



Attitude of Rural Youth Towards Agriculture

M. Anamica* and V. Ravichandran

Department of Agricultural Extension and Rural Sociology,
Tamil Nadu Agricultural University, Coimbatore-641 003

Agriculture is critical to future food security. With global expectations, it should play a huge role in feeding the world population, which will likely exceed nine billion by 2050. Engaging rural youth in agriculture is the only key to meet the world's food crisis. But their perceptible unenthusiastic attitude towards agriculture is a source of concern and challenge to the future of agriculture in India. Considering this point of view, an attitudinal study was conducted among 180 migrant rural youths with agricultural background for assessing their attitude towards agriculture. An attitude scale was developed by using equal appearing interval method. It was evident from the study that nearly three fourth (72.45%) of the rural youth possessed a less favourable to moderately favourable attitude towards agriculture. Independent variables like possession of farm skill, farm size, economic motivation, comfort expectancy, affiliation expectancy and stimulation expectancy had positively favoured their attitude towards agriculture.

Keywords: Rural youth, Attitude, Agriculture

Gandhiji had stated, decades earlier that 'India lives in its villages' and it still holds good. He has addressed the rural youth who are not only the future, but also the present. Rural youth is an important and vital segment of human resources as they are the constructors of the future rural community. Nearly, 30 crores of the nation's youth reside in rural areas (Prabhath, 2011). The rural youth population, both male and female is higher than the urban population. The total rural youth population is 296.2 million as against 130.9 million urban youth population (The Hindu, 2011). Their role in development of agriculture and rural economy is imperative. But in the face of rapid urbanisation, the number of young people in rural areas of India is falling. A rising number of rural youth are turning their back on agriculture. They do not find this sector to be lucrative from the point of view of investment and employment. The withdrawal trend of farm youth in India is stronger in regions with low value of agricultural production per capita and villages close to towns (Sharma, 2007). Limited access to markets, assets, finance and infrastructure in rural areas, coupled with rapid growth and opportunities in urban areas increasingly make cities, the obvious choice in the search for a better life. The exodus of rural youth means fewer farmers, today and tomorrow. While their contribution towards attaining food security cannot be underestimated, their apparent lukewarm attitude towards agriculture is a source of concern and challenge to the future of agriculture in India. Considering this issue, the present study has been conducted with the following objectives.

(i) To measure the attitude of rural youth towards agriculture

(ii) To bring out the association and contribution of profile of migrant rural youth with their attitude towards agriculture.

Materials and Methods

Selection of area and respondents

The research was carried out in Coimbatore and Tirupur districts of Tamil Nadu by adopting an *ex post facto* research design during 2012. Coimbatore and Tirupur districts were selected as they are the major hubs of industrial activity, specifically manufacturing, indicating the influx of labourers from around the region and even other states. Tirupur stands third and Coimbatore stands fourth in Tamil Nadu in receiving the immigrants. The population decadal growth of Tirupur increased from 25.30 per cent to 28.70 per cent in 2001-11, while for Coimbatore it has increased from 17.00 per cent to 19.10 per cent (Census, 2011). The reason behind the increased population decadal growth is the prospect of migration in search of employment in these districts. On the prospect of agriculture, Coimbatore and Tirupur holds a net sown area of 180185 ha and 194079 ha respectively (Season and Crop report of Tamil Nadu, 2010). They relatively possessed a considerable area under agriculture when compared to the other districts that were found to have a high population decadal growth (Kancheepuram, Thiruvallur, Madurai and Sivagangai districts). Thus, the factors namely, the population decadal growth and the considerable area under agriculture ideally supported this study on attitude of rural youth towards agriculture to be conducted in these two districts of Tamil Nadu.

Coimbatore district has 12 blocks and Tirupur district has 13 blocks respectively. Two blocks have been selected from each district and a total of four

*Corresponding author email : drvextension@gmail.com

blocks were selected based on key information from the officials of the State Department of Agriculture, area under agriculture and scope of studying the issue of rural youth migration. Two revenue villages from each blocks were selected purposively based on the information provided by the State Department officials. From each revenue village, 10 fully migrated rural youth and 10 partially migrated rural youth with agricultural background were selected based on key informant method. A total sample of 160 rural youth in the proportion of 80 fully migrated rural youth and 80 partially migrated rural youth were interviewed in accordance with the objective to measure their attitude towards agriculture.

