Advances in Bioresearch
Adv. Biores., Vol 16 (3) May 2025: 51-57

Print ISSN 0976-4585; Online ISSN 2277-1573
Journal's URL:http://www.soeagra.com/abr.html
CODEN: ABRDC3
DOI: 10.15515/abr.0976-4585.16.3.5157

Advances in Bioresearch

ORIGINAL ARTICLE

Socio-Economic Impact of PM Kisan Samman Nidhi Scheme in Kanpur Dehat District of Uttar Pradesh State

Anurooddha Pratap Singh Yadav[1], K.K. Singh[1], Manish Kumar[2], A.N. Shukla[3], Avinash Pratap[1], Pushpendra Kumar[1]
[1]Department of Agricultural Economics, Acharya Narendra Deva University of Agriculture & Technology Kumarganj, Ayodhya, (U.P.) India
[2]Department of Agricultural Statistics, Acharya Narendra Deva University of Agriculture & Technology Kumarganj, Ayodhya, (U.P.) India
[3]Department of Agricultural Economics, B.N.P.G. College Rath, Hamirpur (U.P.) India
Corresponding Author: Anurooddha Pratap Singh Yadav[1]
Email: (yanurooddha@gmail.com)

ABSTRACT
PM Kisan Samman Nidhi Scheme has commenced on 1.12.2018 and its fund is 100% sponsored by the Central Government. Till the date 19th instalments has been transfers to the farmers through DBT and now has been total number of beneficiaries 9,88,42,900 and amount disbursed 22,270.45 Cr. The study was conducted year 2023-2024 has been carried out on the basis of primary data collected from the study area. the purposive cum random sampling design has been used for the selection of district, block, villages and respondents to investigate the socio-economic position of beneficiary farmers through PM Kisan Samman Nidhi Scheme. Rasulabad and Maitha blocks of Kanpur Dehat district have been chosen purposively, and arranged in descending order of beneficiaries of PM Kisan Samman Nidhi Scheme, two top ranking blocks had selected purposively. Three villages from each block i.e. a total of six villages were selected purposively based on the highest number of beneficiaries in the villages (www.pmkisan.gov.in). an understanding of the socio-economic status of the farmers as majority of the respondents were marginal and small farmers followed by medium and large, they were engaged in mainly farming, subsidiary occupation involving on farm, off farm and non-farm activities. As could be seen from the Table 1, most of the farmers were in junior high school educated 32% and among total number of farmers family with education up to secondary level was 80%. The average land holding size was maximum 4.63 ha in large farmers and has 2.78 ha in medium farmers Remaining 1.35 ha, 0.61 ha was in small and marginal farmers. The average cost of cultivation of the beneficiary farmers was Rs. 87747, while that same season were Rs. 98552 in marginal, Rs. 88860 in small, followed by Rs. 82960, Rs. 79534 costs in medium and large farmers respectively. the overall average gross income of the beneficiary was Rs. 118274 and net income was Rs.30531 similarly, in category size of sample farms the gross income of large farmers Rs. 124677 was maximum among the categories as well as net income Rs. 45143 was also highest followed by Rs. 32420, Rs. 24562, Rs. 21065 in medium, small and marginal farmers. PM-KISAN scheme provided the input and harvesting support to the all-sample farms. This might also defend them from deteriorating within side the clutches of moneylenders for meeting such charges and ensure their continuance in the farming activities. the above study summarizes the socio-economic position of a marginal, small, medium and large farmers and show reduction of financial distress in beneficiary farmers to certain extent and increase in returns from the use of distributed of PM Kisan scheme amount and through the scheme farmers improving their social and economic well-being.
Keywords: *Socio-Economics Status, Cost of Cultivation, Dimensions, Farmers, Agriculture*

Received 10.02.2025 Revised 21.03.2025 Accepted 11.04.2025

How to cite this article:
Anurooddha Pratap S Y, K.K. Singh, Manish Kumar, A.N. Shukla, Avinash Pratap, Pushpendra Kumar[1]. Socio-Economic Impact of Pm Kisan Samman Nidhi Scheme In Kanpur Dehat District Of Uttar Pradesh State. Adv. Biores., Vol 16 (3) May 2025: 51-57.

