers (83.33%), basic information about village provided to students (76.67%), exam conducted by teachers at the end (76.67%), selection of groups by students choice (73.33%) and allocation of RSKs according to areas of students' familiarity (70.00%) were highly influenced the performance of RAWEP.

3.6.2 Off-campus factors

The off-campus factors viz., season during which village stay was conducted(96.97%), building informal relation with farmers in villages (90.00%), constant monitoring by teachers (86.67%), teachers visits to villages(83.33%), guidance provided by subject matter specialists to students in villages(83.33%), convenience and time availability of farmers (83.33%), good cooperation from agro-based institutions (83.33%), cooperation within students' groups

Table 2. Perception of students on extent of achievement of RAWEP objectives in 12 weeks village stay (n =80)

Sl. no.	Statements	Extent of achievement					
		FA		SEA		NA	
		No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
1.	To help the students to understand the socio-economic conditions of farmers.	71	88.75	06	07.50	03	03.75
2.	To help the students to understand farmers problems	69	86.25	09	11.25	02	02.50
3.	To help the students to understand rural institutions	66	82.50	09	11.25	05	06.25
4.	To help the students to get familiar with rural life.	65	81.25	10	12.50	05	06.25
5.	To help the students to understand village situation	65	81.25	12	15.00	03	03.75
6.	To help the students to understand farming and farming systems	64	80.00	10	12.50	06	07.50
7.	To provide the practical training to students on crop production	64	80.00	12	15.00	04	05.00
8.	To improve the students' communication skills	62	77.50	15	18.75	03	03.75
9.	To improve the students' leadership qualities	60	75.00	16	20.00	04	05.00
10.	To help the students' to improve diagnostic skills.	59	73.75	17	21.25	04	05.00
11.	To develop confidence and professional competence in students to solve field problems.	59	73.75	17	21.25	04	05.00
12.	To help the students to understand adoption patterns and adoption gaps.	58	72.50	20	25.00	02	02.50
13.	To provide an opportunity to students to work with various Agro-based institutions.	55	68.75	18	22.50	07	08.75
14.	To improve the students' competency to prepare farm plans / projects for individual farm families.	52	65.00	24	30.00	04	05.00
15.	To provide an opportunity for students to meet role models in agriculture and increase students' confidence.	52	65.00	19	23.75	09	11.25
16.	To help the students to get acquainted with ongoing TOT programmes in agriculture	49	61.25	26	32.50	05	06.25

(FA = Fully Achieved, SEA = Some Extent Achieved, NA = Not Achieved)

Table 3. Perception of teachers on extent of achievement of RAWEP objectives in 12 weeks village stay (n =30)

Sl. no.	Statements	Extent of achievement					
		FA		SEA		NA	
		No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
1.	To help the students to get familiar with rural life	26	86.67	02	06.67	02	06. 67
2.	To help the students to understand village situation	26	86.67	02	06. 67	02	06. 67
3.	To help the students to understand rural institutions	25	83.33	05	16.67	0	0
4.	To help the students to understand adoption patterns and adoption gaps.	25	83.33	03	10.00	02	06.67
5.	To help the students to understand farmers' problems	24	80.00	04	13.33	02	06.67
6.	To improve the students' communication skills	23	76.67	06	20.00	01	03.33
7.	To provide an opportunity to students to work with various Agro-based institutions.	23	76.67	07	23.33	0	0
8.	To help the students to understand socio-economic conditions of farmers.	22	73.33	06	20.00	02	06.67
9.	To help the students to understand farming and farming systems	22	73.33	08	26.67	0	0
10.	To provide an opportunity to students to meet role models in agriculture and increase student's confidence.	21	70.00	09	30.00	0	0
11.	To develop confidence and professional competence in students to solve field problems.	21	70.00	08	26.67	01	03.34
12.	To provides practical training to students on crop production	21	70.00	07	23.33	02	06.67
13.	To improve students' diagnostic skills.	21	70.00	08	26.67	01	03.33
14.	To improve students' leadership qualities.	20	66.67	07	23.33	03	10.00
15.	To help the students to get acquainted with ongoing TOT programmes in agriculture	20	66.67	10	33.33	0	0
16.	To improve students' competency to prepare farm plans / projects for individual farm families.	19	63.34	07	23.33	04	13.33

FA = Fully Achieved, SEA = Some Extent Achieved, NA = Not Achieved)

Table 4. Perception of students on factors influencing performance of RAWEP in 12 weeks village stay (n =80)

