J Krishi Vigyan 2021, 9 (2) : 36-39 DOI : 10.5958/2349-4433.2021.00006.4

Decision Making Role of Rural Youth in Farming

Nikitaben Thakor[1] and S P Pandya[2]

Department of Agricultural Extension and Communication
B. A. Collage of Agriculture, A.A.U, Anand, 388 001 (Gujarat)

ABSTRACT

A study was conducted in Banaskantha district of Gujarat state, state about the participation of rural youth in making decision about farming. Out of thirteen blocks in the district, four blocks randomly selected and four villages from each block were selected randomly. From each selected village ten rural youth were selected randomly for data collection. The total sample size of the study was 160 rural youth of Banaskantha district. A structured interview schedule was used to collect the data. A three point scale developed by Nandapurkar (1981) was used. The study revealed that 68.74 per cent of rural youth had medium level of decision making while participation in farming. Age and size of family had not-significant relationship with decision making of rural youth in farming. Innovativeness, attitude and sources of information had positive and highly significant relationship with decision making of rural youth in farming.

Key Words: Decision making, farming, participation, rural youth.

INTRODUCTION

The outlook of Nation depends upon how well it appears to youth to make decision and carry the errands of mature citizenship. The progress of nation and the youth is inseparable and inter-reliant. Youth is an imperative and essential part of human resources which is not only today, but in future will have to shoulder responsibility for the expansion of agriculture and rural sectors. They form the bulk of total population of the nation and are considered as the precious human possessions that can play an important role in nation edifice activities. If a country can harness inspired and pervasive force like youth, it can substantially and quickly advance towards modernization and progress. The socio-economic status increase and prosperity of the rural areas depends upon the type of youth the country owns. Indian rural youth eschew agriculture as our society looks down upon farming. The pessimistic participation and decision making of rural youth towards agriculture and withdrawal of rural youth from farming should cause concern among India's agricultural policy makers as it is likely to influence agricultural activities in the future. The rural youth have potential to orient themselves to go along with the main rivulet of the magnification route.

The youth are familiar as effective change agents who help in the process of dissemination and adoption of present techniques of agriculture. If the talents and abilities of rural youth are properly nurtured and scientifically guided, agriculture can attain sustained growth and bring opulence to the country. Singh *et al* (2020) concluded that efforts should be made to encourage rural youth to start machinery banks and support them both financially and technologically to successfully provide the services to the farming community. Kushwah et al (2018) stated that in order to enhance the adoption of scientific plant propagation practices by rural youth, they should be facilitated with latest technology know-how and motivated by imparting skill-based capacity building programme. Besides, concentrated efforts should be made by line departments to offer technical support, guaranteed

Corresponding Author's Email: nikithakor99@gmail.com

[1]Ph. D. Scholar,

[2] Asst. Professor, Dept. of Extn. Education, C. P. Collage of Agriculture, S.D.A.U., Sardarkrushinagar, Gujarat – 385506

market linkage, value addition facilities and other input supply service to different stakeholders that may create entrepreneurial opportunity in establishment of nurseries by rural youth. Hence, a study was undertaken to note down role of youth in decision making process related to agricultural and allied sectors activities.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

It is extent to which an individual justifies his assortment of most proficient means from among the available substitute on the basis scientific criterion for achieving greatest economic profits. This variable is measured with help of scale developed by Nandapurkar (1981).It consisted ten items each with three point response continuum *viz.,* not considered, considered after consultation with other and decision taken independently. The score was given according to the nature of in decision making. 0, 1 and 2 not considered, considered after consultation with other and considered independently, respectively.

Table 1 indicates that 47.5 per cent of rural youth took decision after consultation with other regards to trying new crop variety, while 38.75 per cent decided independently and reaming 13.75 per cent of the rural youth had not considered for taken decision. Half (50.0 %) of the rural youth takes decision for borrowing money for the farm independently, while 33.75 per cent of rural youth had taken decision after consultation with other and reaming 16.25 per cent of the rural youth had not considered for taken decision. Slightly more than half (56.25 %) of the rural youth takes decision to buying farm equipment after consultation with other, while 31.25 per cent of rural youth had taken decision independently. Slightly less than half (47.50 %) of the rural youth had taken decision independently with regards to choosing kind of fertilizers, while 40.0 per cent of rural youth had decision taken after consultation with other.

Slightly less half (47.5%) of the rural youth takes decision for attaining agricultural meeting after consultation with other, while 36.25 per cent of rural youth had taken decision independently. Half (50.0%) of the rural youth had taken decision

Table: 1 Distribution of the rural youth according to their decision making on various aspects of farming (n=160)

Sr. No.	Decisions on various aspects of farming	Not considered	Considered after consultation	Considered independently
1	To try new crop variety	22(13.75)	76(47.50)	62(38.75)
2	Borrow money for the farm	26(16.25)	54(33.75)	80(50.00)
3	To buy farm equipment	20(12.50)	90(56.25)	50(31.25)
4	Choose kind of fertilizers	20(12.50)	64(40.00)	76(47.50)
5	To attend agricultural meeting	26(16.25)	76(47.50)	58(36.25)
6	Subscribe farm publications	20(12.50)	60(37.50)	80(50.00)
7	Hire farm workers	20(12.50)	40(25.00)	100(62.50)
8	To try new farm practices	20(12.50)	94(58.75)	46(28.75)
9	To increases or decrease crop acreage	10(6.25)	80(50.00)	70(43.75)
10	To switch to new cropping plan	16(10.00)	74(46.25)	70(43.75)

Figures in parentheses indicate per cent

Table 2. Distribution of the rural youth according to their level of decision making.