INTRODUCTION

In India, more than half of the farming households do not have access to formal credit, in such a situation, the introduction of a cash transfer scheme (Pradhan Mantri Kisan Samman Nidhi, PM-KISAN) in

December 2018 to ease liquidity constraints of farmers for procuring inputs is quite salient. Pradhan Mantri Kisan Samman Nidhi (PM-KISAN) provides income support to all landholding farmers' families in the country to supplement their financial needs for procuring various inputs related to agriculture and allied activities, as well as, domestic needs. The scheme enables as direct benefit transfer of 6000 per year is transferred in three instalments for every four months of 2000 each into the Aadhar ceded bank accounts for the eligible landholding farmers. PM-Kisan Samman Nidhi Yojana was announced on February 1, 2019. And Prime Minister launched PM-Kisan Samman Nidhi Yojana on February 24, 2019, in Gorakhpur. A landholding farmer's family under the scheme is defined as "a family comprising of husband, wife and minor children who owns cultivable land as per land records of the concerned State. the programme, PM-KISAN, is similar to other such schemes like the Rythu Bandhu of Telangana and Kaalia programmes of Odisha. Bhavantar Bhugtan Yojana in Madhya Pradesh sought to provide relief to farmers by providing the differential between MSPs and market prices [1, 2]. We found that the number of beneficiaries is highest in Uttar Pradesh. out of the total covered beneficiaries of the country under PM-Kisan Scheme, the UP is maximum beneficiary being of the country followed by Maharashtra, Madhya Pradesh, Bihar, Rajasthan, Gujarat and Andhra Pradesh respectively. The economy of Uttar Pradesh is based primarily on agriculture and around 65% of the total population is dependent on agriculture. Uttar Pradesh is the top producer of food grain in the country's total food production. The average holding size of agriculture in Uttar Pradesh is 0.76 hectare which is less than the national average of 1.5 hectares. The State produces all weather crops i.e., Rabi, Kharif and Zaid. Socio-economic status (SES) is a combined measurement of economic and social position of an individual or a group in relation to others in the society. It has a profound role in determining one's accessibility to the common resources, livelihood pattern, household food & nutritional security etc. It also guides the psychological and behavioural components of a sample viz. knowledge, attitude, perception, adoption, change- proneness, level of aspiration, risk bearing ability, economic motivation etc. under the scheme, for the first time the direct investment support received by the Uttar Pradesh beneficiaries of all districts was 1,11,93,799 farmers at the rate of 2000 per instalment during 2018-19 agriculture year to the beneficiary bank accounts, same time along with the entire country[2-5]. With good amount of cultivable area and irrigation facility in relative to other districts of Uttar Pradesh, Kanpur Dahat district had promising contribution to state agriculture growth with PM Kisan scheme adding enhancement to the beneficiary farmers. In overall terms, the scheme has been contributing to increased ability in terms of cost of cultivation, gross returns and net returns in comparison with that of beneficiaries to non-beneficiaries which was implying to the reduction of financial distress to certain extent. social and economic development is the main aim of rural development. specially to bring about sustained improvement in their livelihood through an increased income and access to social life.

MATERIAL AND METHODS

The present study year 2023-2024 has been carried out on the basis of primary data collected from the study area. the purposive cum random sampling design has been used for the selection of district, block, villages and respondents. Kanpur Dehat district of Uttar Pradesh was selected purposively considering the time and money construct of the investigation and awareness of about his.

a) Farmers in the District are progressive and early adopters of new schemes and advanced technology.
b) Kanpur District possesses good potential for Agriculture development resource endowment like fertile land and assured irrigation.
c) Large number of PM-Kisan beneficiaries is here and enterprise like Dairy, poultry, fisheries, beekeeping apart from crop cultivation are being practiced.
d) Villages in the district are well connected with the network of road transport.

