Andhra Pradesh J Agril. Sci : 12(3): 281-286, 2026

PROFILE CHARACTERISTICS OF ANNADATHA SUKHIBHAVA SCHEME FARMERS IN ANANTHAPURAMU DISTRICT OF ANDHRA PRADESH

S. VIKSHITHA*, M. SATHISH RAHUL, T. LAKSHMI AND A. V. NAGAVANI

Department of Agricultural Extension Education, ANGRAU-S.V. Agricultural College, Tirupati-517 502.

Date of Receipt: 19-08-2026 Date of Acceptance: 30-09-2026

ABSTRACT

The present study was conducted in Ananthapuramu district of Andhra Pradesh with a sample of 120 beneficiaries of Annadatha Sukhibhava scheme selected through random sampling. The findings revealed that a majority of the beneficiaries belonged to the middle-aged category (53.33%), had high school education (29.17%), medium landholding (44.16%), medium farming experience (65.83%), medium annual income (43.33%), medium extension contact (60.83%), medium social participation (65.00%), medium achievement motivation (67.50%), medium economic motivation (80.00%), medium credit orientation (50.83%) and medium awareness regarding government schemes (75.83%).

KEYWORDS: Annadatha Sukhibhava Scheme, PM- KISAN, farmer welfare.

INTRODUCTION

The Annadatha Sukhibhava Scheme was a farmer welfare and income support programme implemented by the Government of Andhra Pradesh to provide financial assistance to farmers. The scheme was originally introduced in 2019 and was later continued as YSR Rythu Bharosa–PM KISAN (https://pmkisan.gov.in/PM kissan). In 2025, it was relaunched as Annadatha Sukhibhava with enhanced financial support. Under the scheme, eligible farmer families receive ₹20,000 annually, including ₹14,000 from the State Government and ₹6,000 under PM-KISAN. The assistance was provided through Direct Benefit Transfer (DBT) in instalments to help farmers meet cultivation expenses, purchase quality inputs, reduce dependence on non-institutional credit and improve agricultural productivity and livelihood security. Annadatha Sukhibhava Scheme (https://annadathasukhibhava.ap.gov.in/). Profile characteristics play a significant role in understanding the socio-economic background of farmers benefiting from the Annadatha Sukhibhava Scheme. These characteristics include age, education, landholding, annual income, farming experience and extension contact, which help describe the beneficiaries and their farming circumstances. Studying these attributes provides insights into the diversity of farmers, their resource availability and their information needs. It also helps assess the representation of different categories of farmers among the beneficiaries and provides a basis for interpreting their experiences with the scheme. Understanding farmers' profile characteristics is therefore essential for developing appropriate extension strategies and improving the implementation of farmer welfare programmes.

MATERIAL AND METHODS

The study followed an ex-post facto research design to analyse the profile characteristics of the Annadatha Sukhibhava Scheme farmers Ananthapuramu district of Andhra Pradesh which was purposively selected. Three mandals, namely, Peddapappur, Gooty and Bukkaraya Samudram, were selected purposively and two villages from each mandal were chosen randomly making a total of six villages. Beneficiaries were selected from the identified villages using a random sampling procedure, resulting in a sample size of 120 respondents. Based on a literature review and expert input, 11 variables were selected for the study. Data were collected through a structured interview schedule and analyzed using frequency, percentage, mean and standard deviation for interpretation.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The farmers were distributed into different categories based on their selected profile characteristics and the results were presented in the Table 1.

Age

The results from Table 1 revealed that half of the of Annadatha Sukhibhava Scheme beneficiary farmers belonged to the middle aged (53.33%) followed by old

*Corresponding author, E-mail: vikshithanani123@gmail.com

(35.00%) and young (11.67%) age. The predominance of middle-aged and older farmers indicated that the beneficiary group largely comprised farmers with established roles in agricultural activities and household management. The comparatively lower proportion of young farmers highlighted the need to encourage greater participation of younger individuals in agriculture and related extension programmes. This finding was in conformity with Nagesh (2019).

