P-ISSN: 2618-0723
E-ISSN: 2618-0731

NAAS Rating (2025): 5.04
www.extensionjournal.com

International Journal of Agriculture Extension and Social Development

Volume 8; Issue 9; September 2025; Page No. 93-97

Received: 19-06-2025
Accepted: 21-07-2025

Indexed Journal
Peer Reviewed Journal

Profile characteristics of beneficiaries and non beneficiary farmers of Cluster Frontline Demonstrations (CFLDs) on oilseeds in Telangana State

[1]B Akanksha, [2]P Prashanth, [3]V Ravinder Naik and [4]K Krishna Reddy

[1]PG Scholar, Department of Agricultural Extension Education, College of Agriculture, Rajendranagar, Hyderabad, Telangana, India

[2]Assistant Professor, Department of Agricultural Extension Education, Agriculture College, Palem, Telangana, India

[3]Professor and Head, Department of Agricultural Extension Education, College of Agriculture, Rajendranagar, Hyderabad, Telangana, India

[4]Director (ICT), Department of Agricultural Economics, National Institute of Agricultural Extension Management, Hyderabad, Telangana, India

DOI: https://www.doi.org/10.33545/26180723.2025.v8.i9b.2379

Corresponding Author: B Akanksha

Abstract

The present study was conducted in Nagarkurnool and Wanaparthy districts of Telangana state to study profile characteristics of Cluster Frontline Demonstrations (CFLDs) on oilseeds beneficiary and non-beneficiaries in Telangana State. Sixty beneficiaries and sixty non beneficiaries a total of 120 respondents were selected for the study. Ex-post facto research design was used for the present study. It was found that majority of the beneficiaries fell under middle age (53.33%), had primary level of education (36.66%), small land holdings (43.33), medium farming experience (53.33%), lower middle farm income (48.33%), medium resource availability (55.00%), medium social participation (63.33%), medium mass media exposure (58.33%), medium cosmopoliteness (63.33%), medium trainings received (56.66%), medium risk taking ability (56.66%), medium economic motivation (50.00%) and medium achievement motivation (53.33%). Majority of non-beneficiaries fell under medium age (48.33%), had primary level of education (31.66%), small land holdings (40.00%), medium farming experience (50.00%), lower middle income (55.00%), medium resource availability (43.33%), medium social participation (41.66%), medium mass media exposure (48.33%), medium cosmopoliteness (48.33%), low trainings received (50.00%), medium risk taking ability (46.66%), medium economic motivation (45.00%) and medium achievement motivation (48.33%).

Keywords: Profile characteristics, Cluster Frontline Demonstrations (CFLDs), oilseeds, beneficiaries, non-beneficiaries

1. Introduction

Agriculture is the most crucial sector in the Indian economy, it contributes a significant portion to our national income. The agriculture sector provides essential livelihood support to about 42 per cent of the Indian population, highlighting its critical role in the economy and society (IBEF, 2023) [1]. Oilseed crops are the second most important determinant of agricultural economy, next to cereals within the segment of field crops. It has 20.80% of total area under cultivation globally, accounting for 10.00% of global production (IBEF, 2023) [1]. To increase area, production and productivity of oilseeds crops in India, the Department of Agriculture and Farmers Welfare (DA&FW) initiated Cluster Frontline Demonstrations of Oilseeds during 2015-16 under National Mission on Oilseeds and Oil pam (NMOOP) project in cooperation with Directorate of Extension, ICAR, New Delhi, continued till 2017-18. The project was implemented by Agricultural Technology Application Research Institutes (ATARI) all over India through KVKs to enhance the oilseed production in the country. NMOOP scheme has merged with revamped National Food Security Mission (NFSM) (Mamgai *et al.*, 2018) [4].

