



## **Youth in Farming - Personal, Economic and Socio-Psychological Analysis**

**K Shireesha, P V Satyagopal, T Lakshmi, S V Prasad and B Ravindra Reddy**

Department of Agricultural Extension, S V Agricultural College, Tirupathi 517 502, Andhra Pradesh

### **ABSTRACT**

In the present study, more than half (57.08%) of the youth in farming were found to fit in the upper young age. More than one-fourth (27.10%) of them completed their college education. Majority (90.00%) of them were married, nearly two-third (62.92%) of them were in nuclear family. About 54.17 per cent of them were with medium level of farming experience, half (50.41%) of them were marginal farmers, nearly half (49.58%) of them were with medium level of material possession. About half (50.42%) of them had medium level of annual income, nearly three-fourth (39.16% medium and 37.91% low) of them had medium to low exposure to training, nearly half (45.83%) of them had medium extension contact, Equal proportion each (45.00%) of them had medium exposure to mass media and medium decision making ability. About 46.25 per cent of them had moderate innovativeness, exactly half (50.00%) of them had moderate scientific orientation, slightly more than half (50.83%) of them had medium management orientation, less than half (45.00%) of them had medium achievement motivation, more than two-fifth (45.83%) of them had medium economic orientation and two-fifth (41.67%) of them had medium risk orientation.

**Key words:** Chi-square test, Descriptive statistics, Profile characteristics, Youth in farming.

Youth, the very dynamic stage of everyone's life with many challenges. In the same way the youth who are involved in farming profession do have faced such challenges. The youth in farming are very dynamic, courageous, innovative and analytical in their thoughts. They perform the farming activities in a planned manner and apply technological interventions very enthusiastically and economically. They in turn strive for the minimization of cost of inputs and maximization of profits in their farming activities. The way the youth are carrying forward the farming profession in current scenario is very essential for the development of the nation from all the spheres of economy. Hence the nation has to tap the potential of these youth in farming in the right time and divert it towards the overall economic development of the nation. Thus the present study was taken up with an objective to find out the profile including their personal, economic and socio-psychological characteristics contributing to their attitude towards farming.

### **MATERIAL AND METHODS**

Ex post facto research design was followed in the present investigation. The lottery method of simple random sampling procedure was

followed to select the sample size. The Andhra Pradesh state was chosen as the locale of the study. One district from each region was selected, thus constituting to a total of three districts. The selected districts were Kurnool (Rayalaseema region), Nellore (Coastal region) and Vizianagaram (North Coastal region). Four mandals from each district were selected further two villages from each mandal were selected, making a total of twenty four villages. From each village, ten youth in farming were selected, thus constituting to a total of 240 respondents. Mean, standard deviation, quartile deviation, count and percentage were used as descriptive statistics in the study. Chi-square test was used to find out whether there is significant association between independent variable and the region. Entire analysis of data was carried out using Microsoft Office Excel and SPSS software.

### **RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**

#### **Selected Profile Characteristics of Youth in Farming**

##### **1. Age**

It is clear from the table 1. that, more than half (57.08%) of the youth in all the three regions were found to fit in the upper young age, followed by the middle young age (29.58%) and lower young

age (13.34%). The chi-square test of independence has shown  $\chi^2=5.127$  and  $p=0.27$ , which means that the age distribution of youth in farming is not related to region. The plausible reason for the above trend might be, relatively higher age group of youth might have settled in farming erstwhile and continuing in the same profession. On the other side the youth of lower age group still may be seeking after higher education to choose their career. The findings of the present study were similar with that of Uddin *et al.* (2008) and Bahamana *et al.* (2010).

