

**RESEARCH PAPER**

Relationship between selected profile characteristics of rural youth with their perception towards agriculture as an occupation

S. S. Kshirsagar* and R. P. Kadam

Department of Agricultural Extension Education, College of Agriculture, Vasanttrao Naik Marathwada Krishi Vidyapeeth, Parbhani (M.S.) India (Email : samikshaksagar7202@gmail.com; rpk.mkv@gmail.com)

Abstract : The present investigation is conducted in Marathwada region of the Maharashtra state during 2022-2023 with the objective to study “Relationship between selected profile characteristics of rural youth with their perception towards agriculture as an occupation”. One district namely Beed was selected randomly from Marathwada region. Three talukas from Beed district and five villages from each taluka were selected randomly for the study. From each selected village, ten rural youth were selected randomly who was able to express their views on agriculture as an occupation, which comprising total sample of 150 respondents were considered for the study. An Ex-post-facto research design was followed for the study. Data was gathered using a well-structured interview schedule created with the study’s objectives in mind. The collected data was analysed, classified and tabulated. Statistical tools such as frequency, percentage, mean, standard deviation, and co-efficient correlation were used to interpret findings and draw conclusions.

Key Words : Relationship, Selected profile characteristics, Rural youth, Towards agriculture

View Point Article : Kshirsagar, S. S. and Kadam, R. P. (2023). Relationship between selected profile characteristics of rural youth with their perception towards agriculture as an occupation. *Internat. J. agric. Sci.*, 20 (1) : 286-291, DOI:10.15740/HAS/IJAS/20.1/286-291. Copyright@2024: Hind Agri-Horticultural Society.

Article History : Received : 11.10.2023; Revised : 10.11.2023; Accepted : 13.12.2023

INTRODUCTION

Youth are a statistically significant, resourceful, and adventurous sector of the population of our nation. The present Indian population is made up of more than 50.00 per cent people under the age of 25, and more than 65.00 per cent people under the 35 years old. Between 2001 and 2011, there were 430 million people aged 15 to 34, an increase from 351 million in 2001. According to

current forecasts, there will be 464 million young people in the world by 2021. With 64.00 per cent of its population in the working age group by 2020, India is expected to overtake Japan as the youngest nation in the world. (2011 Indian Census). The current population of India is 141.76 crore which ranks in the list of countries by population. The country’s rural youth population in 2022 stand at approximately 67-68 per cent of India’s total population. Out of the total rural youth population, the male-female

*Author for correspondence:

ratio remains almost equal at about 52 per cent and 48 per cent, respectively.

Objectives :

- To study the profile of rural youth
- To ascertain relationship between profile of rural youth and their perception towards agriculture as an occupation.

MATERIAL AND METHODS

The Present study was undertaken in Marathwada region in the Maharashtra State. The research study was carried out in Beed district of Marathwada region in Maharashtra State. Out of 11 Talukas in Beed district, 3 Talukas namely Ashti, Patoda and Shirur (kasar) were randomly selected for the study. From each selected taluka, five villages with highest youth population were purposively selected for the study. Thus, a total of fifteen villages were selected for study. From each of selected villages, 10 rural youth (15-35 yrs. age group) were selected randomly who was able to express their views on agriculture as an occupation, which comprising total sample of 150 respondents. An ex-post-facto research design was followed to achieve the objectives of the study as the variables have already occurred. The interview schedule was constructed by formulating relevant questions in accordance with the study objectives. The schedule was divided into two parts. The questions related to personal, socio-economic, situational and psychological characteristics of respondents were included in first part. The questions related to the perception of rural youth in second part. The collected data was analysed, classified and tabulated. Statistical tool such as frequency, percentage, mean, standard deviation and co-efficient correlation were used to interpret findings and draw conclusions.

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

The detailed analysis of profile characteristics of rural youth indicated that majority of them had secondary high school (35.33%) education, having small land holdings (35.33 %), medium annual income (60.00%), medium size families (57.33 %), belonging to joint families (62.00%), engaged in Agriculture + Animal husbandry occupation (32.67%), had medium extension contact (55.33%), low level of social participation (42.00%),

medium level of mass media exposure (56.00%), medium level of economic motivation (56.67%), medium level of risk orientation (45.33%) and medium level of innovativeness (59.33%). The findings shows that detailed analysis of dependent variable indicated that majority of rural youth had medium level (72.00%) of perception towards agriculture as an occupation followed by low (16.67%) and high (11.33%).

According to correlation analysis, it was found that out of twelve selected profile characteristics, eight of them *viz.*, landholdings, family type, social participation, mass media exposure, occupation of parents, risk orientation, innovativeness and economic motivation showed positive and significant relation with the level of perception, while annual income, extension contact, size of family, and education had shown non-significant relationship.

Education :

Majority (35.33%) of rural youth with regard to their education belonging to secondary high school followed by those coming under secondary school (26.67%), graduate (16.67%), postgraduate (08.67 %), primary school (07.33%) and illiterate (05.33 %).