Rasulabad and Maitha blocks of Kanpur Dehat district have been chosen purposively, and arranged in descending order of beneficiaries of PM Kisan Samman Nidhi Scheme, two top ranking blocks had selected purposively. Three villages from each block i.e. a total of six villages were selected purposively based on the highest number of beneficiaries in the villages (www.pmkisan.gov.in). The data from 60 beneficiaries was collected through an interview schedule. Different cost concepts, cost of cultivation, gross returns and net returns were estimated and tabular analysis was done to obtain the results and draw conclusions regarding the present study. A summary of them used in the present study is as follows:

Analytical tools: Suitable statistical tools will be applied for analysis of data. For tabular analysis percentage, average and weighted average will be applied.

Per cent: The frequency particular cell will be divided by the total number of respondents and multiplied by 100 to calculate the percentage.

Average: The simplest and important measure of average which has been used into statistical analysis will be average and weighted average. The formula used to estimate the average is:
Mean: It is computed by summing the values of all observations or items and by dividing the sum by total number of observations or items.
Weight Average: The weight average of values is the sum of weights times values divided by the sum of the weights.
Cost Concepts:
Cost A1: This cost includes value of hired human labour, owned and hired bullock labour, owned and hired machine labour, seeds, fertilizers, farmyard manure, plant protection chemicals, depreciation, land revenue and interest on working capital.
Cost A2: Cost A1 + rent paid on leased in land
Cost B1: Cost A1 + interest on owned fixed capital assets (excluding land)
Cost B2: Cost B1 + Rental value of owned land + Rent paid for leased-in land
Cost C1: Cost B1 + imputed value of family labour
Cost C2: Cost B2 + imputed value of family labour
Cost of cultivation is being calculated using Cost C2 which is comprehensive including both fixed as well as variable costs.
Returns: A number of income measures are used for estimation of return, Measures used in the present study is as follow.
Gross income: Value of farm output (main product and by product) whether sold or utilized by the farm family.
Net income: Difference between gross income and total cost, i.e. gross income minus cost C.

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

The present study to assessed the socio-economic status of beneficiary farmers.
Socio-economic conditions of respondents:
Two top ranking blocks had selected purposively and three villages from each block i.e. a total of six villages were selected purposively based on the highest number of beneficiaries in the villages. an understanding of the socio-economic status of the farmers as majority of the respondents were marginal and small farmers followed by medium and large, they were engaged in mainly farming, subsidiary occupation involving on farm, off farm and non- farm activities [3].

Table: 1. Socio-Economic Profile of Various Sample Farms

S. No.	Particular	Marginal Farmers	Small Farmers	Medium Farmers	Large Farmers	Overall
1	**Number of family Members**	28	20	8	4	60
	Children (0-18 age)	48	34	10	1	93
	Adult (18-60 age)	66	50	21	12	149
	Senior citizen (>60 age)	56	36	15	4	111
	Total Member	170	120	46	17	353
	Average Family Size (No.)	6	6	5	4	6
2	**Education %**					
	Illiterate %	12	13	14	11	13
	Primary Education %	21	23	15	7	20
	Junior Education %	33	32	28	41	32
	Secondary Education %	24	26	37	41	28
	Graduation or Other %	10	6	6	0	7
3	Average Land holding(ha)	0.61	1.35	2.78	4.63	1.41
4	Average Occupation (No.)	2	1	1	1	1

Nature of the Family Size: In table 1 seen family size were bigger 170 members in marginal farmers family followed by 120, 46, 17 members in small, medium and large in farmers. And where as maximum adult 66 members have found in marginal farmers family and among 60 farmers family size were of 353 members.
Family Education: As could be seen from the Table 1, most of the farmers were in junior high school educated 32% and among total number of farmers family with education up to secondary level was 80%. It could be observed that is 20% family members was found primary education as well as 7% farmers family graduated with 87% of literacy. It was found that most of the farmer families belong to nuclear

family with average family size 6 members [6]. Highest 89% large farmers literate followed by marginal 88 per cent, small 87 per cent and medium 87 percent and that there were 13% illiterates.