Construction of scale to measure the attitude of rural youth towards agriculture

Construction of attitude scale

The scale was constructed by following 'Equal Appearing Interval' scaling technique developed by Thurstone and Chave (1929). In the study, attitude was operationalised as the mental disposition of the rural youth about agriculture in varying degrees of favourableness or unfavourableness. Possible statements concerning the psychological object *i.e.* 'Agriculture' with respect to the psychological and economical domains was collected based on review of literature, discussion with scientists and extensionists. Totally 80 statements were collected which were organized and structured in the form of attitude items. The items were screened by following the informal criteria suggested by Edwards (1969) for editing the statements to be used in the construction of the attitude scale.

Based on the screening, 59 items were selected which formed the universe of content. The 59 statements were then subjected to judges opinion on a five-point continuum, ranging from, most unfavourable to most favourable. The list of statements was sent to 50 Judges who comprised of extension specialists of State Agricultural Universities of Tamil Nadu, Kerala, Andhra Pradesh and Karnataka and Gandhigram Rural University. Of the 50 Judges, 40 Judges responded by sending their judgements. Based on the judgements the scale values and Q values for each statement were calculated by applying the equal appearing scale interval formula as suggested by Thrustone and Chave (1929). The computed scale and Q values are tabulated in Table 1.

Selection of attitude items

The items to be included in the final attitude scale were selected based on the distribution of scale values uniformly along the psychological continuum and high scale values and smaller Q values. The scale values were arranged in descending order of magnitude and the difference between the successive scale values and the cumulative total of the computed differences were worked out. Considering the time limitation from rural youths' point of view, it was decided to select 10 statements to constitute the attitude scale. Since, the selected scale values

should have equal appearing interval and distributed uniformly along the psychological continuum, it was necessary to form 10 compartments so as to select 10 statements @ one statement from each compartment. The basis for forming the compartments was that, each compartment should be equally spaced in the continuum. For this purpose (in Table 1), the difference between the highest scale value (4.83) and the lowest scale value (1.16) was worked out. The difference value (0.367) was divided by ten. This formed the width of the first class interval. The second interval was worked out by adding the value 0.367 with the width of the first class interval (0.734). Adding the value 0.367 with the width interval of second class (0.734) gives the third interval (1.101). Subsequently, all the ten intervals were worked out. Each class interval represented a compartment for the selection of the attitude items. For example the value 0.367 is close to 0.33 of the cumulative value of difference. So this forms the first compartment and similarly ten compartments were worked out.

To select the attitude items from the 10 compartments, the scale values and the corresponding Q values were considered. Based on the criteria already mentioned, items having high scale values and low Q values were selected @ one item from each compartment. Care was taken to ensure that the selected items represented the universe of content and covered the psychological and economical domains of Agriculture. Thereby, 10 items were selected with equal appearing interval and with a uniform distribution along the psychological continuum. The attitude scale thus constructed is given in Table 2.

Reliability and validity of the scale

The reliability of the scale was determined by 'Split-half' method. The 10 selected attitude items were divided into two equal halves by odd-even method (Singh, 2008). The two halves were administered separately to 30 rural youths in a non-sample area. The scores were subjected to product moment correlation test in order to find out the reliability of the half test. The half-test reliability coefficient r was 0.637, which was significant at one per cent level of probability. Further the reliability coefficient of the whole test was computed using the spearman-brown prophecy formula. The whole test reliability r_{tt} was 0.778. According to Singh (2008), when the purpose of the test is to compare the mean scores of two groups of narrow range, a reliability coefficient of 0.50 or 0.60 would suffice. Hence, the constructed scale is reliable as the r_{tt} was > 0.60 .

Content validation was carried out by subjecting the selected 10 items to judges' opinion. The responses were obtained on a four – point continuum of 'most adequately covers', 'more adequately covers', 'less adequately covers' and 'least adequately covers'. Scores of 4, 3, 2 and 1 were given for the points on the continuum, respectively. Totally, 30 judges responded by sending their judgments. The

mean score of 2.5 was fixed as the basis for deciding the content validity of the scale. If the overall mean score of the attitude items as rated by the judges was above 2.5, the scale will be declared as valid and if not otherwise. In the present case, the overall mean score was worked out as 3.22 and therefore, the constructed attitude scale is said to be valid.