Land holding :

Nearly 35.33 per cent of rural youth had small land holdings, followed by those coming under medium (31.33%) and large (17.33 %) categories. Whereas, 16.00 % belonged to marginal category of land holdings.

Annual income :

Majority (60.00 %) of rural youth fall under medium annual income category, followed by those coming under high (20.67 %) and low (19.33 %) of annual income.

Size of family :

Nearly three-fourth (57.33 %) of rural youth belongs to medium size families followed by those coming under small (22.50%) families.

Family type :

Majority (62.00 %) of rural youth belong to joint families followed by those belonged to nuclear (38.00 %) family.

Occupation of parents :

Majority (32.67 %) of rural youth' father engaged

Table 1 : Profile characteristics of the rural youth

Sr. No.		Frequency	Per cent
Education			
1.	Illiterate	8	05.33
2.	Primary School (1 st to7 th Class)	11	07.33
3.	Secondary School (8 th , 9 th and 10 th Class)	40	26.67
4.	Secondary High School	53	35.33
5.	Graduation	25	16.67
6.	Post-Graduation	13	08.67
	Total:	150	100.00
Land Holding			
1.	Marginal (0.01 to 1.00 ha)	24	16.00
2.	Small(1.01-2.00ha)	53	35.33
3.	Medium(2.01-4.00 ha)	47	31.33
4.	Large(Above4.00 ha)	26	17.33
	Total:	150	100.00
Annual Income			
1.	Low(upto Rs.1,27,656)	29	19.33
2.	Medium(Rs.1, 27,657-Rs.5,46,288)	90	60.00
3.	High(5,46,289 & above)	31	20.67
	Total:	150	100.00
Size of family			
1.	Small size (upto 4 members)	32	21.33
2.	Medium size (5 – 8 members)	86	57.33
3.	Large size(9 and above members)	32	21.33
	Total:	150	100.00
Family type			
1.	Nuclear	57	38.00
2.	Joint	93	62.00
	Total:	150	100.00
Occupation of parents			
1.	Agriculture	40	26.67
2.	Agriculture + Labour Work	13	08.67
3.	Agriculture + Animal Husbandry	49	32.67
4.	Agriculture + Labour work + Animal Husbandry	30	20.00
5.	Agriculture + Service	13	08.67
6.	Agriculture + Business	05	03.33
	Total:	150	100.00
Extension contact			
1.	Low (Upto 10.80)	20	13.33
2.	Medium (10.81 -14.13)	83	55.33
3.	High (14.14 and above)	47	31.33
	Total:	150	100.00
Social participation			
1.	Low (upto01.04)	63	42.00
2.	Medium (01.05 -04.87)	47	31.33
3.	High (04.87 and above)	40	26.67
	Total:	150	100.00

Table 1 : Contd.....

Table 1 : Contd.....

Mass media exposure			
1.	Low (upto 13.68)	21	14.00
2.	Medium (13.69-17.33)	84	56.00
3.	High (17.34 and above)	45	30.00
4.	Total:	150	100.00
Economic motivation			
1.	Low (upto20.84)	39	26.00
2.	Medium (20.85 -26.10)	68	45.33
3.	High (26.11 and above)	43	28.67
4.	Total:	150	100.00
Risk orientation			
1.	Low (upto 33.19)	39	26.00
2.	Medium (33.20 -37.55)	68	45.33
3.	High (37.56 and above)	43	28.67
	Total:	150	100.00
Innovativeness			
1.	Low (upto 28.00)	28	18.67
2.	Medium (28.01-31.24)	89	59.33
3.	High (31.25 and above)	33	22.00
	Total:	150	100.00

in Agriculture +Animal husbandry, followed by those coming under Agriculture (26.67%), Agriculture + labour + Animal husbandry (20.00%), Agriculture + labour work (08.67%), Agriculture + Service (08.67%), and Agriculture + business (03.33%) categories.

Extension contact :

Majority (55.33%) of rural youth had medium extension contact, followed by those with high (31.33%) and low (13.33%) levels of extension contact.

Social participation :

Nearly 42.00 per cent of rural youth had low social participation, followed by the rest had medium (31.33%) and high (26.67%) level of social participation.

Mass media exposure :

Majority (56.00%) of rural youth had medium mass media exposure, followed by the rest with high (30.00%) and low (14.00%) levels of mass media exposure.

Economic motivation :

Majority (56.67%) of rural youth had medium level of economic motivation, followed by the remaining had high (24.00%) and low (19.33%) levels of economic

motivation.

Risk orientation :

Majority (45.33%) of rural youth had medium level of risk orientation, followed by the rest with high (28.67%) and low (26.00%) levels of risk orientation.

Innovativeness

Nearly (59.33%) of rural youth had medium level of innovativeness, followed by there maining with high (22.00%) and low (18.67%) levels of innovativeness.

Education and perception :

There was a positive and non- significant relationship between education and perception of rural youth towards agriculture as an occupation. The present finding of the study was inconsonance to the finding of Bodake (2016) and Chaudhary (2019).