Sr. No	Decision making	Frequency	Per cent
1.	Low (below 6.65 score)	023	14.38
2.	Medium (between 6.65 to 14.35 score)	110	68.74
3.	High (above 14.35 score)	027	16.88

independently with regards to subscribe farm publications, while 37.5 per cent of rural youth had taken decision after consultation with other. Slightly less than two third (62.5%) of the rural youth takes decision independently with regards to hire farm workers, while 25.0 per cent of rural youth had taken decision after consultation with other.

More than half (58.75 %) of the rural youth had taken decision after consultation with other regards to trying new farm practices, while 28.75 per cent of rural youth had taken decision independently. Half (50.0%) of the rural youth takes decision regards to increases or decrease crop acreage, while 43.75 per cent of rural youth had taken decision independently. Slightly less than half (46.25%) of the rural youth had taken decision regards to switch to new cropping plan, while 43.75 per cent of rural youth had taken decision independently and reaming 10.0 per cent of the rural youth had not considered for taken decision.

In order to know the level of participation of rural youth in decision making about farming, they were grouped into three categories. The statistics are obtainable in Table 2.

The data (Table 2) showed that about slightly more than two-third (68.74 %) of the rural youths had a medium level of decision making about farming, followed by 16.88 and 14.38 per cent of rural youth had high to low level of decision making about farming, respectively. This finding was similar with the finding of Nataraju (2015).

The results of correlation analysis indicated that out of the twelve independent variables, seven variables *viz.,* education, caste, family income, land holding, risk orientation, social participation and

Table 3. Relationship between independent variables of rural youth and decision making in farming. (n=160)

Sr. No	Independent variable	Correlation coefficient ('r' value)
1.	Age	0.0890^{NS}
2.	Education	0.1550*
3.	Size of family	0.0902 ^{NS}
4.	Caste	0.1516*
5.	Family income	0.1772*
6.	Social participation	0.1799*
7.	Land holding	0.1508*
8.	Risk orientation	0.1790*
9.	Innovativeness	0.2083**
10.	Attitude	0.2279**
11.	Extension participation	0.1891*
12.	Sources of information	0.2070**
*, ** = 5 and 1 per cent level of significance, respectively;		NS = Not significant.

extension participation had positive and significant relationship with decision making of rural youth in farming. Innovativeness, attitude and sources of information had positive and highly significant relationship with decision making of rural youth in farming. Age and size of family had not-significant relationship with decision making of rural youth in farming.

CONCLUSION

Based on the present study it can be concluded that the maximum number of rural youth of Banaskantha district of Gujarat state, overall decision making of rural youth had medium to low level of in farming because of participation of rural youth also low in farming. Need to enhance the number of agricultural activities and rural youth who have never participated must be encouraged to participate in agricultural activities. Innovativeness, attitude and sources of information had positive and highly significant relationship with decision making of rural youth in farming. The need of the hour is to create consciousness among rural youths that they too can lead a decent life in the village by taking up secondary agriculture, as it has the potential to absorb a large workforce. The state government should take up programmes to reward revolutionary rural youth and utilize their potential in its extension services to give them social gratitude.

REFERENCES

Anamica, M (2014). Attitude of rural youth towards agriculture. *Madras Agric J* **101** (1-3) : 79-86.

Anamica, M and Ravichandran V (2013). Perception of farm households on factors influencing the migration of rural youth and its repercussion in agriculture. *Int J Trop Agri* **31** (3-4) : 55

Barge, S A and Deshmukh A N (2011). Participation of rural youth in farming. *Adv Res J Soc Sci* **2** (2) : 207-209.

Kushwah Sunita, Kumari Sharda and Kushwaha Srishti (2018). Knowledge levels of rural youth about plant propagation techniques of horticultural crops. *J Krishi Vigyan* **7** (Special Issue) : 88-93

Nataraju, M S (2015). Participation of farm youth in agriculture. *Mysore J Agri Sci* **49** (2) : 399-402.

Patel B M, Patel J K, Badhe D K and Gulkari K D (2012). Function analysis of rural youth's participation in paddy farming. *Agri Update* **7** (3) : 206-209.

Singh Rajbir, Mahal J S , Arvind Kumar , Chahal V P, Singh K K and Singh A K (2020). Establishment of machinery bank for attracting rural youth for entrepreneurship development. *J Krishi Vigyan* 9 (1) : 125-130.

Received on 26/04/2021 *Accepted on 20/05/2021*