Occupation: It was observed from Table 1, that marginal farmers were involved in on farming activities in addition to non- farm activities such as owning a grocery store, private sector jobs, tailoring etc., while the remaining respondents belonged to only engaged in the cultivation of crops along with agriculture-related activities that occur beyond the farm such as livestock which involve farming and agricultural production, including casual and seasonal labor. The majority of the farmers belong to marginal farmer category, which necessitated them to take up any one of the subsidiary occupations to improve their livelihood and income [4].

Size of land holding: The average land holding size was maximum 4.63 ha in large farmers and has 2.78 ha in medium farmers Remaining 1.35 ha, 0.61 ha was in small and marginal farmers.

Table: 2. Total number of Beneficiary, Average & Aggregate Size Holding of Sample Farm (ha)

Farmers (N=60)	Marginal	Small	Medium	Large
Sample Farms	28	20	8	4
Average Size Holding (ha)	0.61	1.35	2.78	4.63
Aggregate Size Holding (ha)	17	27	22.25	18.5

Table no. 2 shows in the study area total number of beneficiaries were 60 and large size sample 28 were found in marginal categories followed by 20, 8, 4 in marginal, small and medium among the farmers the highest average size of holding was 4.63 ha but aggregate size holding 27 ha was in small categories farms.

Table: 3. Cropping Pattern under Various Size of Sample Farms

S. No.	Crops	Average Size of Sample Farms (ha)				overall average
		Marginal	Small	Medium	Large	
A	**Kharif**	0.60	1.34	2.66	4.63	1.39
		(43.79)	(43.15)	(37.95)	(39.78)	(41.06)
1	Pearl millet	0.07	0.14	0.41	0.75	0.10
		(5.23)	(4.44)	(5.80)	(6.45)	(2.96)
2	Sorghum	0.04	0.10	0.22	0.00	0.03
		(2.61)	(3.23)	(3.13)	(0.00)	(0.89)
3	Sesame	0.04	0.18	0.28	0.88	0.09
		(3.27)	(5.65)	(4.02)	(7.53)	(2.66)
4	Paddy	0.38	0.78	1.34	2.50	0.39
		(28.10)	(25.00)	(19.20)	(21.51)	(11.54)
5	White pumpkin	0.06	0.15	0.41	0.50	0.08
		(6.25)	(15.00)	(40.63)	(50.00)	(8.00)
B	**Rabi**	0.60	1.33	2.78	4.63	1.40
		(43.79)	(42.74)	(39.73)	(39.78)	(41.43)
1	Wheat	0.43	0.75	1.63	2.75	0.43
		(31.37)	(24.19)	(23.21)	(23.66)	(12.73)
2	Mustered	0.04	0.14	0.38	0.69	0.07
		(2.61)	(4.44)	(5.36)	(5.91)	(2.07)
3	Barley	0.03	0.08	0.03	0.13	0.02
		(1.96)	(2.42)	(0.45)	(1.08)	(0.59)
4	Gram	0.04	0.13	0.34	0.38	0.07
		(2.61)	(4.03)	(4.91)	(3.23)	(2.07)
5	Pigeon pea	0.04	0.10	0.22	0.50	0.06
		(2.61)	(3.23)	(3.13)	(4.30)	(1.78)
6	Potato	0.04	0.14	0.19	0.19	0.05
		(2.61)	(4.44)	(2.68)	(1.61)	(1.48)
C	**Zaid**	0.17	0.44	1.56	2.38	0.59
		(12.42)	(14.11)	(22.32)	(20.43)	(17.51)
1	Mung bean	0.09	0.31	1.25	1.88	0.21
		(6.54)	(10.08)	(17.86)	(16.13)	(6.21)
2	Vigna Mungo	0.08	0.13	0.31	0.50	0.08
		(5.88)	(4.03)	(4.46)	(4.30)	(2.37)
Total (A+B+C)		1.37	3.10	7.00	11.63	3.38
		(100)	(100)	(100)	(100)	(100)