## 2. Education

More than one-fourth (27.10%) of the youth in farming completed their college education followed by their middle and high school education (23.30% and 24.60%) respectively. About 15.83 per cent of them were in 'can read and write' category followed by illiterates (9.17%). The overall trend revealed that the importance of education has been recognised by the youth in farming. It is also evident that, about 18.75 and 31.25 per cent of them were illiterates and in 'can read and write' category respectively in North Coastal region. This is higher when compared to other regions. Nearly one-third (31.25%) of the Coastal youth had middle school education, followed by the other two regions. In case of Rayalaseema region, 32.50 per cent and 42.50 per cent of them had completed their high school and college education which is higher when compared to other regions. The values of  $\chi^2=61.186$  and  $p=0.00$  validated that, there was a significant association between region and education of youth in farming. This might be due to the differences in their standard of living. Low standard of living might have forced the youth to discontinue education in order to go for daily wage employment so as to meet the family requirements. The results were in line with findings of Olaniyi *et al.* (2011).

## 3. Farming Experience

About 54.17 per cent of the youth in farming were with medium level of farming experience, followed by 28.75 per cent with low level of farming experience and only 17.08 per cent with high level of farming experience. The youth in rural areas might have concentrated on higher studies instead of taking up of farming in their early stages of life. On the other side, the youth with

discontinuation of studies and the dire need for the involvement in farming might have directed them to adopt farming. The regional distribution informed that, slightly more than two-third (67.50%) of the youth were with medium level of farming experience in Rayalaseema. About 36.25 per cent of them were with low level of farming experience in Coastal region, followed by other regions. About 31.25 per cent and equal per cent of the youth (10.00%) had high level of farming experience in North Coastal, Rayalaseema and Coastal regions individually. The 'chi-square' and 'p' value (21.88 & 0.00) respectively confirmed that, there exists a significant association between region and respondent's farming experience. The inequalities in education qualification in different regions might have led to the early entry into farming without acquiring higher education. Similar findings were observed by Olaniyi *et al.* (2011) and Doney *et al.* (2012)

## 4. Farm Size

Half (50.41%) of the youth in farming were marginal farmers, followed by 27.50 per cent small farmers, 14.17 per cent semi-medium farmers. Very meagre per cent (6.67% and 1.25%) of them were medium farmers and large farmers respectively. Fragmentation of land holding might be the major reason for having more than three fourth of small and marginal farmers among the rural youth. The youth in farming from the families of land lords might have fell under semi-medium, medium and large farmers. Own acquisition of land, as a result of farming output also might have contributed for the above trend. It could be observed from the table that, nearly three fourth (72.50%) of the youth in farming were marginal farmers in North Coastal depicting the higher proportion than the other two regions. About 32.50 per cent, 23.75 per cent and 12.50 per cent of the youth in farming were small, semi-medium and medium farmers in Rayalaseema region respectively and this is comparatively more than that of other two regions. Equal per cent (1.25%) of the youth in farming were large farmers in all the three regions. It is crystal clear from the 'chi-square' value (34.50) and 'p' value (0.00) that, there exists a significant association between region and size of land holdings with the youth. The findings