Sl. no.	Factors	Extent of association					
		HI		MI		LI	
		No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
A.	**On-campus**						
1.	Advance planning by teachers	71	88.75	8	10.00	1	1.25
2.	Orientation provided in the beginning	65	81.25	12	15.00	3	3.75
3.	Guidance from teachers	63	78.75	14	17.50	3	3.75
4.	Basic information about village provided to students.	62	77.50	18	22.50	0	0
5.	Selection of groups by students choice.	58	72.50	11	13.75	11	13.75
6.	Allocation of RSKs according to areas of students' familiarity.	55	68.75	17	21.25	8	10.00
7.	Exam conducted by teachers at the end.	34	42.50	35	43.75	11	13.75
B.	**Off-campus**						
1.	Season during which village stay is conducted	72	90.00	7	8.75	1	1.25
2.	Cooperation within students groups	71	88.75	9	11.25	0	0
3.	Cooperation from farmers	71	88.75	6	7.50	3	3.75
4.	Security feeling in villages	68	85.00	9	11.25	3	3.75
5.	Food facility in villages	64	80.00	9	11.25	7	8.75
6.	Teachers visits to villages	64	80.00	13	16.25	3	3.75
7.	Basic facilities available in villages.	63	78.75	11	13.75	6	7.50
8.	Convenience and time availability of farmers	63	78.75	13	16.25	4	5.00
9.	Guidance provided by subject matter specialists to students in villages.	62	77.50	14	17.50	4	5.00
10.	Building informal relation with farmers in villages.	60	75.00	14	17.50	6	7.50
11.	Good cooperation from agro-based institutions.	60	75.00	18	22.50	2	2.50
12.	Constant monitoring by teachers	60	75.00	17	21.25	3	3.75
13.	Farmers choice or preference of subjects	58	72.50	22	27.50	0	0
14.	Farmers interest in subject matter covered by students.	57	71.25	19	23.75	4	5.00
C.	**General**						
1.	Grade points of RAWEP.	69	86.25	10	12.50	1	1.25
2.	Stipend provided to students	68	85.00	8	10.00	4	5.00
3.	Students own interest in RAWEP	65	81.25	13	16.25	2	2.50
4.	Duration of stay in village	64	80.00	10	12.50	6	7.50
5.	Knowledge on subject matter	64	80.00	11	13.75	5	6.25
6.	Preparations for other competitive exams like Junior Research Fellow, Common	62	77.50	14	17.50	4	5.00

Sl. no.	Factors	Extent of association					
		HI		MI		LI	
		No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
	Aptitude Test etc.,						
7.	Cooperation from line department officials	62	77.50	16	20.00	2	2.50
8.	Number of students per group	60	75.00	14	17.50	6	7.50
9.	Availability of enough teaching aids for students.	60	75.00	10	12.50	10	12.50
10.	Getting exposure to one village only	56	70.00	16	20.00	8	10.00

(HI= Highly Influenced, MI = Moderately Influenced, LI = Least Influenced)

Table 5. Perception of teachers on factors influencing performance of RAWEP in 12 weeks village stay (n =30)

Sl. no.	Factors	Extent of association					
		HI		MI		LI	
		No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
A.	**On-campus**						
1.	Orientation provided in the beginning	28	93.33	02	06.67	0	0
2.	Advance planning by teachers	26	86.67	04	13.33	0	0
3.	Guidance from teachers	25	83.33	05	16.67	0	0
4.	Basic information about village provided to students.	23	76.67	06	20.00	01	03.33
5.	Exam conducted by teachers at the end.	23	76.67	05	16.67	02	06.67
6.	Selection of groups by students' choice.	22	73.33	06	20.00	02	06.67
7.	Allocation of RSKs according to areas of students' familiarity.	21	70.00	07	23.33	02	06.67
B.	**Off-campus**						
1.	Season during which village stay is conducted.	29	96.67	01	03.33	0	0
2.	Building informal relation with farmers in villages.	27	90.00	03	10.00	0	0
3.	Constant monitoring by teachers	26	86.67	04	13.33	0	0
4.	Teachers visits to villages.	25	83.33	05	16.67	0	0
5.	Guidance provided by subject matter specialists to students in villages.	25	83.33	04	13.33	01	03.33
6.	Convenience and time availability of farmers	25	83.33	02	06.67	03	10.00
7.	Good cooperation from agro-based institutions.	25	83.33	04	13.33	01	03.33
8.	Cooperation within students' groups	24	80.00	04	13.33	02	06.67
9.	Cooperation from farmers	24	80.00	04	13.33	02	06.67
10.	Farmers' interest in subject matter covered by students.	23	76.67	05	16.67	02	06.67
11.	Food facility in villages	23	76.67	05	16.67	02	06.67