(figures in parenthesis are percentage to total)

Cropping pattern presents the area devoted to the various crop during the given period, conventionally in a single year [8]. It indicates the yearly sequence and arrangement of crop grown by farmer in particular area. Among the beneficiaries' size of sample farms, the average area 0.39 ha which is 11.54 per cent of total covered area of paddy crop in kharif season as well as 0.43 ha (12.73) per cent area covered by wheat crop. The cropping pattern observed as followed by farmers under various size of sample farms are presented in table 3.

Table: 4. Per hectare Cost of different inputs used in Paddy cultivation of Beneficiaries Sample Farms (Rs.)

S. No.	Particulars	Size group of sample farms				
		Marginal Farmers	Small Farmers	Medium Farmers	Large Farmers	Overall average
1	Seed	4178	3586	4702	4960	4269
		(4.24)	(4.04)	(5.67)	(6.24)	(4.87)
2	Manure & Fertilizer	4915	4789	4436	4282	4629
		(4.99)	(5.39)	(5.35)	(5.38)	(5.28)
3	Irrigation	11256	11264	10894	11088	11140
		(11.42)	(12.68)	(13.13)	(13.94)	(12.70)
4	Plant protection	1047	1055	1014.0	970	1026
		(1.06)	(1.19)	(1.22)	(1.22)	(1.17)
5	Total Humen labour	33130	29419	26651	23205	28313
		(33.62)	(33.11)	(32.13)	(29.18)	(32.27)
	A- Family Labour	6626	7355	7995	8122	7786
		(6.72)	(8.28)	(9.64)	(10.21)	(8.87)
	B- Hired Labour	26504	22065	18656	15083	20527
		(26.89)	(24.83)	(22.49)	(18.96)	(23.39)
6	Machinery & Tractor charges	24630	19812	19000	18166	20378
		(24.99)	(22.30)	(22.90)	(22.84)	(23.22)
7	A- Rental value of land	1200	1200	1200	1200	1200
		(1.22)	(1.35)	(1.45)	(1.51)	(1.37)
8	B-Interest on fixed capital	5279	6161	4186	5300	5324
		(5.36)	(6.93)	(5.05)	(6.66)	(6.07)
9	C-Total Working Capital	79156	69924	66698	62671	69754
		(80.32)	(78.69)	(80.40)	(78.80)	(79.50)
10	D-Interest on working capital	3958	3496	3335	3134	3488
		(4.02)	(3.93)	(4.02)	(3.94)	(3.97)
11	Sub-total (A+B+C+D)	89593	80781	75419	72304	79767
		(90.91)	(90.91)	(90.91)	(90.91)	(90.91)
12	Managerial cost@10% of sub total	8959	8078	7542	7230	7977
		(9.09)	(9.09)	(9.09)	(9.09)	(9.09)
	Grand Total	98552	88860	82960	79534	87743
		(100)	(100)	(100)	(100)	(100)

(figures in parenthesis are percentage to total)

The average cost of cultivation of paddy per hectare for Kharif 2023-24 of beneficiary farmers were calculated according to farm size and presented in Table 4. The average cost of cultivation of the beneficiary farmers was Rs. 87747, while that same season were Rs. 98552 in marginal, Rs. 88860 in small, followed by Rs. 82960, Rs. 79534 costs in medium and large farmers respectively. Similarly, cost of total working capital for the small farmer category, a percentage difference of 1.52 per cent, with an absolute difference of large farmer were seen between of them.

Table: 5. Comparative cost and profit measures of size of sample farms (Rs.)

