Andhra Pradesh J Agril. Sci : 7(2): 118-124, 2021

PROFILE OF CLUSTER FRONT LINE DEMONSTRATIONS (CFLDs) BENEFICIARY AND NON-BENEFICIARY FARMERS IN CHITTOOR DISTRICT OF ANDHRA PRADESH

A. NIKHITHA, P. BALA HUSSAIN REDDY, V. SAILAJA AND Y. REDDI RAMU

Department of Agricultural Extension, S.V. Agricultural College, ANGRAU, Tirupati

Date of Receipt: 27-03-2021 Date of Acceptance: 01-06-2021

ABSTRACT

The present study was carried out to know the profile of CFLDs beneficiary and non-beneficiary farmers in Chittoor district of Andhra Pradesh over a randomly drawn sample of 120 respondents. The results revealed that majority of the CFLDs beneficiary farmers were in middle age (58.33%), completed high school education (35.00%), small farmers (46.67%), medium level of farming experience (70.00%), medium training undergone (66.67%), had medium level of extension contact (60.00%), medium level of mass media exposure (50.00%), medium social participation (60.00%), medium level of innovativeness (65.00%), high level of scientific orientation (41.67%), high management orientation (50.00%), medium level of economic orientation (65.00%), medium level of risk orientation (63.33%) and medium level of achievement motivation (63.33%). Whereas in case of CFLDs non-beneficiary farmers majority were in middle age (50.00%), completed primary school education (26.67%), marginal farmers (50.00%), medium level of farming experience (60.00%), low training undergone (43.33%), had medium level of extension contact (43.33%), low level of mass media exposure (45.00%), low social participation(63.33%), medium level of innovativeness (50.00%), low level of scientific orientation (40.00%), medium management orientation(41.67%), medium level of economic orientation (53.33%), medium risk orientation (56.67%) and medium level of achievement motivation (50.00%)

KEYWORDS: Profile, Cluster Front Line demonstrations (CFLDs), beneficiary and non-beneficiary farmers.

INTRODUCTION

Krishi Vigyan Kendra, a district level front-line extension system, plays a critical role in technology assessment and refinement and conduct large scale demonstrations on successful technologies to convince the farming community and increase adoption. In order to enlarge the production and productivity of oilseed crops in the country, Ministry of Agriculture and Farmers' Welfare, Government of India sanctioned a project on "Cluster Frontline Demonstrations of Oilseeds in 2017-18" under National Mission on Oilseeds and Oil Palm (NMOOP) implemented through eleven ICAR-Agricultural Technology Application Research Institutes (ATARI) all over India. KVKs were assigned to conduct Cluster Front Line Demonstrations (CFLD's) under NFSM, for demonstrating the production potential of newly released technologies on the farmer's fields at different locations in a given farming system and organize farming and extension activities for farmer and extension workers for diffusion of various technologies. They are conducted under the supervision of scientists of Krishi Vigyan Kendras, SAUs, and Regional Agricultural Research Stations.

MATERIAL AND METHODS

The study was conducted by following *Ex post facto* research design to assess the profile of CFLDs beneficiaries as well as non-beneficiaries in Chittoor district of Andhra Pradesh. Two KVKs operating in chittoor district were selected purposively for the study. Out of 66 mandals in Chittoor district, two mandals adopted by each KVK were selected purposively for the study. From each of the selected mandals three villages were selected by purposive sampling technique, thus making a total of six villages. From each of the selected villages, ten CFLD beneficiary and ten non-beneficiary farmers were selected by following simple random sampling procedure, thus making a total of 120 respondents. After going through review of literature and consultation with experts as set of 14 personal, psychological and socio-economic variables were selected. The data was collected through a structured comprehensive interview schedule and analyzed using mean standard deviation, frequencies and percentages for drawing meaningful interpretations.