Education

The findings from Table 1 showed that 29.17 per cent had education up to high school level followed by middle (20.83%) school, college (17.50%) level education, those who could read and write (11.67%), primary education and could read only (7.50% each) and (5.83%) were illiterate. The distribution indicated that the respondents had varied educational backgrounds, with high school education being the most common. Extension programmes should therefore use clear, accessible communication methods, combining written information with verbal explanations to address the needs of farmers with different educational levels. This finding was in conformity with Choudhary (2021).

Land holding

The results furnished in Table 1 stated that, more than one-third 44.16 per cent beneficiaries belonged to the medium land holding category followed by (29.17%) semi medium farmers, (20.00%) were small farmers, (5.00%) were large farmer and only 1.67 per cent were marginal farmers. The predominance of medium and semi-medium landholders indicated that these categories formed a substantial share of the respondents. Differences in landholding size may be associated with variations in cultivation expenditure and the scale of farming operations. The result was in accordance with the finding of Hani *et al.* (2022).

Farming experience

The results from Table 1 revealed that, majority (65.83%) beneficiaries belonged to the medium farming experience category followed by (18.34%) high farming experience and (15.83%) low farming experience. The predominance of medium-experience farmers suggested that most respondents had accumulated considerable practical experience in agricultural activities. Such experience can be useful in farm management and decision-making; however, continued extension support remains important for improving awareness of new agricultural practices and government programmes. This finding was in conformity with Adhikari *et al.* (2021).

Annual income

From the Table 1, it can be inferred that, 43.33 per cent of the beneficiaries belonged to the medium annual income category followed by (16.67%) high annual income category, (15.83%) low annual income category, (12.50%) very low annual income category and (11.67%) fell under the very high annual income category. The predominance of the medium-income category indicated that this was the most common income group among the surveyed beneficiaries. Nevertheless, the presence of farmers across all five income categories demonstrated variation in their economic circumstances. This variation highlights the importance of timely financial assistance and accessible extension services to help farmers manage cultivation expenses according to their individual needs. The results were in line with the findings of Reddy (2026).

Extension Contact

The findings on extension contact from Table 1 projected that, 60.83 per cent of the beneficiaries belonged to the medium extension contact category followed by (20.00%) high extension contact and (19.17%) low extension contact. Most respondents had a moderate level of interaction with extension personnel and related information sources. However, the proportion with low extension contact suggested that some farmers might have limited opportunities to obtain timely agricultural information. Strengthening village-level extension activities and regular communication with farmers could help improve access to information about agricultural practices and welfare programmes. The result was in accordance with the finding Hani *et al.* (2022).

Social participation

It could be understood from the Table 1 that, 65.00 per cent of the beneficiaries belonged to the medium category followed by (20.00%) high social participation and (15.00%) low social participation category. The predominance of medium social participation suggested that most respondents had some level of involvement in social organisations or community activities. Such participation may provide opportunities for information

Table 1. Distribution of Annadatha Sukhibhava scheme farmers according to their profile (n=120)