**Table 1. Distribution of youth in farming based on selected profile characteristics.**

	Rayalaseema		Coastal		North Coastal		Total		Statistics		
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%			
<b>I. Age</b>											
1.	Lower	young age	11	13.75	7	8.75	14	17.50	32	13.34	M = 30
2.	Middle	young age	25	31.25	20	25.00	26	32.50	71	29.58	SD = 4
3.	Upper	young age	44	55.00	53	66.25	40	50.00	137	57.08	$\chi^2 = 5.127$ p = 0.27
<b>II. Education</b>											
1.	Illiterate		5	6.25	2	2.50	15	18.75	22	9.17	$\chi^2 = 61.186$
2.	Can Read and write		6	7.50	7	8.75	25	31.25	38	15.83	p = 0.00
3.	Middle school		9	11.25	25	31.25	22	27.50	56	23.30	
4.	High school		26	32.50	22	27.50	11	13.75	59	24.60	
5.	College education		34	42.50	24	30.00	7	8.75	65	27.10	
<b>IV. Farm Size</b>											
1.	Marginal		24	30.00	39	48.75	58	72.50	121	50.41	M = 1.82
2.	Small		26	32.50	24	30.00	16	20.00	66	27.50	SD = 2.290
3.	Semi-Medium		19	23.75	11	13.75	4	5.00	34	14.17	$\chi^2 = 34.50$
4.	Medium		10	12.50	5	6.25	1	1.25	16	6.67	p = 0.00
5.	Large		1	1.25	1	1.25	1	1.25	3	1.25	
<b>III. Farming Experience</b>											
1.	Low		18	22.50	29	36.25	22	27.50	69	28.75	M = 10.88
2.	Medium		54	67.50	43	53.75	33	41.25	138	54.17	SD = 5.619
3.	High		8	10.00	8	10.00	25	31.25	33	17.08	$Q_1 = 6$ $Q_2 = 10$ $Q_3 = 15$ $\chi^2 = 21.88$ p = 0.00
<b>V. Annual Income</b>											
1.	Low		20	25.00	8	10.00	32	40.00	60	25.00	M = 3.34
2.	Medium		37	46.25	44	55.00	40	50.00	121	50.42	SD = 2.882
3.	High		23	28.75	28	35.00	8	10.00	59	24.58	$Q_1 = 1.41$ lakh $Q_2 = 2.65$ lakh $Q_3 = 4.50$ lakh $\chi^2 = 55.29$ p = 0.00
<b>VI. Extension Contact</b>											
1.	Low		20	25.00	18	22.50	36	45.00	74	30.83	M = 5.02
2.	Medium		30	37.50	50	62.50	30	37.50	110	45.83	SD = 2.618
3.	High		30	37.50	12	15.00	14	17.50	56	23.34	$Q_1 = 3$ $Q_2 = 5$ $Q_3 = 6$ $\chi^2 = 25.59$ p = 0.00
<b>VII. Mass Media Exposure</b>											
1.	Low		18	22.50	18	22.50	38	47.50	74	30.83	M = 4.14
2.	Medium		29	36.25	43	53.75	36	45.00	108	45.00	SD = 2.823
3.	High		33	41.25	19	23.75	6	7.50	58	24.17	$Q_1 = 2$ $Q_2 = 4$ $Q_3 = 5$ $\chi^2 = 32.39$ p = 0.00
<b>VIII. Decision Making Ability</b>											
1.	Low		35	43.75	12	15.00	15	18.75	62	25.83	M = 19.60
2.	Medium		27	33.75	45	56.25	36	45.00	108	45.00	SD = 4.228
3.	High		18	22.50	23	28.75	29	36.25	70	29.17	$Q_1 = 17$ $Q_2 = 21$ $Q_3 = 23$ $\chi^2 = 22.22$ p = 0.00

Table 1. cont.....

<b>IX. Innovativeness</b>										
1.	Low	24	30.00	21	26.25	26	32.50	71	29.58	M = 20.34
2.	Moderate	27	33.75	41	51.25	43	53.75	111	46.25	SD = 3.865
3.	High	29	36.25	18	22.50	11	13.75	58	24.17	Q <sub>1</sub> =18 Q <sub>2</sub> =21 Q <sub>3</sub> =22 x <sup>2</sup> = 13.16 p = 0.01
<b>X. Scientific Orientation</b>										
1.	Low	24	30.00	16	20.00	26	32.50	66	27.50	M = 22.09
2.	Medium	36	45.00	41	51.25	43	53.75	120	50.00	SD = 4.85
3.	High	20	25.00	23	28.75	11	13.75	54	22.50	Q <sub>1</sub> =18 Q <sub>2</sub> =22 Q <sub>3</sub> =25 x <sup>2</sup> = 7.52 p = 0.11
<b>XI. Management Orientation</b>										
1.	Low	21	26.25	9	11.25	30	37.50	60	25.00	M = 26.08
2.	Medium	27	33.75	48	60.00	47	58.75	122	50.83	SD = 7.376
3.	High	32	40.00	23	28.75	3	3.75	58	24.17	Q <sub>1</sub> =19.25 Q <sub>2</sub> =26.5 Q <sub>3</sub> =32 x <sup>2</sup> = 32.10 p = 0.11
<b>XII. Achievement Motivation</b>										
1.	Low	19	23.75	12	15.00	32	40.00	63	26.25	M = 13.30
2.	Medium	36	45.00	38	47.50	34	42.50	108	45.00	SD = 2.694
3.	High	25	31.25	30	37.50	14	17.50	69	28.75	Q <sub>1</sub> =12 Q <sub>2</sub> =14 Q <sub>3</sub> =16 x <sup>2</sup> = 42.09 p = 0.00
<b>XIII. Economic Orientation</b>										
1.	Low	24	30.00	17	21.25	29	36.25	70	29.17	M = 8.59
2.	Medium	25	31.25	40	50.00	45	56.25	110	45.83	SD = 2.665
3.	High	31	38.75	23	28.75	6	7.50	60	25.00	Q <sub>1</sub> =7 Q <sub>2</sub> =9 Q <sub>3</sub> =10.75 x <sup>2</sup> = 25.32 p = 0.00
<b>XIV. Risk Orientation</b>										
1.	Low	22	27.50	17	21.25	22	27.50	61	25.42	M = 9.45
2.	Medium	23	28.75	40	50.00	37	46.25	100	41.67	SD = 2.268
3.	High	35	43.75	23	28.75	21	26.25	79	32.91	Q <sub>1</sub> =8 Q <sub>2</sub> =10 Q <sub>3</sub> =11 x <sup>2</sup> = 10.11 p = 0.03

