Journal of AgriSearch, 9 (2): 185-188
An Open Access International Peer Reviewed Quarterly

ISSN : 2348-8808 (Print), 2348-8867 (Online)
https://doi.org/10.21921/jas.v9i02.10130

Role of Rural Youth in Decision Making Related to the Farming System in Fatehpur District of Uttar Pradesh, India

ALIMUL ISLAM[1]* MOINUDDIN[2] NAUSHAD ALAM[3]

ABSTRACT

The involvement of youth in agriculture is vital as they may be more energetic, effective, and receptive to new ideas and advanced technologies. A study was conducted in the district of Fatehpur, Uttar Pradesh state, out of thirteen development blocks five blocks were selected purposively in the district, and three villages were selected randomly from each block. From each selected village eight rural youth were selected randomly for data collection. The total sample size of the study was 120 rural youth farmers of the Fatehpur district. A structured interview schedule was used to collect the data; collected data were analyzed and interpreted in the light of the objective by using the appropriate statistical tool to draw a logical conclusion. The study revealed that 65.83 per cent of rural youth farmers had a medium level of decision-making while participating in agricultural practices. Innovativeness, size of family, landholding, family income, and sources of information had a positive and highly significant relationship with the decision-making of rural youth in farming. Age and occupation had a significant relationship with the decision-making of rural youth in agricultural Practices.

Keywords: Decision making, Agricultural Practices, participation, rural youth.

ARTICLE INFO

Received on	:	04.02. 2022
Accepted	:	18.05.2022
Published online	:	16.06.2022

INTRODUCTION

Providing economic opportunities for youth in agriculture is essential to securing the future of agriculture in India, addressing poverty, unemployment, and inequality. However, barriers limit youth participation in agriculture and the broader food system. Agriculture is recognized as a primary livelihood source for rural people in India and an essential contributor to economic growth (FAO 2014).

Farming offers the young generation a chance to make a difference by growing enough food to feed the world. Those who become farmers now have the opportunity to be the generation that ends world hunger and alleviates malnutrition as well as helping the sector adapt to climate change and agriculture plays a crucial role in the economy of developing countries and provides the main source of food, income, and employment to their rural populations. However, improvements in agriculture and land use are fundamental to achieving food security, poverty alleviation, and overall sustainable development.

Young people are innovative and creative in problem-solving and in finding solutions: they are the key to helping communities in meeting their subsistence needs, improving the security of the people, and even acquiring control over their own lives. In 2019, there are about 1.2 billion youth aged 15 to 24 years in the world, or 16 per cent of the global population. Around 2065, the world's youth population is projected to reach its peak, at just under 1.4 billion persons (13%). The share of youth in the total population peaked at 19.3 per cent in 1985. In 2019, Central and Southern Asia were home to the largest number of youth (361 million), followed by Eastern and South-Eastern Asia (307 million) and sub-Saharan Africa (211 million) (United Nations 2015). Young people constitute a high and a peaking portion of the world's population; they represent challenges as well as development opportunities. But present time rural youth continue to face challenges related to unemployment, underemployment, and poverty. Despite the agricultural sector's ample potential to provide income-generating opportunities for rural youth, challenges related specifically to youth participation in this sector and, more importantly, options for overcoming them are not extensively documented. Furthermore, statistics on rural youth are often lacking, as data are rarely disaggregated by important factors such as age, sex, and geographical location.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

The present study was conducted in the Fatehpur district of Uttar Pradesh. Out of thirteen blocks of the Fatehpur district, five blocks were selected randomly. Three villages from each block were selected randomly, thus a total of fifteen villages were selected for the study. Eight rural youth within the age group of 18- 30 years, those who were already engaged in agriculture were selected randomly from each selected village to make the total size of 120 respondents. The extent of participation referred to actual performance/supervision of the farm and farm-related activities by the rural youth in terms of the number of days in a cropping season. Based on the information obtained in the survey, a review of available literature, and in consultation with the experts a schedule was developed to know the pattern of farm-related activities performed/supervised by rural youth. The schedule consisted of common field activities. Against each activity, it was designed to obtain responses as considered, not considered, and considered after consultation in frequency and percentage. The scoring pattern was 3, 2, and 1 for considered,

