



Perceived Constraints of Return Migrated Rural Youths in Agripreneurship Development

J. Parameswaranaik^{1*}, Sujeet Kumar Jha², H. R. Meena² and H. A. Manu²

¹Central Sericulture Research and Training Institute, Berhampore, (W.B), India.

²ICAR-National Dairy Research Institute, Karnal, Haryana, India.

Authors' contributions

The present study was carried out in collaboration among all the authors. Author JP has planned the study, collected the data from respondents, performed statistical analysis and wrote the draft of the manuscript. Authors SKJ and HRM have guided in formulating research plan and developing interview schedule. Author HAM managed the literature searches. All authors read and approved the final manuscript.

Article Information

DOI: 10.9734/AJAEES/2019/v36i230240

Editor(s):

(1) Dr. Zhao Chen, Joint Institute for Food Safety and Applied Nutrition, University of Maryland, College Park, USA.

Reviewers:

(1) John Walsh, RMIT University, Vietnam.

(2) M. V. Chandramathi, Delhi Public School, India.

(3) António Geraldo Manso Calha, Instituto Politécnico de Portalegre, Portugal.

Complete Peer review History: <https://sdiarticle4.com/review-history/49860>

Original Research Article

Received 22 April 2019
Accepted 26 June 2019
Published 04 October 2019

ABSTRACT

'Return Migration' is defined as the "voluntary movement of migrants back to their place of origin". It is the logical consequences of the successful achievement of all migration-related goals and targets. Return migration has been becoming a very common phenomenon in rural areas; and it may be due to factors like insecurity feeling in urban areas and lack of freedom in working place, opportunities created under schemes like MGNAREGA in rural areas and other family-related issues. When youths returned to their place of origin (Rural areas) they may not have much alternative to taking up as an occupation other than agriculture and allied activities for their livelihood, in this process the return migrated rural youths had faced and/or perceived many constraints in agripreneurship development. In present study 180 return migrated rural youths of southern India were purposively selected, constraints were operationalized as all the factors, such as social, psychological, economic, technical, marketing and infrastructural which obstruct the youths to take up agripreneurship. For measuring constraints, "Garrett's Ranking Technique" was

*Corresponding author: E-mail: drpnaik.csb@gmail.com;

used. The salient findings were low social recognition in the agriculture business (62.21), Lack of technical guidance in scientific cultivation (61.50), Lack of proper market intelligence (65.79) and Lack of awareness of different funding schemes and their procedures (59.91), etc. were the major constraints perceived by the return migrated rural youths in the study area. Hence promotion and recognition of rural youths in agriculture and allied activities would apparently motivate the youths more dynamically, in agripreneurship development.

Keywords: Agripreneurship; constraints; garret ranking; return migration; youths.

1. INTRODUCTION

The Youth is passionate, vibrant, innovative and dynamic in nature which makes them, the most important section of our society. The total rural youth population is 296.2 million (153.2 million males and 143.9 million females) as against 130.9 million (69.5 million males and 61.4 million female) urban youth population (Census, 2011). Rural youths are also very heterogeneous; since their livelihood needs are diverse, they require varied set of policy interventions. Young women and men living in rural areas face challenges brought about by limited and unequal access to resources, health-care, education, training, and employment. If they didn't find a suitable opportunity, then the chances of their migration to other places happened to be a common phenomenon in rural areas. In the recent days it has been observed that those people who had migrated earlier, have had been coming back to their place of origin; and, this phenomena can be stated as 'Return Migration'. It is defined as the "voluntary movement of migrants back to their place of origin" [1].

Return to the home destination is part of a migration strategy [2]. In the words of Cassarino [3], an intention to return is a calculated strategy and natural outcome of successful experiences in the host destination during which migrants met their goals (i.e. higher incomes and accumulation of savings), while naturally remitting part of their income to the household. Further, he also stated that affiliation to the family profession, attachment with the home place and remittance constitute as explanatory factors in 'Return Migration'. Waldorf [4] hypothesized that 'Return Migration' is influenced by personal attributes, residential and job satisfaction. The 'Return Migration' phenomena will increase in future days; as in 2001, the urban to rural migration was 6.5 million but, because of continuous 'Return Migration', by 2020, it may reach up to 30 million [5].

The process of 'Return Migration' has, however, not received much attention until now. This lack

of emphasis on 'Return Migration' is probably because of the difficulties in obtaining satisfactory data and partly due to the problems in defining or identifying the 'return migrants'. Besides these practical problems, another reason why 'Return Migration' did not receive much attention was the notion that migration is a one-way process, in which migrants abandon their original homes for a permanent stay at the place of destination. As a result, even if there was any 'Return Migration', it was considered insignificant in volume and hence of no consequence.