Administration of the scale

The ten attitude items selected were arranged randomly in order to avoid biased responses. The scale was administered on a five point continuum as strongly agree, agree, undecided, strongly disagree and disagree. The scores for favourable statements were given as strongly agree - 7, agree - 5, undecided - 4, disagree - 3 and strongly disagree - 1. For unfavourable statements, the scoring procedure was reversed. The score obtained for each statement was summed up to arrive at the attitude score for that respondent. The score ranged from 70 (maximum) to 10 (minimum). The responses were grouped as less favourable, moderately favourable and highly favourable based on the cumulative frequency method.

Results and Discussion

Attitude of rural youth towards agriculture

Attitude means a set of tendencies, views, and beliefs of an individual about his/her environmental factors. These tendencies and beliefs will be stabilized based on environmental effect, the gained experiences and the period of time (Rafiepour, 1993). In this study, attitude was operationalised as the psychological outlook of the rural youth towards agriculture in varying degrees of favourableness or unfavourableness. The respondents were categorized into three groups viz., less favorable, moderately favorable and highly favorable using cumulative frequency method, and the distribution of respondents are presented in Table 3.

The results from the table depicted that in total, nearly three fourth (72.45%) of the rural youth possessed less favourable to moderately favourable attitude towards agriculture. Only one fourth (27.50%) of the respondents were found to hold a highly favourable attitude. This is supported with the findings of Sajjan (2006) who reported that 63.33 per cent of the rural youth in rainfed tract and 66.66 per cent of rural youth in irrigated tract had a moderately favourable attitude towards agriculture.

The table also portrayed that more than 40.00 per cent of the migrant rural youth had less favourable attitude towards agriculture followed by one third (35.00%) of the respondents with moderately favourable attitude towards agriculture. The left over 22.50 per cent of the respondents possessed a highly favourable attitude. The migrant rural youth possessed a less favourable attitude towards agriculture since they could have felt agriculture to be the least prospective occupation.

They might have also felt that the income from farming has less stabilizing impact on their family economy, and this might have pushed them to migrate in search of a job with a decent income.

On the other hand almost 45.00 per cent of the partial migrants possessed a moderately favourable attitude towards agriculture. Nearly, one third (32.50%) of the respondents possessed a highly favourable attitude and the remaining 23.75 per cent possessed a less favourable attitude. The moderately favourable attitude of rural youth towards agriculture might have made the rural youth to continue practicing agriculture on part time or seasonal basis, rather than to abandon. Moreover, they might have also thought that, it could be better for a family to hold diversified occupation than to be dependent on agriculture. The income from diversified occupations could also act as a shock absorber during economic crisis in the farm family.

The 't' test further confirmed the existence of significant differences in the attitude towards agriculture between the two categories of rural youth.

Association and contribution of profile characteristics of rural youth with their attitude towards agriculture

The study on association and contribution of profile of the rural youth with their attitude towards agriculture is important as some of the key profile characteristics determine their differences in opinion. Hence, correlation and regression analysis had been carried out and the results revealed in Table 4.

From the tabulated data, it could be understood that the variables, involvement in farming, income expectancy, comfort expectancy, stimulation expectancy and affiliation expectancy showed positive and significant relationships at one per cent level of probability level, whereas age, education, non-farm skill, proximity to towns/cities, prior migration experience, economic motivation and risk orientation exhibited negative and significant relationships at the same probability level.

The results also indicated that occupational status had a positive and significant relationship at five per cent level of probability, whereas self reliance and self confidence portrayed negative and significant relationships at the same probability level. However, variables such as farm size, farm skill and achievement motivation depicted their non significant relationship with the dependent variables.