S. No.	Category	Frequency (f)	Percentage (%)
1.	**Age**		
1	Young age (35 years and below)	14	11.67
2	Middle age (36 to 55 years)	64	53.33
3	Old age (56 years and above)	42	35.00
	Total	**120**	**100.00**
2.	**Education**		
1	Illiterate	70	05.83
2	Can read only	09	07.50
3	Can read and write	14	11.67
4	Primary	09	07.50
5	Middle	25	20.83
6	High school	35	29.17
7	College level	21	17.50
	Total	**120**	**100.00**
3.	**Land holding**		
1	Marginal (Up to 2.5 acres)	02	01.67
2	Small (2.5 to 5 acres)	24	20.00
3	Semi medium (5 to 7.5 acres)	35	29.17
4	Medium (7.5 to 10 acres)	53	44.16
5	Large (>10 acres)	06	05.00
	Total	**120**	**100.00**
4.	**Farming experience**		
1	Low farming experience	19	15.83
2	Medium farming experience	79	65.83
3	High farming experience	22	18.34
	Total	**120**	**100.00**
			Mean= 24.36; SD= 11.33
5.	**Annual income**		
1	Very high annual income (above 2,00,000/-)	14	11.67
2	High annual income (1,50,001/- to 2,00,000/-)	20	16.67
3	Medium annual income (1,00,001/- to 1,50,000/-)	52	43.33
4	Low annual income (50,001/- to 1,00,000/-)	19	15.83
5	Very low annual income (Up to 50,000/-)	15	12.5
	Total	**120**	**100.00**
6.	**Extension contact**		
1	Low extension contact	23	19.17
2	Medium extension contact	73	60.83
	High extension contact	24	20.00
	Total	**120**	**100.00**
			Mean= 37.98; SD= 4.60

Cont...

Table 1. Distribution of Annadatha Sukhibhava scheme farmers according to their profile (n=120)

S. No.	Category	Frequency (f)	Percentage (%)
1.	**Social participation**		
1	Low social participation	18	15.00
2	Medium social participation	78	65.00
3	High social participation	24	20.00
	Total	**120**	**100.00**
			Mean= 11.98; SD= 2.62
2.	**Achievement motivation**		
1	Low achievement Motivation	20	16.67
2	Medium achievement Motivation	81	67.50
3	High achievement Motivation	19	15.83
	Total	**120**	**100.00**
			Mean= 19.05; SD= 1.88
3.	**Economic motivation**		
1	Low economic motivation	08	06.67
2	Medium economic motivation	96	80.00
3	High economic motivation	16	13.33
	Total	**120**	**100.00**
			Mean= 23.11; SD= 2.24
4.	**Credit orientation**		
1	Low credit orientation	24	20.00
2	Medium credit orientation	61	50.83
3	High credit orientation	35	29.17
	Total	**120**	**100.00**
			Mean= 3.08; SD= 0.71
5.	**Awareness on government schemes**		
1	Low awareness on government schemes	10	8.33
2	Medium awareness on government schemes	91	75.83
3	High awareness on government schemes	19	15.84
	Total	**120**	**100.00**
			Mean= 8.46; SD= 1.61

exchange and collective learning among farmers. Encouraging participation in farmer groups, self-help groups and other relevant community organisations may further strengthen communication and awareness regarding agricultural support programmes. This finding was in conformity with Dhulgand (2020).

Achievement motivation

It could be concluded from the Table 1 that, majority (67.50%) of the beneficiaries belonged to the medium achievement motivation category followed by (16.67%) low achievement motivation category and (15.83%) high achievement motivation category. The predominance of medium achievement motivation suggested that most respondents demonstrated a moderate orientation towards achieving farming-related goals. Extension programmes that promote goal setting, exposure to successful farming practices and interaction with progressive farmers may help strengthen farmers' motivation to improve their agricultural performance. The result was in accordance with the finding Thakur *et al.* (2022).

Economic motivation

It could be observed from Table 1 that, majority (80.00%) of the beneficiaries belonged to the medium economic motivation followed by (13.33%) high and (6.67%) low economic motivation category. This distribution indicated that most beneficiary farmers demonstrated a moderate orientation towards improving their economic position through farming. Timely access to agricultural information, suitable technologies and financial support may help farmers make informed decisions regarding input use, farm investment and income improvement. The result was in accordance with the findings of Dhulgand (2020).

Credit Orientation

From the Table 1 it could be interpreted that, more than half (50.83%) of the beneficiaries belonged to the medium credit orientation category followed by the high credit orientation category (29.17%) and low credit orientation category (20.00%). This highlights the importance of providing information about institutional credit facilities, loan procedures and responsible credit management. Better access to appropriate credit information may help farmers make informed financial decisions and manage cultivation-related expenditure. The findings of the present study were similar to that of Sreedaya and Suresh (2022).