*Corresponding author, E-mail: anagallunikhitha@gmail.com

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The beneficiaries and non-beneficiaries farmers of CFLDs were distributed into different categories based on their selected profile characteristics and the results were presented in the table 1.

Age

More than half (58.33%) of the CFLDs beneficiary farmers were middle aged followed by old age (26.67%) and young age (15.00%) groups. Whereas in case of CFLDs non-beneficiary farmers half (50.00%) were middle aged followed by old (30.00%) and young age (20.00%) groups. From above findings it is clear that the majority of CFLDs beneficiary farmers as well as non-beneficiaries were in the middle age groups. The probable reasons might be that young farmers showed less interest in farming and they are more interested in non-agricultural pursuits, while older farmers were moving away from farming and given their land holdings for lease to other farmers. This finding was similar to the findings of Borole (2010) and Babu (2016)

Education

More than one-third (35.00%) of the CFLDs beneficiary farmers were educated up to high school followed by middle school (28.33%), graduate (13.33%), primary school (10.00%), illiterate (6.67%), can read and write (5.00%), and can read only (1.67%). Whereas, in case of CFLDs non-beneficiary farmers 26.67 per cent were educated up to primary school level, followed by middle school (23.33%), high school (20.00%), illiterate (16.67%), can read and write (8.33%), graduate (3.33%) and can read only (1.67%). This might be because majority of the CFLDs beneficiary farmers as well as CFLD non-beneficiary farmers were literates having education from primary school to graduation.It is a universal truth that education is critical in moulding and bringing about desired changes in human behavior. Educated farmers had better access to all types of communication media and had more information seeking tendencies. Because most of the farmers were educated, they were able to learn about new agriculture technologies and modern methods and the messages sent by KVK scientists are well utilized by the beneficiaries. These findings are in tune with findings of Padmaiah *et al.* (2014) and yadav (2016).

Farm size

Nearly half (46.67 %) of the CFLDs beneficiary farmers possess small land holding followed by 20.00 per cent possess marginal land holding, 18.33 per cent possess semi-medium land holding, 11.67 per cent possess medium land holding and very few 3.33 per cent possess large holding. Whereas, in case of CFLDs non-beneficiary farmers half of them possess (50.00%) marginal land holding followed by 23.33 per cent possess small land holding, 16.67 per cent semi-medium land holding, 8.33 per cent possess medium land holding and very few 1.67 per cent possess large land holding. The possible reason might be due to the fact that majority of the farmers in Chittoor district fall under small and marginal land holding category.Hence above trend was noticed. This finding was in conformity with the findings of Kalyan (2011), Badhala (2012) and Yashashwini (2013).

Farming experience

Majority (70.00%) of CFLDs beneficiary farmers had medium level of farming experience followed by low (20.00%) and high (10.00%) levels of farming experience. Whereas, CFLDs non-beneficiary farmers more than half (60.00%) had medium level of farming experience followed by low (26.67%) and high (13.33%) levels of farming experience. This might be due to the fact that majority of them belonged to middle age followed by old age group. Younger generation has not chosen farming as a profession and it was continued by their parents only. Many farmers were engaged in agriculture after their education. Hence most of the CFLDs beneficiary farmers had medium farming experience. This result was in accordance with the results of Vohra (2016) and Deshmukh *et al* (2018).

Training Undergone

Majority (66.67 %) of the CFLDs beneficiary farmers had medium level of training followed by high (25.00%) and low (8.33%) levels of training. Whereas in case of CFLDs non-beneficiary farmers two-fifth (43.33%) had low level of training followed by medium (40.00%) and high (16.67%) levels of training. The probable reason might be due to the fact that during the demonstration season, KVKs provide seed to seed training programs to CFLD beneficiary farmers, assured that they acquired a thorough understanding of the production technology. Few farmers regularly attended KVK training programs because inputs were delivered under CFLDs and