2. Materials and Methods

In the study *Ex-post facto* research design was adopted. Two KVKs *i.e.*, KVK Palem and KVK Madanapuram, which are conducting CFLDs on oilseeds in larger area in the crops like groundnut and castor was selected for the study. The CFLDs pertaining to oilseed crops *i.e.*, Groundnut and Castor was selected for the study. Two (2) districts *i.e.*, Nagarkurnool and Wanaparthy which are covering the highest areas under selected oilseed crops were selected for the study. A total of two (2) mandals were taken from each district, three (3) villages were selected from each mandal making total of six villages through stratified random sampling for the study. Sixty (60) beneficiary who are adopting and sixty (60) non-beneficiary farmers who are not adopting the CFLDs from selected KVKs were chosen for the study. Data was collected from the respondents using pre-tested interview scheduled by personal interview method by the researcher.

3. Results and Discussion

The profile characteristics *viz*. Age, Education, Size of land holding, Farming Experience, Annual income, Resource availability, Social participation, Mass media exposure, Cosmopoliteness, Trainings received, Risk taking ability, Economic motivation and Achievement motivation were taken as independent variables. The details of profile characteristics of CFLD beneficiary and non-beneficiary farmers of Telangana state were presented in Table 1.

3.1 Age: From the Table 1 it was found that majority (53.33%) of beneficiaries belonged to middle age, followed by old age (25.00%) and young age (21.67%). Among non-beneficiaries majority (48.33%) belonged to middle age followed by old age (28.34%) and young age (23.33%). Hence from the results it could be concluded that majority of the beneficiary and non-beneficiary farmers belonged to middle age group. The above findings were in accordance with studies of Malviya (2022) [3] and Shrivastava *et al.* (2022) [8].

3.2 Education: It could be observed from Table 1 that, majority of the beneficiary farmers were educated up to primary school level (36.66%) followed by middle school (20.00%), high school (16.67%), Intermediate (8.33%), Under Graduation (6.67%), Illiterate(6.67%) and Post graduate and above (5.00%) whereas, the majority of the non-beneficiary were educated up to primary school (31.66%), followed by middle school (21.67%), illiterate (16.67%), High school (13.33%), Intermediate (8.33%), Under graduation (5.00%) and Post graduate and above (3.34%).Therefore, from the above results it could be concluded that majority of the beneficiary and non-beneficiary farmers were educated up to primary school level. The reason is due to absence of enough formal education institutions and discontinuance of education at primary level.

3.3 Size of Land holdings: It could be seen from Table 1 that, majority of the beneficiary farmers had small land holdings (43.33%), followed by marginal (23.34%), semi medium (18.33%), medium (10.00%) and large size land holding (5.00%). Whereas in case of non-beneficiary farmers majority had small land holdings (40.00%), marginal (26.66%), semi medium (21.67%), medium (8.33%) and large size land holding (3.34%). Therefore, from the above results it could be concluded that majority of the beneficiary and non-beneficiary farmers had small size of land holdings. The reason might be due to fragmentation of land from generation to generation leading to sub division of land to smaller size of land holding. The above findings were in accordance with the studies of Parry (2017) [5] and Vamshi (2022) [10].

3.4 Farming Experience: It can be observed from Table 1 that, majority of the beneficiaries had medium (53.33%) farming experience, followed by low (25.00%) and high (21.67%). Whereas in case of non-beneficiaries majority had medium (50.00%) farming experience followed by low (26.67%) and high (23.33%) level of farming experience. Therefore, from the above results it could be concluded that majority of the beneficiary and non-beneficiary farmers had medium level of farming experience. The reason might be most of the farmers started farming at a young age and continued it as their main occupation. Many had only up to primary level of education not pursuing higher education leading them to depend on agriculture, as a result they gained moderate experience over years. The above findings were in accordance with the studies of Parry (2017) [5] and Vamshi (2022) [10].

3.5 Annual Income: It is evident from Table 1 that, majority of the beneficiary farmers belonged to lower-middle level (48.33%) of annual income followed by upper-middle (41.67%), high (5.00%) and low (5.00%). Whereas in case of non-beneficiaries majority belonged to lower-middle level (55.00%) of annual income followed by upper-middle (35.00%), high (6.66%) and low (3.34%). Therefore, from the above results it could be concluded that majority of the beneficiary and non-beneficiary farmers belonged to lower-middle class. The reason might be many of the farmers depend mainly on farming for their livelihood and have small land holdings. Therefore, earnings are just enough to meet basic needs with little surplus.