of the present study were similar to that of Anamica and Ravichandran (2014).

### 5. Annual Income

Half (50.42%) of the youth in farming had medium level of annual income, followed by low level of annual income (25.00%) and high level of annual income (24.58%). With the advent of civilisation and technological interventions in agriculture about one fourth of the youth in farming

might have properly utilised such facilities and strive hard in achieving high returns from unit area. In contrary, about one fourth of the youth in farming with scarce resources and poor environmental conditions could not achieve their targeted results and fell under low income category. The remaining half of the youth in farming might be operating their farming activities with the available resources and leading their life with medium annual income. It is also observed that, 55.00 per cent and 35.00 per

cent of the youth in farming had medium and high level of annual income respectively in Coastal region which is higher than other two regions. Two-fifth (40.00%) of the youth had low level of annual income in North Coastal, followed by other two regions. The 'chi-square' value (55.29) and 'p' value (0.00) revealed that, there was a significant association between region and annual income of youth in farming. This might be due to the differences in land holdings and cropping pattern being followed by the youth in three regions. Similar findings were communicated in the studies of Viswanatha *et al.* (2014a).

### 6. Extension Contact

Nearly half (45.83%) of the youth in farming had medium extension contact, followed by low (30.83%) and high (23.34%) extension contact. In spite of having well established extension network in the recent past still about one-third of youth in farming were unable to access the extension services. This might be due to lack of awareness on extension services or the lack of interest in consulting the extension officials. The overall trend reflects the scope for enhancing the quality and quantity of extension system through appropriate strategies. The present education status and desire for the modern technologies might be motivating the youth towards building up of regular extension contacts. Nearly half (45.00%) of the youth in farming in North Coastal region had low extension contact which is comparatively more. Almost equal per cent (25.00%, 37.50% and 37.50%) of them had been distributed among all categories in Rayalaseema. More than three-fourth (62.50% and 15.00%) of them had medium to low extension contact in Coastal region respectively. The 'chi-square' value (25.59) and 'p' value (0.00) denoted that, there was a significant association between region and extension contact of youth in farming. This might be due to the regional differences in terms of awareness on the available information sources. Uddin *et al.* (2008) expressed the similar results in their studies.