Table 1. Distribution of CFLDs beneficiary and non-beneficiary farmers

S. No.	Variables	Category	CFLDs beneficiary farmers (n = 60)		CFLDS non-beneficiary farmers (n = 60)	
			Frequency (f)	Percentage (%)	Frequency (f)	Percentage (%)
1.	Age	Young age (<35 years)	9	15.00	12	20.00
		Middle age (36-55 years)	35	58.33	30	50.00
		Old age (>56 years)	16	26.67	18	30.00
		Mean		-		-
		S.D		-		-
2.	Education	Illiterate	4	6.67	10	16.67
		Can read only	1	1.67	1	1.67
		Can read and write	3	5.00	5	8.33
		Primary school	6	10.00	16	26.67
		Middle school	17	28.33	14	23.33
		High school	21	35.00	12	20.00
		Graduate	8	13.33	2	3.33
		Mean		-		-
		S.D		-		-
3.	Farm Size	Marginal land holding	12	20.00	30	50.00
		Small land holding	28	46.67	14	23.33
		Semi-medium land holding	11	18.33	10	16.67
		Medium land holding	7	11.67	5	8.33
		Large land holding	2	3.33	1	1.67
		Mean		-		-
		S.D		-		-
4.	Farming Experience	Low	12	20.00	16	26.67
		Medium	42	70.00	36	60.00
		High	6	10.00	8	13.33
		Mean		20.47		16.8
		S.D		7.16		5.4
5.	Training Undergone	Low	5	8.33	26	43.33
		Medium	40	66.67	24	40.00
		High	15	25.00	10	16.67
		Mean		3.70		1.00
		SD		1.48		0.90
6.	Extension Contact	Low	8	13.33	24	40.00
		Medium	36	60.00	26	43.33
		High	16	26.67	10	16.67
		Mean		31.10		20.2
		S.D		5.17		5.3
7.	Mass Media Exposure	Low	14	23.33	27	45.00
		Medium	30	50.00	22	36.67
		High	16	26.67	11	18.33
		Mean		10.07		8.8
		S.D		1.89		2.0
8.	Social Participation	Low	14	23.33	38	63.33
		Medium	36	60.00	21	35.00
		High	10	16.67	1	1.67
		Mean		2.00		1.2
		S.D		1.01		1.1
9.	Innovativeness	Low	3	5.00	21	35.00
		Medium	39	65.00	30	50.00
		High	18	30.00	9	15.00
		Mean		36.57		26.8
		S.D		2.75		7.0

Cont...

Table 1. Cont...

S. No.	Variables	Category	CFLDs beneficiary farmers (n = 60)		CFLDS non-beneficiary farmers (n = 60)	
			Frequency (f)	Percentage (%)	Frequency (f)	Percentage (%)
11.	Scientific Orientation	Low	14	23.33	24	40.00
		Medium	21	35.00	23	38.33
		High	25	41.67	13	21.67
		Mean	25.63		19.8	
		S.D	2.00		2.8	
12.	Management Orientation	Low	10	16.67	23	38.33
		Medium	20	33.33	25	41.67
		High	30	50.00	12	20.00
		Mean	73.13		64.3	
		S.D	6.25		4.3	
13.	Economic Orientation	Low	7	11.67	21	35.00
		Medium	39	65.00	32	53.33
		High	14	23.33	7	11.67
		Mean	20.30		16.5	
		S.D	2.95		2.5	
14.	Risk Orientation	Low	6	10.00	22	36.67
		Medium	38	63.33	34	56.67
		High	16	26.67	4	6.66
		Mean	20.50		17.5	
		S.D	3.81		2.1	
15.	Achievement Motivation	Low	4	6.67	22	36.67
		Medium	38	63.33	30	50
		High	18	30	8	13.33
		Mean	26.83		19.9	
		S.D	2.33		2.0	

supervised by KVK employees. As a result, majority of the beneficiary farmers belonged to medium to high training undergone categories. Similar findings were observed with the findings of Vishwakarma (2016).