The results of multiple regression analysis showed a R² value of 0.544, which revealed 54.40 per cent variation in the attitude of rural youth towards agriculture. Farm size (X₁) and farm skill (X₂) showed positive significant contribution with the dependent variable 'attitude of rural youth towards agriculture' at one per cent level of probability, whereas variables like achievement motivation (X₃) and comfort expectancy (X₄) showed positively significant contribution at five per cent level of probability. However, variables like

Table 1. Computation of Equal Appearing Intervals

S. No	Statement No.	Scale value	Q value	Difference between successive scale values	Cumulative value of the differences	Equal appearing class intervals	Compartments
1	41	4.83	0.26				
2	4	4.78	0.87	0.05	0.05		
3	25	4.75	0.92	0.03	0.08		
4	5	4.66	0.95	0.09	0.17		
5	6	4.66	1.33	0	0.17		I
6	19	4.5	1.09	0.16	0.33		
7	32	4.5	0.5	0	0.33		
8	59	4.5	0.5	0	0.33	.367	
9	8	4.44	1.3	0.06	0.39		
10	54	4.38	1.1	0.06	0.45		
11	55	4.38	0.89	0	0.45		
12	33	4.36	0.97	0.02	0.47		
13	26	4.3	1.07	0.06	0.53		
14	31	4.3	1.075	0	0.53		
15	28	4.28	0.98	0.02	0.55		
16	3	4.23	0.81	0.05	0.6		II
17	29	4.22	1.16	0.01	0.61		
18	56	4.22	0.91	0	0.61		
19	45	4.21	0.82	0.01	0.62		
20	9	4.2	1.3	0.01	0.63		
21	1	4.19	0.79	0.01	0.64		
22	46	4.15	0.82	0.04	0.68		
23	27	4.09	0.65	0.06	0.74	.734	
24	20	3.96	2.4	0.13	0.87		
25	39	3.9	0.95	0.06	0.93	1.101	III
26	43	3.5	0.74	0.4	1.33	1.468	IV
27	7	3.24	0.87	0.26	1.59	1.853	V
28	50	2.78	2.12	0.46	2.05	2.202	VI
29	22	2.45	2.08	0.33	2.38		
30	38	2.25	1.04	0.2	2.58	2.569	VII
31	10	2.05	0.74	0.2	2.78		
32	30	2	0.82	0.05	2.83		
33	40	1.96	0.71	0.04	2.87		
34	15	1.9	0.8	0.06	2.93		VIII
35	24	1.9	1.34	0	2.93	2.936	
36	49	1.87	0.88	0.03	2.96		
37	47	1.83	0.91	0.04	3		
38	57	1.83	0.92	0	3		
39	18	1.82	0.76	0.01	3.01		IX
40	48	1.82	0.89	0	3.01		
41	2	1.78	0.8	0.04	3.05	3.303	

S. No	Statement No.	Scale value	Q value	Difference between successive scale values	Cumulative value of the differences	Equal appearing class intervals	Compartments
42	42	1.76	0.26	0.02	3.07		
43	23	1.75	1.47	0.01	3.08		
44	34	1.75	0.94	0	3.08		
45	52	1.75	0.54	0	3.08		
46	51	1.73	1.05	0.02	3.1		
47	12	1.72	1.02	0.01	3.11		
48	58	1.72	1.14	0	3.11		
49	36	1.71	0.98	0.01	3.12		
50	44	1.71	1.105	0	3.12		X
51	17	1.7	0.96	0.01	3.13		
52	35	1.6	1.04	0.1	3.23		
53	11	1.59	0.96	0.01	3.24		
54	16	1.59	1.02	0	3.24		
55	53	1.55	0.54	0.04	3.28		
56	14	1.45	0.99	0.1	3.38		
57	21	1.45	1.04	0	3.38		
58	13	1.36	1.04	0.09	3.47		
59	37	1.16	0.42	0.2	3.67	3.67	

education (X_2) and proximity to towns/cities (X_8) showed negative significant contribution at five per cent level of probability.

The strength of contribution of these variables could be explained in such a way that a unit increase in farm size, farm skill, achievement motivation and comfort expectancy *ceteris paribus* would result in an increase in favourable attitude towards agriculture by 1.716, 5.549, 0.438 and 0.529 units respectively.