3.6 Resource availability: It is evident from Table 1 that, majority of the beneficiaries had medium (55.00%) availability of resources, followed by high (28.33%) and low (16.67%) availability of resources. Whereas, in case of non-beneficiaries majority had medium (43.33%) availability of resources followed by low (41.67%) and high (15.00%) availability of resources. Therefore, the results indicate both beneficiaries and non-beneficiaries have medium availability of resources. The reason might be that most of them had access to some basic resources like seeds, fertilizers, water, and farm equipment, but not in abundance. Their average land size and income allowed them to manage farming with moderate inputs. Beneficiaries had a slight advantage than non-beneficiaries through the support from CFLDs. The above findings were in accordance with the study of Vamshi (2022) [10].

3.7 Social Participation: It can be observed from Table 1 that, majority of beneficiary farmers had medium (63.33%) level of social participation followed by high (26.67%) level and low (10.00%) level of social participation. Whereas, in case of non-beneficiaries majority had medium (41.66%) level of social participation followed by high (30.00%) and low (28.34%) level of social participation. Therefore, the results indicate both beneficiaries and non-beneficiaries have medium level of social participation. The possible reason might be that beneficiary farmers were more interested in participation of local activities and organizations as they were more educated and motivated by support of KVKs. This involvement helped them to develop better communication and social skills. But, in case of non-beneficiaries, the social participation is relatively less due to lower awareness and fewer opportunities. The above findings were in accordance with the studies of Jamandas (2022) [2], Shrivastava *et al.* (2022) [8] and Vamshi (2022) [10].

3.8 Mass media exposure: It was found from Table 1 that, majority of beneficiaries had medium (58.33%) level of mass media exposure followed by high (25.00%) and low

(16.67%) level of mass media exposure. Whereas in case of non-beneficiaries majority had medium (48.33%) level of mass media exposure followed by low (35.00%) and high (16.67%) level of mass media exposure. Therefore, the results indicate both beneficiaries and non-beneficiaries have medium level of mass media exposure. The possible reason might be beneficiaries had regular contact with KVKs also received timely updates through different sources like TV, newspapers and mobile advisory messages. The field visits and awareness programs arranged by KVKs helped beneficiaries stay informed about latest technologies. Whereas non-beneficiaries had a fewer opportunities to access such information due to lack of awareness. Activities like demonstrations and field visits helped to spread useful information to beneficiaries, especially when these were covered by media. The above findings were in accordance with the studies of Swami (2021) [9] and Shrivastava *et al.* (2022) [8].

3.9 Cosmopoliteness: It can be seen from Table 1 that, majority of beneficiaries had medium (63.33%) level of cosmopoliteness followed by high (28.34%) and low (8.33%) level of cosmopoliteness. Whereas in case of non-beneficiaries majority had medium (48.33%) level of cosmopoliteness followed by high (26.67%) and low (25.00%) level of cosmopoliteness. Therefore, the results indicate both beneficiaries and non-beneficiaries have medium level of cosmopoliteness. The reason might be many of them are middle-aged and had medium to high level of education and as they had actively taken part in meetings and training programs that helped them to attain medium level of cosmopoliteness. The above findings were in accordance with the study of Vamshi (2022) [10].

3.10 Trainings received: It could be observed from Table 1 that, majority of the beneficiaries had received medium (56.66%) level of training followed by high (30.00%) and low (13.34%) level of trainings received. Whereas, in case of non-beneficiaries majority had low (50.00%) level of training followed by medium (35.00%) and high (15.00%) level of trainings received. The reason might be beneficiaries are more aware about the training programme and also know the value of trainings, whereas in case of non- beneficiaries due to their lack of awareness and interest they might had no have undergone trainings and fall under low category. The above findings were in accordance with the study of Vamshi (2022) [10].