### 7. Mass Media Exposure

Nearly half (45.00%) of the youth in farming had medium exposure to mass media, followed by 30.83 per cent had low and only 24.17

per cent had high exposure to mass media. In the present digital world, the electronic and print media are taking lead to reach the farming community but the pattern of utilization of these media by the youth in farming was not up to the mark. This might be due to lack of proper access to the mass media, lack of proper awareness and knowledge in utilizing the media. The intensive multifaceted work load of the youth in farming also might be hindering them to expose to different mass media. In contrast, the youth in farming with high access, time and cosmopolitanism might be attracted towards different mass media and utilizing them in befitting way. This might be the cause for the existence of above trend in the youth in farming of the three regions. The distribution of the youth in farming among different regions revealed that, more than half (53.75%) of them had medium mass media exposure in Coastal region, followed by the other two regions. Almost half (47.50%) of youth in North Coastal region and equal per cent (22.50%) of the youth in Rayalaseema and Coastal regions had low mass media exposure. About two-fifth (41.25%) of the youth in Rayalaseema and meagre part (7.50%) in North Coastal had high mass media exposure. This trend was substantiated by the 'chi-square' value (32.39) and 'p' value (0.00). The differences in terms of remoteness of the villages and non availability of various mass media sources might have contributed for the regional differences in terms of mass media exposure. The research findings were in correspondence with the studies of Mohan and Reddy (2012).

### 8. Decision Making Ability

About 45.00 per cent of the youth in farming had medium decision making ability, followed by high decision making ability (29.17%) and low decision making ability (25.83%). By virtue of their dynamic mindset, they might be having the quality of choosing the best alternative of course of actions. In majority of cases they might not be frightened for failures rather than desperately anticipated for accomplishment of their ambition. On the other side, the youth in farming shouldering family errands with limited resources might not be bold enough to take decisions at appropriate time. As a whole the decision making ability is the foremost asset for the youth to lead the farming

lucratively. It is noticed that, about 56.25 per cent of them had medium decision making ability, followed by high (28.75%) and low (15.00%) decision making ability in Coastal region. Majority (43.75%) of them in Rayalaseema had low decision making ability, followed by medium (33.75%) and high (22.50%) decision making ability. Whereas, 45.00 per cent, 36.25 per cent and 18.75 per cent of them had medium, high and low decision making ability in North Coastal region. The 'chi-square' value (22.22) and 'p' value (0.00) revealed that, there was a significant association between region and decision making ability of youth in farming. Differences in involvement of family members in farming and discretion power on the part of youth might have contributed to the above trend. Anamica (2010) also reported the similar results.

### 9. Innovativeness

Nearly half (46.25%) of the youth in farming had moderate innovativeness, followed by 29.58 per cent of them had less and 24.17 per cent of them had high innovativeness. Being the youngsters, they think imaginatively endeavouring to put their contemporary thoughts into actual circumstance with no dithering. Having the nature of looking for novelty in every single operation, the youth dependably take a stab at substitution or refinement of existing advancements. Quite the opposite side, dominant part of the youth habituated to standard methods of cultivating and not looking for advances in farming. This might be the possible cause for the incidence of the above mentioned tendency of youth in farming. Nearly equal percentage (30.00%, 33.75% and 36.25%) of them had low, moderate and high innovativeness in Rayalaseema region respectively. About 51.25 per cent, 26.25 per cent and 22.50 per cent of them in Coastal region had moderate, low and high innovativeness respectively. Different proportions (53.75%, 32.50% and 13.75%) of them in North Coastal region had moderate, low and high innovativeness respectively. The chi-square' value (13.16) and 'p' value (0.01) clearly portrayed that, there exists a significant association between region and innovativeness of youth in farming. This might be due to differences in utilization of information sources and existence of need based modern technologies. Uddin *et al.* (2008) and Umunnakwe *et al.* (2014) also found the similar results.