It could also be observed from the table that among the four significantly contributing variables, farm size and farm skill contributed much on 'attitude towards agriculture'. In general, increased farm size would increase the attitude towards agriculture. Increased employment generation and increased income because of increased farm size would be the reason behind the development of favourable attitude. Similarly, possession of farm skill is positively related to the attitude of rural youth towards agriculture. The more the possession of farm skill, more would be the dexterity to manage the farm and this would probably lead to possess a positive attitude towards agriculture.

When discussing about the other contributing variables, strong achievement motivation might enhance an individual to earn more income and profit from the farming. Better achievement motivation also might pave way for the comfortable risk management endeavour (Senthil, 2009). Pertaining to comfort expectancy, more the expectation of living

in a pleasant and socially amenable commune, more would be the rural youth intention to retain in agriculture. Thus, achievement motivation level and comfort expectancy of the rural youth would positively influence their attitude towards agriculture.

In the case of migrant rural youth, the correlation analysis revealed that variables like farm skill, income expectancy, comfort expectancy, stimulation expectancy and affiliation expectancy were found to have positive and significant relationships at one per cent level of probability level, whereas proximity to towns/cities, economic motivation and self confidence exhibited a negative and significant relationships at the same probability level. It was also found that age, education, occupation and risk orientation portrayed negative and significant relationships at five per cent probability level.

Further, the multiple regression analysis with respect to migrants indicated a significant R^2 value of 0.646 which revealed that 64.60 per cent variation in the attitude of rural youth towards agriculture. Farm skill (X_5) and comfort expectancy (X_{16}) showed positive significant contribution with the dependent variable at one per cent level of probability, where as one variable namely, stimulation expectancy (X_{17}) showed a positively significant contribution at five per cent level of probability. The strength of contribution of these variables could be explained in such a way that a unit increase in farm skill, comfort expectancy and

stimulation expectancy *ceteris paribus* would result in an increase in favourable attitude towards agriculture by 5.408, 1.312 and 0.742 units respectively.

With respect to partially migrant rural youth, the results of correlation analysis revealed that the variables namely, comfort expectancy and affiliation

Table 2. Final set of attitude items selected with corresponding scale and Q values

S. No	Statement No.	Scale Value	Q Value	Statement	Nature of the statement
1.	41	4.83	0.26	Agricultural skill training to rural youth increases their participation in agriculture.	Favourable
2.	27	4.09	0.65	Rural youth practicing agriculture can prosper in their life.	Favourable
3.	39	3.9	0.95	Rural youth with agricultural background do not give up agriculture.	Favourable
4.	43	3.5	0.74	Rural youth with passion towards agriculture can confidently practice farming.	Favourable
5.	7	3.24	0.84	Focusing more on the principal agricultural sector is the need of the hour.	Favourable
6.	50	2.78	2.12	It is better for a family to hold diversified occupation rather to be dependent on agriculture.	Unfavourable
7.	38	2.25	1.04	Practising agriculture affects the prestige of rural youth.	Unfavourable
8.	40	1.96	0.71	Rural youth with higher aspirations do not practice agriculture.	Unfavourable
9.	18	1.82	0.76	The income from agriculture has a less stabilizing impact on the farmer's household economy.	Unfavourable
10.	42	1.76	0.26	Agricultural support policies do not focus on rural youth.	Unfavourable

Table 3. Distribution of respondents based on their attitude towards agriculture

S. No.	Category	Fully Migrated (n=80)		Partially Migrated (n=80)		Total (n=160)	
		No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
1	Highly favourable	18	22.50	26	32.50	44	27.50
2	Moderately favourable	28	35.00	35	43.75	63	39.33
3	Less favourable	34	42.50	19	23.75	53	33.12
4	Total	80	100.00	80	100.00	160	100.00

t value = 3.516**

**Significant at 0.01 probability level

expectancy had positive and significant relationships at one per cent level of probability level, whereas age, education, non-farm skill, proximity to towns/cities, prior migration experience and economic motivation exhibited a negative and significant relationships at the same probability level. One variable namely, income expectancy showed a positive and significant relationship at five per cent level of probability.