Rural youths' 'Return Migration' reflects considerable changes in the structural and functional system of rural areas. When youths returned to their place of origin (Rural areas) they may not have much alternative to taking up as an occupation other than agriculture and allied activities for their livelihood, so they have to select agriculture and allied activities in rural areas as an occupation.

With this background, the study was conducted to ascertain the constraints perceived by return migrated rural youths to take up agripreneurship.

2. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

For the present study 180 return migrated rural youths were purposively selected from southern India i.e., Karnataka, Tamil Nadu, and the Kerala States. Before the selection of districts, a pilot survey was conducted to find out the highest number of 'Return Migration' from each district of all the three selected states. For that some of the randomly selected job-providing bureaus, garments, hotels, factories, and other agencies in Bengaluru, Chennai and Ernakulum cities were contacted, which had provided temporary jobs to rural youths; and the secondary information about return migration was obtained from them. Further, a list of return migrated rural youths was prepared, according to their respective districts. All the districts of three states were

classified into highest to lowest number of return migration, and then the top two districts from each state were selected, purposively.

Respondents for the study were the rural youths, aged between 18 to 35 years, who primarily left their villages to urban areas for doing non-agricultural activities as an occupation; and stayed there for a minimum of two years, and subsequently returned to their villages to carry out agriculture and/or any enterprises related to agriculture and allied sectors, to earn his/her livelihood.

The term 'constraint' literally refers to the quality/state of being checked, restricted or compelled to avoid some action. A constraint is anything that limits a system in reaching its goal. Constraints for this study were operationalized as all the factors, such as social, psychological, economic, technical, marketing and infrastructural which hinder youths to take up agripreneurship. For measuring these constraints, "Garrett's Ranking Technique" was used. The respondents were asked to rank the factors. The order of merit given by the respondents was changed into ranks by using the formula:

$$\text{Percent position} = \frac{100 * (R_i - 0.50)}{N_j}$$

Where,

R=Rank given for i^{th} item by j^{th} individual
 N=Number of items ranked by j^{th} individual

The percent position of each rank was converted into scores [6]. For each factor, the scores of individual respondents were added together and divided by the total number of the respondents. The mean scores for all the factors were ranked by arranging in the descending order.

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The return migrated rural youths had faced and/or perceived many constraints in agripreneurship development so those constraints were grouped under different dimensions and the results have been presented below.

3.1 Psycho-social constraints

Among the psycho-social constraints, Low social recognition in agriculture business (62.21) was the foremost constraint as perceived by the rural

youths. It might be due to the fact that many of return migrated youths were feeling that people who did agriculture business were not getting as respect as other youths who did work in urban areas were getting, and further they also perceived that the society felt that, if someone was doing agriculture, it meant that he/she was not eligible for any other job as such people only can do agriculture.

The risk associated with agriculture business (57.16), lack of family encouragement (52.95) and drudgery associated with agricultural production (48.22) were other most perceived psycho-social constraints, since many of the rural youths involved in agripreneurship felt that their own family members were not encouraging them to do agripreneurship, because of the risk associated with agriculture and drudgery associated with agriculture, along with social pressure.

The research findings of Ramasubramaniam [7] and Anaamika [8] found that the foremost constraints were insufficient income from agriculture and lesser employment in the village was the major constraints of migrated of rural youths.

3.2 Technical and Input Constraints

The major technical and input constraints were: Lack of land availability, Lack of technical guidance in scientific cultivation, Lack of farm machineries and Lack of availability of good quality of inputs (with Garret Mean Score 64.05, 61.50, 59.36 and 57.46, respectively). The most important perceived constraint happened to be lack of land availability, as the majority of the youths who were involved in agripreneurship possessed less than 1 acre of land, and the youths were facing difficulty in extending their agripreneurship development skills. Lack of technical guidance in scientific cultivation was found to be the second most perceived constraint among the rural youths, because in the study area, many of the youths were following traditional cultivation practices, although they were aware of scientific agriculture but lack of specific knowledge about implementation of such scientific cultivation at the field-level was a significant technical constraint for them.

Nag [9] in his study conducted among the rural youths of Eastern India found the major technical and input constraints in crop farming were: lack of availability of labour, facing weather vagaries,

and insufficient access to credit with the average scores of 70.58, 60.14, and 55.78, respectively.

3.3 Marketing and Institutional Constraints

Among 'Marketing and Institutional constraints', Lack of proper market intelligence, unaware of supplies and services offered by government and lack of proper market information (with Garret Mean Score 65.79, 61.38 and 58.32 respectively) were found to be the most severed marketing and institutional constraints, as the rural youths perceived that the prices of agricultural produce would fluctuate very frequently; however, if one had market intelligence he could sell his produces when there was higher market price, so they felt that they were lacking it. Also, they felt that the market intelligence would come only via experience. Unaware of supplies and services offered by the government was found to be the second most marketing and institutional constraint. Even during the field -level survey, the researcher had found that the majority of the

youths were having no idea about the storage facility, pledge loan facility, etc. No proper market for agricultural products (56.54) and lack of electricity facilities (54.02) were also perceived as marketing and institutional constraints faced by the return migrated rural youths in agriprenurship development.