[1] Research Scholar, Deptt. of Ag. Extension & Comm., Sam Higginbottom University of Agriculture Technology and Sciences, Prayagraj, Uttar Pradesh, India
[2] Associate Professor, School of Agricultural Sciences, Shri Guru Ram Rai University, Dehradun, Uttarakhand, India
[3] Senior Scientist, Agriculture Ext., KVK, Thariaon, Fatehpur, Uttar Pradesh, India
*Corresponding Author E-mail: alikhan9695@gmail.com

Table 1: Distribution of the rural youth according to their socio-economic conditions

S. No.	Category	Respondents	
		Frequency	Percentage
1.	**Youth Age group**		
	(15-20)	26	21.66
	(21-25)	38	31.66
	(26-30)	56	46.66
2.	**Education**		
	Illiterate	19	15.84
	Primary School	25	20.83
	High School	29	24.16
	Intermediate	34	28.34
	Graduate and above	13	10.83
3.	**Size of Family**		
	Small size (up to 5 members)	36	30.00
	Large size (above 5 members	84	70.00
4.	**Occupation**		
	Main (Agriculture)	73	60.83
	Subsidiary		
	Ag.+ Caste Occupation	17	14.16
	Ag.+ Business	23	19.16
	Ag.+ Service	07	05.83
5.	**Land Holding**		
	Below 1 hac.	38	31.66
	Below 1-2 hac.	45	37.50
	Large above 2 hac.	37	30.84
6.	**Family Income**		
	Rs.50001-100000	40	33.33
	Rs. 100001-150000	51	42.50
	Above Rs. 150000	29	24.17
7.	**Level of Innovativeness**		
	Low (0-3 score)	37	30.83
	Medium (4 – 6 score)	59	49.6
	High (above 7 scores)	24	24.00
8.	**Source of Information**		
	Low (9-14)	25	20.83
	Medium (15-21)	57	47.05
	High (22-27)	38	31.66
9.	**Overall extension contacts**		
	Low (5-8)	44	36.66
	Medium (9-12)	53	44.67
	High (13-15)	23	19.17

not considered, and considered after consultation. Statistical tools like correlation coefficient, multiple and stepwise regression, and path analysis were used.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The maximum of the respondents (46.66) belonged to the age group of 26 to 30 years (Table 1). A considerable number of respondents (31.66%) were from the age group of 21-25 and only (21.66%) of respondents were found to be from the age group of 15-20 years while (15.84%) of the respondents were illiterately followed by (20.83%) were educated up to the primary level whereas (24.16%) of the respondents were educated up to high school, (28.34%) respondents had educated up to intermediate level, (10.83%) of the respondents were educated up to graduation and above. Finally, the results indicate that majority of the respondents were educated up to an intermediate level. Similar findings were also revealed by Nataraju (2015) & Dorkar and Shaikh (2018).

The data incorporated in the above table indicate that majority of respondents (70.00%) were from large families (above 5 members) while the remaining (30.00%) respondents belong to small families (up to 5 members) whereas the majority of the respondents (60.83%) were engaged in agriculture as their main occupation for their livelihood, followed by (14.16%), (19.16%) and (5.83%) of them were engaged in agriculture + caste occupation, agriculture + business and agriculture + service as their main occupation respectively while (31.66%) respondents had below 1 hectare of land holding, whereas (37.50%) respondents had 1-2 hectares of landholding and (30.84%) respondents had more than 2 hectares landholding. Such findings have been also reported in their research paper Kushwaha *et al.* (2018).

The table also depicts that respondent according to their annual income, indicate that out of a total of 120 respondents, (33.33%) respondents had an annual income below Rs. 100000 whereas (42.00%) and (24.17%) of respondents had an annual income less than Rs.1, 50,000 and above Rs. 1, 50,000, respectively whereas (49.06%) of the respondents had a medium level of innovativeness in decision making. Followed by low (30.83%) had low and (24.00%) had a high level of innovativeness in decision making respectively. The table revealed that out of 120 respondents, most of the respondents (47.05%) were found to medium level of source of information followed by the low level of information category (20.83%) and high level of information category (31.67%), respectively. Apart from the above table shows that most of the respondents (44.66%) were found to have medium extension contact while (36.66%) of the respondents had a low level of extension contact followed by a high level of extension contact were found (19.17%). Findings also revealed by Kitturmath *et al.* (2014).