### 10. Scientific Orientation

Exactly half (50.00%) of the youth in farming had moderate scientific orientation, followed by 27.50 per cent of them had low and 22.50 per cent of them had high scientific orientation. Nearly one fourth of the youth in farming with higher education, exposure to training might have considered each and every operation of farming more technically and trying to analyze pros and cons of an activity towards superior farming performance. On the other hand, the youth in farming with lower education and orthodox way of farming might be adopting principle of thumb rule in taking up different farming operations instead of logical and intellectual thinking. More than half (53.75%) of the youth in North Coastal had medium scientific orientation, followed by low (32.50%) and high (13.75%) scientific orientation. In case of the Coastal region, slightly more than half (51.25%) of them had medium scientific orientation, followed by high (28.75%) and low (20.00%) scientific orientation, whereas more than two-fifth (45.00%) of them were having medium scientific orientation, followed by low (30.00%) and high (25.00%) scientific orientation in Rayalaseema region. The 'chi-square' value (7.52) and 'p' value (0.00) obviously explained that, there was no significant association between region and scientific orientation of youth in farming. The overall trend also depicted that there might be limitation of resources or means for acquiring scientific orientation by the youth in farming. Similar findings were explored by Ramalakshmi (2012).

### 11. Management Orientation

Half (50.83%) of the youth in farming had medium management orientation, followed by low (25.00%) and high (24.17%) management orientation. The above trend might be due to the fact that majority of youth in farming might be good in planning and production activities, but with regard to marketing, they might be resorting to local merchants without exploring other marketing avenues. On the contrary, the farmers with good inter personal skills and established networking might be adopting the best marketing strategies to sell their farm produce. It is also revealed from table that, majority (60.00% medium and 28.75% high) of the youth in farming had medium to high management orientation in Coastal region, but more

than one-third (37.50%) of them had low management orientation in North Coastal region which is comparatively more than other two regions. The 'chi-square' value (32.10) and 'p' value (0.00) clearly indicated that, there exists a significant association between region and management orientation of youth in farming. Differences in autonomy in farming for youth and their farming experiences might have led to the above trend. The findings of Ramalakshmi (2012) were in line with the present study.

### 12. Achievement Motivation

Less than half (45.00%) of the youth in farming had medium achievement motivation, followed by 28.75 per cent had high and 26.25 per cent of them had low achievement motivation. n-Ach is a striving force for success with some standard of excellence. The youth might have tendency to seek challenges and a high degree of independence in their thoughts and ambitions. They strive for personal satisfaction, recognition in the society and financial assistance as the rewards of their achievement. Conversely, the youth might have chosen traditional way of farming in order to avoid failure. They might not have received the satisfaction for their efforts or recognition from the society and they might have become dissatisfied or frustrated with the existing situations in farming. The overall inclination portrayed that majority of the youth were well potent to take up challenging tasks in their future farming. The majority (40.00% and 42.50%) of the youth in farming had low to medium achievement motivation and only 17.50 per cent of them had high achievement motivation in North Coastal region respectively. More than one-third (37.50%) of the youth in farming had high achievement motivation in Coastal region which is comparatively higher than that of other two regions. More than three-fourth (45.00% and 31.25%) of the youth had medium to high achievement motivation respectively in Rayalaseema region. The 'chi-square' value (42.09) and 'p' value (0.00) keenly revealed that, there exists a significant association between region and achievement motivation of youth in farming. The possible reason might be the differences in attitude towards farming and success in previous endeavours of the youth in three regions. Anamica (2010) and Anamica and Ravichandran (2014) also mentioned similar results in their studies.

### 13. Economic Orientation

More than two-fifth (45.83%) of the youth in farming had medium economic orientation, followed by 29.17 per cent of them had low and only 25.00 per cent of them had high economic orientation. With the advent of globalization and liberalization youth in farming are concentrating more on commercial farming with high economic orientation. This has resulted due to their vast and regular extension contacts and good market intelligence. In contrast, some of the youth in farming with lack of enough resources and life threatening problems could not orient economically inspite of having the interest to produce higher yields and to gain higher profits. Even though, the overall trend pointed out that the youth in farming might have realized the importance of economic orientation in the concurrent competitive world. The facts also projected that, more than half (56.25%) of the youth in farming had medium economic orientation in North Coastal region, followed by other two regions. More than one third (38.75%) of them had high economic orientation in Rayalaseema, followed by the other two regions. Slightly more than one-third (36.25%) of them had low economic orientation in North Coastal region followed by the other two regions. The 'chi-square' value (25.32) and 'p' value (0.00) from the table denoted that, there exists a significant association between region and economic orientation of youth in farming. Differences in established patterns of values and the existing education and knowledge level might have contributed to the above trend. The research work done by Anamica and Ravichandran (2014) also supported the present study.