S. No.	Particular	Marginal Farmers	Small Farmers	Medium Farmers	Large Farmers	Overall average
1	Gross Income	119617	113422	115380	124677	118274
2	Total Cost	98552	88860	82960	79534	87743
3	Net Income	21065	24562	32420	45143	30531

In Comparative cost and profit measures we observed as followed by farmers under various size of sample farms are presented in table 5. the overall average gross income of the beneficiary was Rs. 118274

and net income was Rs.30531 similarly, in category size of sample farms the gross income of large farmers Rs. 124677 was maximum among the categories as well as net income Rs. 45143 was also highest followed by Rs. 32420, Rs. 24562, Rs. 21065 in medium, small and marginal farmers [9].

Table: 6. Utilization of PM Kisan funds in reference year 2023-2024 by selected beneficiary farmers for paddy crop

S. No.	Instalments No.	Month	No. of Beneficiaries farms	Amount Received	Utilized Funds
1	14th	December- March	60	120000	Nill
2	15th	April- July	60	120000	120000
3	16th	August- November	60	120000	120000

In reference year 2023-24 the utilization of PM Kisan funds by selected beneficiary farmers was Rs. 240000 i.e. 15th and 16th instalments and beneficiaries utilized two instalments causes the production of paddy for kharif season. Table. 6 show the utilization of PM Kisan funds for paddy crop.

Table: 7. Expenditure on different operations in paddy crops on the selected beneficiary sample farms during the reference year in (Rs.)

S. No.	Name of the operations	Total Operational Cost	PM Kisan Scheme Fund	Owned Funds
1	Seed	200640	125000	75640
		(17)	(52)	(8)
2	Manure & Fertilizer	42820	26000	16820
		(4)	(11)	(2)
3	Irrigation	523580	21500	502080
		(45)	(9)	(54)
4	Plant protection	48200	35000	13200
		(4)	(15)	(1)
5	Total Humen labour	232050	12000	220050
		(20)	(5)	(24)
	A- Family Labour	51051	3000	80000
		(4)	(1)	(9)
	B- Hired Labour	180999	9000	140050
		(16)	(4)	(15)
6	Machinery & Tractor charges	106489	8500	97989
		(9)	(4)	(11)
Total operational cost		1153779	240000	925779
		(100)	(100)	(100)

(figures in parenthesis are percentage to total)

Table. 7 determine the Expenditure on different operations in paddy crops on the selected beneficiary sample farms during the reference year. The overall average operational cost of seed was Rs. 200640 which is sharing 52 per cent of PM Kisan funds, plant protection cost Rs. 48200 and scheme shares 15 per cent of it followed by manure & fertilizer, human labour and machinery and tractor charges sharing i.e. 11, 5 & 4 per cent of total operational cost. Interestingly the total operational cost of owned fund uses only 1 per cent in plant protection and 2 per cent in manure and fertilizer followed by the 8 per cent in seed due benefits of the PM Kisan scheme [10].

CONCLUSION

It is concluded that the PM-KISAN Scheme has significantly contributed to improving various aspects of agricultural productivity, economic stability, and social welfare among beneficiaries. Farmers reported notable enhancements in crop yield, income stability, and access to financial resources, indicating a positive impact on their overall well-being. the average cost of cultivation of paddy per hectare for Kharif 2023-24 of beneficiary farmers were calculated according to farm size and presented in Table 4. The average cost of cultivation of the beneficiary farmers was Rs. 87747 and comparative cost and profit measures we observed as followed by farmers under various size of sample farms are presented in table 5. the overall average gross income of the beneficiary was Rs. 118274 and net income was Rs.30531. Interestingly the total operational cost of owned fund uses only 1 per cent in plant protection and 2 per

cent in manure and fertilizer followed by the 8 per cent in seed due benefits of the PM Kisan scheme. PM-KISAN scheme provided the input and harvesting support to the all-sample farms. This might also defend them from deteriorating within side the clutches of moneylenders for meeting such charges and ensure their continuance in the farming activities. Easily accessible mobile application has been developed; farmer can collect all the information regarding the scheme using this app. This From the study it can be concluded that the beneficiary farmers are somewhat benefited from the PM-Kisan scheme. overall Socio-economic status the results revealed that majority of the respondents are of middle and large farmers belongs to upper class status, while marginal and small farmers belonged to good socio-economic status. and these findings made on the basis of social profile, cropping pattern, gross income, net income and utilization pattern of PM kisan scheme. the above study summarizes the socio-economic position of a marginal, small, medium and large farmers and show reduction of financial distress in beneficiary farmers to certain extent and increase in returns from the use of distributed of PM Kisan scheme amount and through the scheme farmers improving their social and economic well-being.