Awareness on Government Schemes

The findings from the Table 1 showed that, Majority (75.83%) of the beneficiaries belonged to the medium awareness category followed by (15.84%) high and (8.33%) low awareness category. The predominance of medium awareness suggested that most beneficiary farmers possessed a moderate level of knowledge about government support programmes. However, the presence of farmers in the low-awareness category indicated a need for continued awareness-building activities. Regular village-level meetings, farmer-oriented information materials and direct communication through extension personnel could help farmers understand scheme provisions, eligibility requirements and application procedures. The findings of the present study were similar to that of Singh and Rathore (2023).

The present study conducted in Ananthapuramu district of Andhra Pradesh revealed that the beneficiary farmers of the Annadatha Sukhibhava Scheme were predominantly middle-aged, had high school education, possessed medium landholdings and had medium farming experience. Most respondents belonged to the medium annual income, extension contact, social participation, achievement motivation, economic motivation, credit orientation and awareness of government schemes categories. These findings highlighted the diverse socio-economic and psychological characteristics of the beneficiary farmers. The profile information can serve as a useful basis for planning farmer-oriented extension programmes and improving communication regarding agricultural welfare schemes. Greater attention to farmers' educational backgrounds, information needs and awareness levels may help extension agencies provide more accessible and appropriate services to different categories of beneficiaries.

LITERATURE CITED

Adhikari, B., Prasad, S.V., Praveena, P.L.R.J., Sagar, G.K and Ravindra Reddy, B. 2021. Socio-personal and communication characteristics of Pradhan Mantri Krishi Sinchayee Yojana (PMKSY) in Uttarkhand. *Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics and Sociology.* 39 (11): 11-19.

Annadatha Sukhibhava Scheme. Retrieved from https://annadathasukhibhava.ap.gov.in/

Choudhary, S. 2021. A study on repayment behaviour of beneficiary farmers among Kisan Credit Card scheme in Dewas district, Madhya Pradesh. *M.Sc. (Ag.) Thesis*. Rajmata Vijayaraje Scindia Krishi Vishwa Vidyalaya, Gwalior.

Dhulgand, V.G. 2020. Socio-economic impact of Mahatma Gandhi National Rural Employment Guarantee Act (MGNREGA) on its beneficiaries in Marathwada region. *M. Sc. (Ag.) Thesis*. Vasantrao Naik Marthwada Krishi Vidyapeeth, Parbhani.

Hani, U., Raju, R., Moorthy, G and Nagesha, G. 2022. Attitude of farmers on Pradhan Mantri Fasal Bima Yojana (PMFBY) in Tumkur district of Karnataka. *Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics and Sociology.* 40(2): 93-99.

Nagesh, H. 2019. A critical study on Pradhan Mantri Fasal Bima Yojana (PMFBY) in Srikakulam district of Andhra Pradesh. *M.Sc. (Ag.) Thesis.* Acharya N. G. Ranga Agricultural University, Guntur.

PM Kisan Retrieved from https://pmkisan.gov.in/

Reddy, M. V. 2026. Association between PM-KISAN and Rythu Bharosa schemes fund utilization and indebtedness among marginal and small paddy farmers. *EPRA International Journal of Agriculture and Rural Economic Research.* 14(1): 36-44.

Singh, M. and Rathore, R. 2023. Agricultural schemes in India: A review. *Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics and Sociology.* 41 (9): 730-736.

Sreedaya, G.S and Suresh, N. 2022. Perception of farmers towards crop insurance schemes in Kerala, India. *Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics and Sociology.* 40 (1): 437-447.

Thakur, D., Pathak, K.N., Minakshimeshram and Vidhimotiwale. 2020. Profile of beneficiaries rural women under KVK in Madhya Pradesh. *International Journal of Current Microbiology and Applied Sciences.* 9(10): 3535-3541.