3.11 Risk taking ability: It is evident from Table 1 that, majority of beneficiary farmers had medium (56.66%) level of risk taking ability followed by high (30.00%) risk taking ability and low (13.34%) of risk taking ability. Whereas in case of non-beneficiaries majority had medium (46.66%) level of risk taking ability followed by low (38.34%) and high (15.00%) risk taking ability. Therefore, from the above results it could be inferred that majority of beneficiaries and non-beneficiaries had medium level of risk taking ability. The possible reason may be their age, farm size, educational status, farming experience all these were responsible for a person to take risk, develop strategies to reduce risk. Since, beneficiaries had more exposure, awareness compared to non-beneficiaries they had more risk taking ability. The above findings were in accordance with the study of Shrivastava *et al.* (2022) [8].

3.12 Economic motivation: It could be observed from Table 1 that, majority of the beneficiaries had medium (50.00%) level of economic motivation followed by high (35.00%) and low (15.00%) level of economic motivation. Whereas in case of non-beneficiaries majority had medium (45.00%) level of economic motivation followed by low (28.34%) and high (26.66%) level of economic motivation. Therefore, from the above results it could be inferred that majority of beneficiaries and non-beneficiaries had medium level of economic motivation. The possible reason might be as majority were having medium economic motivation that drive to earn and improve their financial status, they tend to show their motivation when they have opportunities to earn more from their produce. The above findings were in accordance with the studies of Rambhai (2022) [6] and Shrivastava *et al.* (2022) [8].

3.13 Achievement motivation: It is evident from Table 1 that, majority of the beneficiaries had medium (53.33%) level of achievement motivation followed by high (28.34%) and low (18.33%) level of achievement motivation. Whereas in case of non-beneficiaries majority had medium (48.33%) level of achievement motivation followed by low (30.00%) and high (21.67%) level of achievement motivation. Therefore, from the above results it could be inferred that majority of beneficiaries and non-beneficiaries had medium level of achievement motivation. The probable reason might be due to majority of beneficiaries through various source of information, exposure to new interventions drive their achievement motivation levels. Whereas, in case of non-beneficiaries due to lack confidence and motivating factors they cannot sustain long. The above findings were in accordance with the study of Shinde (2020) [7].

Table 1: Distribution of CFLD beneficiaries and non-beneficiaries based on their profile characteristics.

S. No	Characteristics	Beneficiaries (n=60)		Non-beneficiaries (n=60)	
		Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
1	**Age (years)**				
	Young age (up to 35)	13	21.67	14	23.33
	Middle age (36-45)	32	53.33	29	48.33
	Old age (>45 years)	15	25.00	17	28.34
2	**Education**				
	Illiterate	4	6.67	10	16.67
	Primary School (Up to 5th Class)	22	36.66	19	31.66
	Middle School (6th to 7th Class)	12	20.00	13	21.67
	High School (8, 9 and 10th Class)	10	16.67	8	13.33