Extension contact

About 60.00 per cent of the CFLDs beneficiary farmers had medium extension contact followed by high (26.67%) and low (13.33%) levels of extension contact. Regarding CFLDs non-beneficiary farmers (43.33%) had medium extension contact followed by low (40.00%) and high (16.67%) levels of extension contact. The feasible reason for this may be that most of CFLDs beneficiary farmers had frequent contact with KVK scientists for the implementation of the CFLDs. Farmers sought timely extension assistance from KVK scientists for their day-to-day farm operations in order to improve productivity using CFLDs. In case of non-beneficiary farmers they don't have much contact with the KVK scientists and others for accepting new technologies. As a result, this pattern was found with similar findings of Dhaneswar (2008).

Mass media exposure

About half (50.00%)of the CFLDs beneficiary farmers had medium level of mass media exposure followed by high (26.67%) and low (23.33%) levels of mass media exposure. Regarding CFLDs non-beneficiary farmers more than two-fifth (45.00%) had low level of mass media exposure followed by medium (36.67%) and high (18.33%) levels of mass media exposure This might be because CFLDs beneficiary farmers had more frequent contact with department officials or extension functionaries, and the intrinsic incentive elicited by these officials or

functionaries could have exposed them to various mass media channels, to obtain up-to-date information on new technologies than CFLDs non-beneficiary farmers. But in case of non-beneficiary farmers they did not receive any message from KVKs as they are not having contact with extension personnel's. Hence the above trend was noticed. This finding had drawn its support from the findings of Sharma *et al.* (2015).

Social participation

Majority (60.00 %) of the CFLDs beneficiary farmers had medium level of social participation followed by low (23.33%) and high (16.67%) levels of social participation. whereas in case of non-beneficiary farmers more than three-fifth (63.33%) had low level of social participation followed by medium (35.00%) and high (1.67%) levels of social participation. This might be that beneficiary farmers were more interested in engaging in many village activities because they were educated up to high school and KVK officials might have selected farmers who were members of various social organizations as they would have more exposure to various sources of information and influence on the fellow farmers. On the other hand, non-beneficiaries had a low level of social participation since they are marginal farmers with low economic status and poor education background, so they were not involved in engaging in social activities. This result was consistent with previous research of Kumar (2006).

Innovativeness

Majority (65.00%) of the CFLDs beneficiary farmers had medium level of innovativeness followed by (30.00%) high and (5.00%) low levels of innovativeness. Whereas in case of CFLDs non-beneficiary farmers half (50.00%) had medium level of innovativeness followed by (35.00%) low and (15.00%) high levels of innovativeness. The above pattern may be due to the fact that CFLDs tend to increase farmers' capacity to test new technologies or innovations in their own fields and evaluate findings and their relevance to specific circumstances. It assists farmers in learning new and creative cultivation technologies. The demonstrations, field days and other activities conducted by KVKs about new technologies, the farmers tried to gain a better understanding of the different practices in order to know the benefits and drawbacks before implementing them. These results were in confirmation with the findings of Gajanan (2019).

Scientific orientation

Nearly 41.67 per cent of the CFLDs beneficiary farmers had high level of scientific orientation followed by medium (35.00%) and low (23.33%) levels of scientific orientation. Regarding CFLDs non-beneficiary farmers 40.00 per cent had low level of scientific orientation followed by medium (38.33%) and high (21.67%) levels of scientific orientation. The possible reason might be that majority of CFLDs beneficiary farmers were found to be educated and had higher percentage of scientific orientation which is a positive sign and spoke on the interest of farmers to perceive things scientifically. Whereas in case of CFLDs non-beneficiary farmers most of the farmers were less educated and have low innovativeness they don't show much interest in the scientific technologies. The findings support the findings of Bapu (2017).