The regression analysis portrayed that the R² value was 0.623, which revealed 62.30 per cent variation in the attitude of rural youth towards agriculture. Farm size (X₄) and affiliation expectancy (X₁₈) showed positive significant contribution with the dependent variable 'attitude of rural youth towards agriculture' at one per cent level of probability, whereas one variable namely, economic motivation (X₁₀) portrayed a positively significant contribution at five per cent level of probability. However, variables

like non-farm skill (X₇) and risk orientation (X₁₂) exhibited negatively significant contribution at one per cent level of probability. The strength of contribution of these variables could be explained in such a way that a unit increase in farm size, economic motivation and affiliation expectancy *ceteris paribus* would enhance the favourable attitude of rural youth towards agriculture by 3.791, 2.205 and 0.933 units, respectively.

The comparative study of the contribution of the profile of migrants and partial migrants with attitude towards agriculture revealed that farm skill, comfort expectancy and stimulation characterized by migrants and farm size, economic motivation and affiliation expectancy characterized by the partial migrants positively favoured their attitude towards agriculture

Table 4. Association and contribution of profile characteristics of rural youth with their attitude towards agriculture

S. No	Profile characteristics	Fully migrated			Partially migrated			Total respondents					
		'r' value	PRC	SE	't' value	'r' value	PRC	SE	'r' value	PRC	SE	't' value	
1.	(X ₁) Age	-.230*	-1.426	1.009	-1.413 ^{NS}	-.361**	.610	1.422	.429 ^{NS}	-.268**	-.663	.707	-.937 ^{NS}
2.	(X ₂) Education	-.272*	.809	.744	1.087 ^{NS}	-.324**	-1.062	.876	-1.212 ^{NS}	-.260**	-1.062	.519	-2.048*
3.	(X ₃) Occupation	-.258*	-.618	1.147	-.538 ^{NS}	-0.031 ^{NS}	-2.964	1.931	-1.535 ^{NS}	.185*	.671	.780	.860 ^{NS}
4.	(X ₄) Farm size	-0.129 ^{NS}	1.130	.846	1.336 ^{NS}	0.098 ^{NS}	3.791	1.200	3.158**	-0.031 ^{NS}	1.716	.600	2.862**
5.	(X ₅) Farm Skill	.588**	5.408	1.802	3.001**	NA	NA	NA	NA	0.011 ^{NS}	5.549	1.544	3.595**
6.	(X ₆) Involvement in farming	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	.269**	2.929	2.744	1.067 ^{NS}
7.	(X ₇) Non-farm skill	-0.085 ^{NS}	-.188	2.115	-.089 ^{NS}	-.510**	-6.394	2.197	-2.910**	-.306**	-2.419	1.372	-1.763 ^{NS}
8.	(X ₈) Proximity to towns/cities	-.453**	-1.905	1.156	-1.648 ^{NS}	-.320**	-1.129	1.952	-.578 ^{NS}	-.435**	-2.063	.910	-2.267*
9.	(X ₉) Prior migration experience	-0.192 ^{NS}	2.256	2.303	.980 ^{NS}	-.375**	-3.159	2.379	-1.328 ^{NS}	-.306**	2.395	1.226	1.953 ^{NS}
10.	(X ₁₀) Economic motivation	-.314**	.418	.284	1.471 ^{NS}	-.364**	.759	.344	2.205*	-.406**	.045	.171	.262 ^{NS}
11.	(X ₁₁) Achievement motivation	-0.075 ^{NS}	.612	.345	1.771 ^{NS}	0.172 ^{NS}	.299	.293	1.022 ^{NS}	0.053 ^{NS}	.438	.194	2.257*
12.	(X ₁₂) Risk orientation	-.259*	-.066	.342	-.192 ^{NS}	-0.047 ^{NS}	-.580	.220	-2.635**	-.273**	-.021	.140	-.153 ^{NS}
13.	(X ₁₃) Self reliance	-0.112 ^{NS}	-.361	2.056	-.175 ^{NS}	-0.206 ^{NS}	1.566	2.341	.669 ^{NS}	-.160*	-1.988	1.289	-1.542 ^{NS}
14.	(X ₁₄) Self Confidence	-.348**	-.150	.528	-.284 ^{NS}	0.093 ^{NS}	.289	.175	1.651 ^{NS}	-.190*	.198	.139	1.423 ^{NS}
15.	(X ₁₅) Income expectancy	.540**	-.008	.377	-.023 ^{NS}	.285*	.126	.221	.571 ^{NS}	.473**	.084	.180	.464 ^{NS}
16.	(X ₁₆) Comfort expectancy	.618**	1.312	.533	2.462**	.465**	.073	.335	.217 ^{NS}	.588**	.529	.246	2.148*
17.	(X ₁₇) Stimulation expectancy	.543**	.742	.364	2.041*	0.066 ^{NS}	-.222	.322	-.687 ^{NS}	.393**	.102	.233	.437 ^{NS}
18.	(X ₁₈) Affiliation expectancy	.507**	-.564	.329	-1.714 ^{NS}	.365**	.933	.351	2.661**	.499**	.191	.203	.944 ^{NS}
	R ²						.623				.544		
	F Value						6.499**				9.327**		
	Constant						2.185				17.638		