### 14. Risk Orientation

Two-fifth (41.67%) of the youth in farming had medium risk orientation, followed by one third (32.91%) of them had high risk orientation and one fourth (25.42%) of them had low risk orientation. Risk is an unavoidable evil in every one's life. Unless one takes risks he/she cannot enjoy the fruits of success. Youth in farming through their dynamic and responsive behaviour might be geared up to endure risk in farming so as to entertain exalted profits. On the contrary, the existing technological gap and other policy issues might have dragging the youth away from bearing risk in farming. Conclusively this might be the probable cause for

the inclination of youth in the above manner. The regional disparity of risk orientation of youth in farming is lucidly explained as relatively higher proportion (50.00%) of the youth in the Coastal region possessed medium risk orientation than that of other two regions. More than two-fifth (43.75%) of them in Rayalaseema possessed high risk orientation, followed by Coastal (28.75%) and North Coastal regions (26.25%). Equal per cent each (27.50%) of them in Rayalaseema, North Coastal and one fifth (21.25%) of the youth in Coastal region possessed low risk orientation. The 'chi-square' value (10.11) and 'p' value (0.03) from the table predicted that, there exists a significant association between region and risk orientation of youth in farming. Differences in net worth and possession of differential landholdings might have resulted in the above difference. The studies of Anamica (2010), Anamica and Ravichandran (2014) and Viswanatha *et al.* (2014a) also expressed the similar results.

#### LITERATURE CITED

- Anamica M 2010** Migration behaviour of dryland farmers. *M.Sc. (Ag.) Thesis*. Tamil Nadu Agricultural University, Coimbatore.
- Anamica M and Ravichandran V 2014** Attitude of rural youth towards farming. *Madras Agricultural Journal*. 101(1-3):79-86.
- Bahamana AS, Jeffery MS, Hayrol A and Jegak U 2010** Acceptance, attitude and knowledge towards agriculture economic activity between rural and urban youth: The case of contract farming. *Journal of Applied Sciences*. 10 (19): 2310-2315.
- Doney A O, Gwary M M, Nuhu H S and Zhintswen AA 2012** Assessment of youth involvement in Yam production in Wukari Local Government Area of Taraba state, Nigeria. *Agriculture and Biology Journal of North America*. 3(8): 311-317 <http://www.scihub.org/ABJNA>.
- Mohan K and Reddy P R 2012** Attitude towards pursuing self employment in agriculture. *Journal of Research ANGRAU*. 40 (1): 69-72.
- Olaniyi O A, Adebayo OO and Akintola S 2011** Rural youth's perception and utilization of agricultural information in Oyo State, Nigeria. *Journal of Agriculture and Social Sciences*, 7: 117-123. <http://www.fspublishers.org>
- Ramalakshmi S 2012** Impact analysis of sugarcane production technologies in Chittoor district of Andhra Pradesh. *M.Sc. (Ag.) Thesis*. Acharya N.G.Ranga Agricultural University, Hyderabad.
- Uddin M E, Rashid M U and Akanda M G R 2008** Attitude of coastal rural youth towards some selected modern agricultural technologies. *Journal of Agriculture and Rural Development*. 6 (1&2):133-138. [www.banglajol.info](http://www.banglajol.info).
- Umunnakwe V C, Pyasi V K and Pande A K 2014** Factors influencing involvement in agricultural livelihood activities among rural youth in Jabalpur district of Madhya Pradesh. *International Journal of Agricultural Policy and Research*. 2 (8): 288-295. [www.Journalissues.Org](http://www.Journalissues.Org) .
- Viswanatha H, Manjunatha B N and Lakshminarayana M T 2014a** Aspirations and problems of rural youth practicing agriculture. *The Mysore Journal of Agricultural sciences*. 48 (4): 583-588.

(Received on 13.01.2016 and revised on 24.05.2016)