Management orientation

About half (50.00%) of CFLDs beneficiary farmers had high management orientation followed by medium (33.33%) and low (16.67%) levels of management orientation. Regarding non-beneficiary farmers more than two-fifth (41.67%) had medium management orientation followed by low (38.33%) and high (20.00%) levels of management orientation. The probable reason might be that the majority of CFLD's beneficiary farmers possess managerial skills, allowing them to effectively manage resources and produce the desired output of an activity. But non-beneficiary farmers face a difficult task in maximizing resource utilization in order to achieve their objectives because they lack proper guidance. The training programmes organized by KVKs have sensitized the farmers on resource conservation technologies which in turn developed maximum output from minimum resources than the non-beneficiary farmers. The results are in line with the findings of Siddeswari (2015).

Economic orientation

Majority (65.00%) of CFLDs beneficiary farmers had medium economic orientation followed by high (23.33%) and low (11.67%) levels of economic orientation. Whereas in case of non-beneficiary farmers more than two-fourth had (53.33%) medium level of economic orientation and low (35.00%) and high (11.67%) levels of economic orientation. The feasible reason might be that CFLDs were conducted under close supervision of scientists and it strengthens the capacity

of farmers to examine their production systems, identify their main constraints and come up with the best feasible solutions. By adding their own knowledge to existing information, farmers eventually identify and implement the most appropriate practices and technologies to their farming system and needs to become more productive, profitable and responsive to changing conditions.. Hence majority of CFLDs beneficiary farmers had medium to high economic orientation than non-beneficiary farmers. This result was in consistent with the findings of Sharma *et al.* (2015).

Risk orientation

Majority (63.33%) of the CFLDs beneficiary farmers had medium level of risk orientation followed by high (26.67 %) and low (10.00%) levels of risk orientation. Whereas in case of non-beneficiary farmers more than two-fourth (56.67 %) had medium level of risk orientation followed by low (36.67%) and high (06.66%) levels of risk orientation.This pattern of results may be attributed to the fact that in the case of CFLDs beneficiary farmers, the risk will be medium to high because they have medium innovativeness and show some anxiety in implementing new technologies, so the risk will be medium to high. Capacity building programmes organized by KVK had improved the risk orientation attribute of CFLDs beneficiary farmers with this motivation the CFLDs came forward to adopt new technologies of KVK in their farm hence, above trend was noticed. Non-beneficiary farmers, on the other hand, were mostly marginal farmers with low innovation, so they aren't interested in introducing new technologies and the risk is low for them. The results are backed up by the findings of Patel (2009).

Achievement Motivation

Majority (63.33%) of the CFLDs beneficiary farmers had medium level of achievement motivation followed by high (30.00%) and low (6.67%) levels of achievement motivation. In case of non-beneficiary farmers half (50.00%) had medium level of achievement motivation followed by low (36.67%) and high (13.33%) levels of achievement motivation. This might be that achievement motivation compels people to move ahead and accomplish their goals by emotionally motivating them to act on their active needs. Farmers' inner motivation to meet their objectives and goals may have increased as a result of their involvement in CFLDs. As a result, the pattern described above was observed. The results are in line with the research done by Siddeswari (2015).

CONCLUSION

The results revealed that majority of the CFLDs beneficiary farmers belonged to medium to high level of profile characteristics. Regarding non-beneficiary farmers majority belonged to low to medium level category with respect to most of the variables selected, hence there is immediate need to promote CFLDs in non-beneficiary farmers , focusing more on need of the CFLDs scheme by showing its distinctly superior results through demonstrations, organizing large scale field days in the fields of beneficiary farmers to orient them towards adoption of new technologies.

LITERATURE CITED

Babu, M.T. 2016. Impact of Andhra Pradesh Micro Irrigation project (APMIP) in Chittoor district of Andhra Pradesh. *M.Sc. (Ag.) Thesis.* Acharya N.G. Ranga Agriculrural University, Guntur.

Badhala, B.S. 2012. Impact of frontline demonstrations on adoption of groundnut production technologies by the farmers of Rajasthan. *M.Sc. (Ag.) Thesis.* Swami Keshwanand Rajasthan Agricultural University, Bikaner.