About 63% of the respondents decided after consultation with others regards to routine and basic decision making, while (19.16%) of respondents decided independently and reaming (17.05%) of respondents had not considered taking a decision (Table 2). Out of 120 respondents (50.0 %), the respondents take decisions independently for personal and organizational decision making, while (28.33%) of respondents had decided after consultation with others and reaming (21.66%) respondents had not considered taking a decision. Slightly (40.00%) of the respondents decided after consultation with

Table 2: Distribution of the rural youth according to their decision-making related farming system

S.No	Decisions on various aspects of the farming system	Considered		Not Considered		Considered after consultation	
		Freq.	(%)	Freq.	(%)	Freq.	(%)
01	Routine and Basic Decision Making	23	19.16	21	17.5	76	63.33
02	Personal and Organizational Decision Making	60	50.00	26	21.66	34	28.33
03	Policy and Operating Decision Making	42	35.00	30	25.00	48	40.00
04	Programmed and Non-Programmed Decision Making	74	61.66	20	16.66	26	21.66
05	To try new farm practices	66	55.00	15	12.05	39	32.05
06	To switch to a new cropping plan	60	50.00	20	16.66	40	33.33
07	To attend the agricultural meeting	80	66.66	15	12.05	25	20.83
08	Technology for crop production	60	50.00	26	21.66	34	28.33
09	Particular crop, size of poultry / livestock enterprise	65	54.16	20	16.66	35	29.16
10	Decisions on utilization of funds	74	61.66	20	16.66	26	21.66
11	To accessing information	66	55.00	20	16.66	34	28.33
12	Buying of inputs and selling of outputs	75	62.05	05	4.16	40	33.33

others regards to policy and operating decisions, while (35.00%) of respondents had taken decisions independently, remaining (25.00%) of the respondents had not considered taken decision.

Similar findings were also reported by Anamica (2014) and Yaseen *et al.* (2021) more than half (61.66%) of the respondents taken decisions independently regards programmed and non-programmed decision making, while (21.66%) of the respondents takes decisions after consultation with others, and the remaining (16.66%) of the respondents not considered to take decisions in this regards, more than half (55.00%) of the respondents had taken decision independently with regards to trying new farm practices, while (32.05%) of the respondents decide after consultation with others, remaining (12.05%) of the respondents not considered to takes decisions, half (50.00%) of the respondents decision independently with regards to switching to new cropping plan, while (33.33%) of the respondents had the decision taken after consultation with others. remaining (16.66%) of the respondents not considered take the decision, Slightly more than half (66.66%) of the respondents takes a decision independently for attending the agricultural meeting, while (20 .83%) respondents had decided after consultation with others, Rout *et al.* (2020) while (12.05%) of the respondents not considered to decides in this regards, half (50.0%) of the respondents had taken decisions independently with regards to technology for crop productions, while (28.33%) of respondents had decided after consultation with others. More than half (54.16%) of the respondents take decisions independently about a particular crop, or size of poultry/ livestock enterprises, while (29.16%) of the respondents had taken decisions after consultation with others.

More than half (61.66%) of the respondents had taken decisions independently regards to decisions on the utilization of funds, while (21.66%) of the respondents had decided after consultation with others. Slightly more than half (55.0%) of the respondents take decisions independently regards to accessing information, while (28.33%) of the respondents had decided after consultation with others. More than fifty (62.05%) of the respondents had taken decisions independently regards to buying of inputs and selling of outputs, while (33.33%) of the respondents had decided after consultation with others. Similar findings were also reported by Abdullah *et al.* (2012).

The table 3 depicted that majority of the respondents (65.83%) had a medium level of decision-making related to the farming system followed by (18.33%) of respondents who had low levels and (15.84%) of the respondents had a high level of decision making related to farming system respectively.