Limitations and Future studies:

Kanpur Dehat district is one of the developing districts of Uttar Pradesh. only a small part of the district had been covered in this study. also because of time and resource constraint, the study was confined to six villages only. Results of this study cannot be generalized beyond the limits of study area which do not have similar conditions, either regarding environmental, situational or infrastructural position as the areas under this study. Therefore, there is ample scope for future studies in the following areas:

- ✓ The similar study may be conducted in larger areas to test genuinity and consistency of the present findings and also to arrive at some generalization of findings, which can help in policy formation.
- ✓ Comparative study on the performance of the scheme can be made for the different districts of the state of Uttar Pradesh.
- ✓ Comparative study on the performance of the scheme can be made for the different states of the India.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

Authors could never accomplish this task without the help of so many Generous People. Authors would like to Acknowledge My Professor at Acharya Narendra Deva University of Agriculture & Technology Kumarganj, Ayodhya, (U.P.) India for their Advices, Instruction, Assistance, Patience and many hours at important edits, Re-Writes, analysis, and discussions; without their example I would not be where I am today.

REFERENCES

1. Akhtar Javed. (2022) The Impact of Pradhan Mantri Kisan Samman Nidhi Scheme on the Farm Income of Beneficiaries in Uttar Pradesh. *Agro. Economic Research Centre University of Allahabad Prayagraj*. Study No. 155 Publication No. 204.
2. Balkrishna, Acharya; et. al. (2021) Pradhan Mantri Kisan Samman Nidhi(PM-KISAN): A Golden Initiative by Indian Government. *Biological Forum – An International Journal* 13(2): 708-710.
3. Gopi, H; and Rangappa, K.B. (2021) Utilization Pattern of PM-KISAN Benefits. *Department of Studies in Economics, Davangere University, Karnataka.* MPRA Paper No. 114232, posted 18 Aug 2022 12:48.
4. Gupta, A., (1984) Impact of agricultural subsidies. *Eco. and Pol. Weekly*, 39(4): 48-53.
5. Gupta G. & Nagar M. (2017) Agriculture Sector in India: As a Career. *International Journal on Arts, Management and Humanities 6*(2), 01-06.
6. Lakshmi and Vallabhaneni, Mounica. (2023) A Study on Analysis of the Progress of PM- Kisan Samman Nidhi Yojana to the Farmers in Karnataka State. *A Research paper Yojana to the Farmers in Karnataka State* Eur. Chem. Bull. 2023, 12 (S3),– 3167.
7. Reddy, Naveen; Chaudhary, Anju; et. al. (2021) An Economic Analysis of PM Kisan, Scheme in Ri Bhoi District of Meghalaya State. *Economic Affairs,* Vol. 66, No. 05,pp. 605-609.
8. Sneha, V. (2020) Socio-Economic and Operational Dimensions of the Rythu Bandhu Scheme in Telangana State: A Case Study in Nalgonda District. (Unpublished master' thesis) *Professor Jayashankar Telangana State Agriculture University, Hyderabad.*
9. Sen, A. and Bhatia, M.S. (2004) Cost of Cultivation and Farm Income in India. *Academic Foundation*, New Delhi.
10. Varshney, Deepak; et. al. (2019) Pradhan Mantri Kisan Samman Nidhi (PM-KISAN) and the Adoption of Modern Agricultural Technologies. *Assessing the Impact of Krishi Vigyan Kendra in India* Draft: December 2019.