Bapu, A.J. 2017. Impact of crop pest surveillance and advisory project on beneficiary farmers. *M.Sc. (Ag.) Thesis.* Dr. Panjabrao Deshmukh Krishi Vidyapeeth Krishinagar , Akola.

Borole, P.Y. 2010. Attitude of demonstrated paddy growers towards SRI technique of paddy crop. *M.Sc. (Ag.) Thesis.* Anand Agriculture University, Gujarat.

Deshmukh, S.K., Tekale, V.S., Bhople, P.P and Rathod, M.K. 2018. Impact of frontline demonstration of soyabean conducted by KVK in Washim districts. Dr. Panjabrao Deshmukh Krishi Vidyapeeth Krishinagar, Akola.

Dhaneswar, S. 2008. Impact of krishi vigyan Kendra, Devataj on the farmers of Anand district. *M.Sc. (Ag.) Thesis*. Anand Agricultural University, Gujarat.

Gajanan, B.M. 2019. Impact of linseed demonstrations on the beneficiary Farmers. *M.Sc. (Ag.) Thesis*. Dr. Panjabrao Deshmukh Krishi Vidyapeeth Krishinagar, Akola.

Kalyan, N. 2011. Impact analysis of groundnut production technologies in Chittoor District of Andhra Pradesh. *M.Sc. (Ag.) Thesis.* Acharya N.G. Ranga Agricultural University, Hyderabad.

Kumar, K. 2006. Swarn Jayanthi Gram Swarojagar Yojna (SGSY) on beneficiaries in relation to income and employment generation in Panagar Block, Jabalpur. *M.Sc. (Ag.). Thesis.* Jawaharlal Nehru Krishi Vishwa Vidyalaya, Jabalpur.

Padmaiah, M., Kumar, G., Sarada, C and Reddy, R.K. 2014. Frontline demonstrations in Chhindwara district of Madhya Pradesh: an impact analysis. *Journal of Oilseeds Research.* 31(2): 155-158.

Patel, M.C. 2009. Results of the research study on measuring the scientific orientation in Agriculture and allied fields. *M.Sc. (Ag.) Thesis* Anand Agricultural University, Gujarat.

Siddeswari, G.K. 2015. Impact of Farmers Field Schools (FFS) on the rice farmers in Nellore district of Andhra Pradesh. *M.Sc. (Ag.) Thesis.* Acharya N.G Ranga Agricultural University Rajendranagar, Hyderabad.

Sharma, V., Kumar, V., Sharma, S.C., Singh, S and Khokhar, A. 2015. Popularization of improved production technologies in oil seed crops through frontline demonstrations under rainfed conditions in Punjab. *Indian Journal of Ecol*ogy. *43*(1): 58-64.

Vishwakarma, S. 2016. Impact of FLDs of beneficiaries farmers in context with durum wheat cultivation in Indore district of Madhya Pradesh . *M.Sc. (Ag.) Thesis*. Rajmata vijayaraje Scindia Krishi Vishwa Vidyalaya. Indore, Madhya Pradesh.

Vohra, P.N. 2016. Attitude of farmers towards Krishi Vigyan Kendra, Navasari of South Gujarat. *M.Sc. (Ag.). Thesis*. Navasari Agricultural University, Navasari.

Yadav, S. 2016. Impact of Front Line Demonstration (FLDs) of krishi vigyan kendra on adoption behavior of soyabean cultivators of rewa block of district Rewa Madhya Pradesh. *M.Sc. (Ag.) Thesis.* Jawaharlal Nehru Krishi Vishwa Vidyalaya, Jabalpur.

Yashashwini, M.A. 2013. Effectiveness of frontline demonstrations of krishi vigyan kendra on FLD farmers of Mandya District. *M.Sc. (Ag.) Thesis.* University of Agricultural Sciences GKVK, Bengaluru.