Table 3: Distribution of the rural youth according to their level of decision-making related Farming system

Sr. No	Decision making	Frequency	Per cent
1.	Low (12-20)	22	18.33
2.	Medium (21-30)	79	65.83
3.	High (31-36)	19	15.84

Extension participation had a positive and highly significant relationship with the decision-making of rural youth in farming (Table 4). Innovativeness, size of family, landholding, family income, and sources of information had a positive and

Table 4: Relationship between independent variables of rural youth and decision making in farming system

Sr. No	Independent variable	Correlation coefficient ('r' value)
1.	Age	0.158*
2.	Education	0.059NS
3.	Size of family	0.922**
4.	Occupation	0.071*
5.	Land Holding	0.997**
6.	Family income	0.887 **
7.	Innovativeness	0.945**
8	Source of Information	0.895**
9.	Extension participation	0.760**

* *Significance = 0.05 level; NS = Non significance*

highly significant relationship with the decision-making of rural youth in farming. Age and occupation had a significant relationship with the decision-making of rural youth in the farming system. While education had a non-significant relationship with the decision-making of rural youth in the farming system. Similar findings were also reported by Thakor and Pandya (2021) and Tripathi and Yadav (2018).

CONCLUSION

This study indicated that the respondents of rural youth in Fatehpur district of Uttar Pradesh state, overall decision making of rural youth in the farming system had medium to low level of farming system because of participation of rural youth also low in the farming system. Need to enhance the number of agricultural activities and rural youth. Innovativeness, size of family, landholding, family income, and sources of information had a positive and highly significant relationship with the decision-making of rural youth in farming. Age and occupation had a significant relationship with the decision-making of rural youth in the farming system. 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. Rural try to seek more information and try out new ideas and technologies within their budget and limits and also a farmer who is prone to innovations will try to gather information regarding the new technology from various aspects, they wanted to learn new ways of farming, improved production technologies and adopt those technologies at a faster rate with maximum accuracy.

REFERENCES

Abdullah FA, Samah BA and Jamilah O. 2012. Inclination towards Agriculture among rural youth in Malaysia. *J. Basic Appl. Sci. Res*. **2**(11):10892-10894.

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

FAO. 2014. Youth and Agriculture: Key challenges and concrete solutions. Published by the Food and *Agriculture Organization of the United Nations* (FAO) 1-128.

United Nations. 2015. Youth population trends and sustainable development. Department of economic and social affairs, population division.2015/1

Dorkar D P and Shaikh J I. 2018. Personal characteristics of rural youth in cattle management practices, *International Journal of Advance Research, Ideas and Innovations in Tech.* **4**(4):304-306.

Kushwaha S, Kumari S, and Kushwaha S 2018. Knowledge levels of rural youth about plant propagation techniques of horticultural crops. *J. Krishi Vigyan* **7**: 88-93.

Kitturmath MG, Suradkar DD, Bharamagoudar MV and Thombre BM. 2014, Study of demographic profile and attitude of rural youth towards rural development activities. *Trends Biosci*. **7** (11):1043-1046.

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

Rout S D, Prusty K A and Rout S. 2020.Participation of Rural Youth in Agriculture and Allied Activities-A Review, *International Journal of Multidisciplinary Perspectives on Health* **1**(1): 32-34.

Thakor N and Pandya S P. 2021. Decision making role of rural youth in farming. *Journal of Krishi Vigyan* **9** (2): 36-39.

Tripathi H and Yadav R.2018. Measuring the attitude of rural youth towards farming: an exploratory study of Haryana. *Haryana Vet.* **57** (2): 183-188.

Yaseen M, Adnan M, Luqman M, Majeed MZ and Mehmood M U. 2021. Encouraging rural youth participation in agriculture: A case study of district Sargodha. *Journal of Innovative Sciences* **7**(2): 244-250.

Citation:
Islam A, Moinuddin and Alam N.2022. Role of rural youth in decision making related to the farming system in Fatehpur district of Uttar Pradesh, India. *Journal of AgriSearch* **9**(2):185-188