Sl. no.	Factors	Extent of association					
		HI		MI		LI	
		No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
12.	Basic facilities available in villages.	23	76.67	06	20.00	01	3.33
13.	Security feeling in villages	22	73.33	06	20.00	02	06.67
14.	Farmers choice or preference of subjects	22	73.33	05	16.67	03	10.00
C.	**General**						
1.	Students own interest in RAWEP	28	93.33	02	06.67	0	0
2.	Knowledge on subject matter	27	90.00	03	10.00	0	0
3.	Availability of enough teaching aids for students.	26	86.67	02	06.67	02	06.67
4.	Stipend provided to students	24	80.00	03	10.00	03	10.00
5.	Number of students per group	24	80.00	02	06.67	04	13.33
6.	Duration of stay in village	24	80.00	05	16.67	01	03.34
7.	Grade points of RAWEP	23	76.67	05	16.67	02	06.67
8.	Cooperation from line department officials	23	76.67	05	16.67	02	06.67
9.	Getting exposure to one village only	20	66.67	07	23.33	03	10.00
10.	Preparations for other competitive exams like Junior Research Fellow, Common Aptitude Test etc.,	18	60.00	10	33.33	02	06.67

(HI= Highly Influenced, MI = Moderately Influenced, LI = Least Influenced)

(80.00%), cooperation from farmers (80.00%), farmers' interest in subject matter covered by students (76.67%), food facility in villages (76.67%), basic facilities available in villages (76.67%), security feeling in villages (73.33%) and farmers choice or preference of subjects (73.33%) were highly influenced the performance of RAWEP in 12 weeks village stay.

3.7 General factors

The general factors viz., students own interest in RAWEP (93.33%), knowledge on subject matter (90.00%), availability of enough teaching aids for students (86.67%), stipend provided to students(80.00%), number of students per group (80.00%), duration of stay in village (80.00%), grade points of RAWEP (76.67%), co-operation from line department officials (76.67%), getting exposure to one village only (66.67%) and preparations for other competitive exams like JRF, CAT etc., (60.00%) were highly influenced the performance of RAWEP.

The obtained pattern of results may be attributed to the fact that the on-campus factors like orientation on RAWEP activities to the students in the beginning by the teachers is very much important. Proper guidance to the students by teachers might have contributed to noticeable performance among the students. After students' placement in villages for 12 weeks, the teachers have to constantly monitor the students' activities in RSKs and in respective villages, by discussing with the farming community and students. The teachers were felt that the performance of RAWEP is mainly depended on the students own interest in gaining practical knowledge with active involvement of the farming community. Proper understanding of subject matter is very much important for better performance of RAWEP. The above results are in line with the studies conducted by [3,4,5,6,7,8,9] and [10].

4. CONCLUSION

To achieve RAWEP objectives to a greater extent Proper planning, guidance, monitoring and evaluation of RAWEP work is very much necessary. In addition sufficient funds and a stipend to the students to be made available at the right time. The line department needs to co-operate with the students by involving them in conducting the extension activities viz.,

demonstration, field days and farm fairs in the farmers' fields. The better transport facilities have to provide to the teachers for constant monitoring of students. Efforts are needed to provide critical inputs to the farmers by line departments along with educating the farmers by RAWEP students to develop model farmers and model villages. These farmers and villages may be further used to motivate other farmers to accelerate the process of agriculture development.

COMPETING INTERESTS

Authors have declared that no competing interests exist.

REFERENCES

1. Raman KV. Scientists training and interactiona with farmers in India, Farmer First (Ed.). 1993;169-171.

2. Annonymus. Third deans Committee Report on Agril. Education ICAR, New Delhi; 1995.

3. Venkataranga Naika K, Narayana Gowda K. An analysis of rural agricultural work experience (RAWE) at UAS, Bangalore and needed changes. Internataional J. tropical Agri. 2001;19(1-4):107-129.

4. Bandyopadhyay AK, Kar S. Teachers' and students' perception about RAWE programme. Res. J. Extn. Edu. 2002;2:38-43.

5. Sajeev M. An analysis of functioning of RAWEP at UAS Bangalore and Kerala Agricultural University. M. Sc. Thesis (Unpub), Univ. Agril. Sci., Bangalore; 2003.

6. Shivarmu K, Ranganatha AD, Manjunatha BN, Krishnamurthy B. Opinion of contract farmers on rural agricultural work experience programme, Mysore J. Agric. Sci. Bengaluru. 2011;45(1):139-142.

7. Borthakurand S, Bortamuly D. Perceived utility of RAWEP in gaining knowledge on communication skill, farm resource management and socio-economic aspects under AAU. Journal of Academia and Industrial Research (JAIR). 2013; 2(6).

8. Kotte S. A study on perception among participants of RAWE programme at J.N.K.V.V., Jabalpur. M.Sc. (Ag.) Thesis (unpublished), JNKVV, Jabalpur; 2014.

9. Kapri Anju, Kurbetta NC, Hiremath US. Perception of RAWE Programme by Students of UAS, Dharwad (Karnataka). Journal of Agroecology and Natural Resource Management. 2016;3(1):121-124.

10. Verma Madhuri, Naberia Seemaand VK. Pyasi. Perception of Agriculture Students towards the Rural Agricultural Work Experience (RAWE) Programme, Int. J. Curr. Microbiol. App. Sci. 2017;6(10): 3420-3423.