Land Holding and perception :

There was found positive and significant relationship between land holding and perception of rural youth towards agriculture as an occupation. The present finding of the study was in obedience with to the findings of Bodake (2016) and Sarita (2021).

Annual income and perception :

There was a positive and non-significant relationship between annual income and perception of rural youth towards agriculture as an occupation. The present finding of the study was in congruence with the findings of Vasava *et al.* (2015), Shireesha *et al.* (2016), Bodake (2016) and Anantha (2018).

Size of family and perception :

There was a positive and non-significant relationship between size of family and perception of rural youth towards agriculture as an occupation. The present finding of the study was in consonance to the finding of Kitturmath *et al.* (2013), Vasava *et al.* (2015) and Anantha (2018).

Family Type and perception :

There was a positive and significant relationship between family type and perception of rural youth towards agriculture as an occupation. The present finding of the study was in tandem to the findings of Bodake (2016).

Father’s occupation and perception :

There was a positive and significant relationship between father’s occupation and perception of rural youth towards agriculture as an occupation. The present finding of the study was ratifying the findings of Pakhmode (2018) and Sarita (2021).

Social participation and perception :

There was a positive and significant relationship between social participation and perception of rural youth towards agriculture as an occupation. The present

finding of the study was in supportive of the findings of Mohite (2016) and Sarita (2021).

Extension contact and perception :

There was a positive and non-significant relationship between extension contact and perception of rural youth towards agriculture as an occupation. The present finding of the study was in amplification of the findings of Bodake (2016).

Mass media exposure and perception :

There was a positive and significant relationship between mass media exposure and perception of rural youth towards agriculture as an occupation. The present finding of the study was in fortification of the findings of Kitturmath *et al.* (2013) and Sarita (2021).

Economic motivation and perception :

There was a positive and highly significant relationship between economic motivation and perception of rural youth towards agriculture as an occupation. The present finding of the study was in agreement with the findings of Bodake (2016), Shireesha *et al.* (2016), Pakhmode *et al.* (2018) and Anantha (2018).

Risk orientation and perception :

There was a positive and highly significant relationship between risk orientation and perception of rural youth towards agriculture as an occupation. The present finding of the study was supplementary to the findings of Angaitkar *et al.* (2013), Preethi (2015), Vasava *et al.* (2015), Shireesha *et al.* (2016), Pakhmode *et al.* (2018) and Anantha (2018).

Table 1 : Relationship between selected profile characteristics of rural youth with their perception towards agriculture as an occupation

Sr. No.	Profile characteristics	Correlation-coefficient (r values)
1.	Education	0.076 ^{NS}
2.	Land holding	0.250*
3.	Annual income	0.022 ^{NS}
4.	Size of family	0.114 ^{NS}
5.	Family type	0.244*
6.	Occupation of parents	0.222*
7.	Extension contact	0.190 ^{NS}
8.	Social participation	0.244*
9.	Mass media exposure	0.235*
10.	Economic motivation	0.297**
11.	Risk orientation	0.262**
12.	Innovativeness	0.268**

Innovativeness and perception :

There was a positive and highly significant relationship between innovativeness and perception of rural youth towards agriculture as an occupation. The present finding of the study was in further proof of the findings of Alao *et al.* (2015), Preethi (2015), Shireesha *et al.* (2016) and Anantha (2018).

Conclusion :

It was found that out of twelve profile characteristics, eight of them *viz.*, landholdings, family type, social participation, mass media exposure, occupation of parents, risk orientation, innovativeness and economic motivation showed positive and significant relation with the level of perception, while annual income, extension contact, size of family, and education had shown non-significant relationship with perception of rural youth towards agriculture as an occupation. As we see the respondents had moderately favourable perception towards agriculture as an occupation, it is essential to take efforts on improving their perception towards agriculture as an occupation.

REFERENCES

- Douglas, K., Singh, A.S. and Zvenyika, K.R. (2017).** Perceptions of Swaziland's Youth towards farming: A case of Manzini Region. *Forestry Research & Engineering: International Journal*, **1** (3) : 1-8.
- Indian Census (2011). Population enumeration data. Government of India, Ministry of Home Affairs. India. www.censusindia.gov.in.
- Mbah, E.N., Ezeano, C.I., Odiaka, E.C. (2016).** Analysis of rural youth' sparticipation in family in Benue state, Nigeria: Implications for policy. *Current Research in Agricultural Sciences*, **3** (3): 46-56.
- Ommami, A.R. (2011).** Social, economic and farming characteristics affecting per ception of rural youths regarding the appropriateness of acareer in production agriculture. *Australian Journal of Basic & Applied Sciences*, **5** (9):2269-6673.
- Sahoo, M.K. (2004).** Knowledge and adoption of eco-friendly practices followed by the groundnut growers of south Saurashtra zone of Gujarat state. Master's Thesis, Junagadh Agriculture University, Junagadh, Gujarat (India).

★ ★ ★ ★ ★ of Excellence ★ ★ ★ ★ ★
20th Year