	Intermediate	5	8.33	5	8.33
	Under Graduation	4	6.67	3	5.00
	Post Graduate / Above	3	5.00	2	3.34
3	**Size of Land holding**				
	Marginal (up to 1 ha)	14	23.34	16	26.66
	Small (1-2 ha)	26	43.33	24	40.00
	Semi medium (2-4 ha)	11	18.33	13	21.67
	Medium (4-10 ha)	6	10.00	5	8.33
	Large (>10 ha)	3	5.00	2	3.34
4	**Farming experience**				
	Low	15	25.00	16	26.67
	Medium	32	53.33	30	50.00
	High	13	21.67	14	23.33
5	**Annual income**				
	Low <Rs. 70,069	3	5.00	2	3.34
	Lower-middle Rs. 70,070- Rs. 2,73,009	29	48.33	33	55.00
	Upper-middle Rs. 2,73,100- Rs. 8,45,945	25	41.67	21	35.00
	High >Rs. 8,45,946	3	5.00	4	6.66
6	**Resource Availability**				
	Low	10	16.67	25	41.67
	Medium	33	55.00	26	43.33
	High	17	28.33	9	15.00
7	**Social Participation**				
	Low	6	10.00	17	28.34
	Medium	38	63.33	25	41.66
	High	16	26.67	18	30.00
8	**Mass media exposure**				
	Low	10	16.67	21	35.00
	Medium	35	58.33	29	48.33
	High	15	25.00	10	16.67
9	**Cosmopoliteness**				
	Low	5	8.33	15	25.00
	Medium	38	63.33	29	48.33
	High	17	28.34	16	26.67
10	**Trainings Received**				
	Low	8	13.34	30	50.00
	Medium	34	56.66	21	35.00
	High	18	30.00	9	15.00
11	**Risk taking ability**				
	Low	8	13.34	23	38.34
	Medium	34	56.66	28	46.66
	high	18	30.00	9	15.00
12	**Economic motivation**				
	Low	9	15.00	17	28.34
	Medium	30	50.00	27	45.00
	High	21	35.00	16	26.66
13	**Achievement motivation**				
	Low	11	18.33	18	30.00
	Medium	32	53.33	29	48.33
	High	17	28.34	13	21.67

4. Conclusion

The results revealed that majority of the CFLDs beneficiary and non-beneficiary farmers fell under medium category for most of the profile characteristics with respect to most of the variables selected. Majority were middle aged, primary level of education, small land holdings, medium farming experience, lower middle income, medium resource availability, medium social participation, medium mass media experience, medium cosmopoliteness, medium risk taking ability, medium economic motivation and medium achievement motivation. But in trainings received majority of beneficiaries fell under medium category and non-beneficiaries under low training received might be due to lack of awareness, exposure and knowledge. Hence, there should be an immediate need to focus on CFLDs scheme benefits and importance to non-beneficiaries by organizing large scale demonstrations, field days to orient farmers for adoption of these technologies.

References

1. IBEF. Economic-survey. 2023-24. Ministry of Commerce and Industry; 2023.
2. Jamandas D. Assessment of Horizontal Spread of Groundnut production technology disseminated through Krishi Vigyan Kendras. Junagadh Agricultural University; 2022.
3. Malviya N. Impact of FLDs on Socio economic Status of Soybean Growers in Sehore District of Madhya

Pradesh. Rajmata Vijayaraje Scindia Krishi Vishwa Vidyalaya; 2022.
4. Mamgai P, Sardana V, Murai AS, Bala A. Performance of cluster frontline demonstrations on Oilseeds in North India. ICAR-ATARI, Zone-1, Ludhiana, Punjab; 2019. p. 50.
5. Parry UDK. Impact Assessment of Front Line Demonstrations under Paddy in district Ganderbal of Kashmir Valley. Sher-e-Kashmir University of Agricultural Sciences and Technology of Kashmir; 2017.
6. Rambai KB. Impact of frontline demonstrations on Mustard growers in Banaskantha district. Sardarkrushinagar Dantiwada Agricultural University; 2022.
7. Shinde S. Farmers Perception and Adoption of Groundnut Production Technologies in Udipi District. University of Agricultural and Horticultural Sciences. Shivmogga; 2020.
8. Shrivastava S, Naberia S, Singh SRK. Profile of Cluster Frontline Demonstration Beneficiaries in Madhya Pradesh and Chhattisgarh State. Asian J Agric Ext Eco Sociol. 2022;40(11):472-7.
9. Swami S. Impact of Cluster Front Line Demonstrations on adoption of Groundnut production technologies organized by Krishi Vigyan Kendra (KVK) Bikaner, Rajasthan. Swami Keshwanand Rajasthan Agricultural University; 2021.
10. Vamshi M. A study on Socio-Economic Impact Assessment of Cluster Frontline Demonstrations in Pulses under National Food Security Mission in Telangana. Professor Jayashankar Telangana State Agricultural University; 2022.