PRC = Partial Regression Co-efficient

SE = Standard Error

^{NS} - Non Significant

* - Significant at 0.05 level

** - Significant at 0.01 level

Conclusion

Indian rural youth shun agriculture as our society looks down upon farming. The pessimistic attitude 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 affect agricultural activities in the future. The need of the hour is to create awareness 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 role of extensionist in providing training on innovative and sustainable agricultural practices to the rural youth is inevitable. The state government should take up programmes to reward innovative farm youth and utilize their abilities in its extension services to give them social recognition. It should involve in creation of infrastructure facilities in various aspects of farming and providing marketing linkages, exploring opportunities in secondary agricultural operations such as value addition of crops and hiring, and servicing of mechanised farm implements etc which would enlighten the livelihood of the farm youth. The combined effort of extensionist from State Department of Agriculture and State Agricultural Universities in making agriculture intellectually stimulating and economically rewarding is the only way to attract and retain rural youth in agriculture.

Acknowledgement

I extend my profound thanks to the 'JAWAHARLAL NEHRU MEMORIAL FUND – SCHOLARSHIP FOR DOCTORAL STUDIES' for financially aiding me to carry out this extensive research on Migration of Rural Youth – An Analysis. I also express my sincere thanks to the chairman of my advisory committee for his constant support and guidance.

References

- Census of India. 2011. Provisional population totals paper I. Office of the Registrar General and Census Commissioner, Ministry of Home Affairs, Government of India, p.4. Available at: www.censusindia.gov.in/2011-prov-results/census2011_PPT_paper1.html
- Edwards, L. and Allen. 1969. Techniques of attitude scale construction. Vakils, Feffer and Simons Private limited, Bombay, p. 83-117.
- Prabath, S.V. 2011. Youth and Rural India. *Ailaan, NCR/ Newsletter*, 2: 1-3.
- Rafiepour, F. 1993. Rural tendency evaluation to Jahad e Sazandagi. Tehran, Arganoon edition, p. 50-58.
- Sajjan, P.S. 2006. Comparative profile analysis of rural youth in rainfed and irrigated tracts of Bagalkot district. Unpub. M.Sc. (Ag.) Thesis, Dharwad University of Agricultural Sciences, Dharwad, p. 67-71.
- Season and Crop report of Tamil Nadu. 2010. Department of Economics and Statistics, Government of Tamil Nadu, p. 12. Available at: www.agritech.tnau.ac.in/.../Season%20&%20Crop%20Report%202012.pdf
- Senthilkumar, R. 2009. Risk management behavioural pattern of paddy farmers – An empirical study. Unpub. Ph.D. Thesis, TNAU, Coimbatore.
- Sharma, A. 2007. The changing agricultural demography of India: Evidence from a rural youth perception survey. *Inter. J. of Rural Mgmt*, 3: 1- 27.
- Singh, A.K. 2008. Test, measurements and research methods in behavioural sciences. Bharati Bhawan publishers and distributors, New Delhi, p. 68-110.
- The Hindu. 2011. Youth should be encouraged to solve crises-ridden agriculture. dated on 03/03/2011. available at: <http://www.hindu.com/seta/2011/03/03/stories/2011030353211500.htm>
- Thurstone. and Chave. 1929. The measurement of attitudes. Chicago University Press. Chicago.