Laxmi (2016) documented in her study from Karnataka that the major marketing and institutional constraints perceived by the youths were: Fear of failure because of more risks and uncertainties (73.10%), Lack of cooperation from bank officials (58.05%), Competition from established and large units (64.25) etc.

3.4 Economic and Infrastructural Constraints

Among economic and infrastructural constraints, Lack of awareness of different funding schemes and their procedures, insufficient access to credit and Lack of surety for getting loans (with Garret Mean Score 59.91, 58.21 and 56.64 respectively)

Table 1. Distribution of return migrated rural youths based on Psycho-social constraints

S.N	Constraints	Garret Mean Score	Rank
1	Low social recognition in agriprenurship	62.21	1
2	The risk associated with agriprenurship	57.16	2
3	Lack of family encouragement	52.95	3
4	Drudgery associated with agricultural production	48.22	4
5	Lack of farm managerial skills	46.58	5
6	Increased stress due to the dual responsibilities	43.63	6

Table 2. Distribution of return migrated rural youths based on Technical and Input constraints (n=180)

S.N	Constraints	Garret Mean Score	Rank
1	Lack of land availability	64.05	1
2	Lack of technical guidance in scientific cultivation	61.54	2
3	Lack of farm machineries	59.36	3
4	Lack of availability of good quality of inputs	57.46	4
5	Small fragmented land holding	53.24	5
6	Lack of availability of labour	49.87	6
7	Lack of knowledge in climate smart agriculture	48.24	7

Table 3. Distribution of return migrated rural youths based on Marketing and Institutional constraints

S.N	Constraints	Garret Mean Score	Rank
1	Lack of proper market intelligence	65.79	1
2	Unaware of supplies and services offered by government	61.38	2
3	Lack of proper market information	58.32	3
4	There is no proper market for agricultural products	56.54	4
5	Lack of electricity facilities	54.02	5
6	Lack of storage facilities	51.13	6

Table 4. Distribution of return migrated rural youths based on Economic and infrastructural constraints

S.N	Constraints	Garret Mean Score	Rank
1	Lack of awareness of different funding schemes and their procedures	59.91	1
2	Insufficient access to credit	58.21	2
3	Lack of surety for getting loans	56.54	3
4	Low returns from agriculture	52.95	4
5	High cost farm machineries	49.88	5
6	Inadequate loan from financial institutions	47.96	6

were the most important economic and infrastructural constraints. Lack of awareness of different funding schemes and their procedures were the foremost economic and infrastructural constraint, because the majority of the youths were not aware of different agricultural schemes of state and central government. Also, they had no knowledge about the agricultural loans provided by the commercial and cooperative banks. Lack of surety for getting loans was another important constraint, since even if someone knew the loan schemes and if he/she went to the bank for getting an agricultural loan, he/she might be facing problems of providing collateral security to the bank. Insufficient access to credit in agripreneurship development could probably affect agricultural innovation systems in rural areas.

Lack of farm machineries (59.36) and Lack of availability of good quality of inputs (57.46) and Small fragmented land-holding (53.34) were other important constraints' as perceived by the rural youths in the study area. Despite the major improvements in the production of agricultural inputs and machineries, there existed problems, such as lack of timely availability, poor quality and higher prices.

Adenkule et al. [10] examined the constraints related to rural youths' involvement in agricultural production in Nigeria. The major constraints of youths were identified as: inadequate credit facility (X=2.883), lack of agricultural insurance (M.S= 2.667), poor returns to agricultural investment (X=2.667), lack of basic farming knowledge (X=2.567) and lack of access to tractors and other farm inputs.

4. CONCLUSION

On the basis of the findings of the study and afore-said discussions as related to the present study, it may be concluded that this as return migrated rural youth-based study in respect of

the development of agripreneurship has provided some valuable insight regarding constraints vis-à-vis agripreneurship development among return migrated rural youths. The rural youths agreed to resort to agripreneurship, provided there existed sufficient resources like quality inputs (seeds, fertilizers, AI, etc.) and credit availability from the financial institution, accessibility of input reserves at reasonable prices and timely guidance from public and private extension systems. In terms of the expectation of the rural youths expressed their desire to achieve social respect for their involvement in agripreneurship. Provision of technical assistance and linkage with the market, along with business support through funding and access to resources would fulfill both economic and social esteem needs and exert a strong factor for building interest and aspiration of rural youths in agripreneurship development. Also promotion and recognition of progressive rural youths in agriculture would obviously motivate them to involve themselves, more dynamically, in agripreneurship development.

COMPETING INTERESTS

Authors have declared that no competing interests exist.

REFERENCES

1. Parameswaranaik J, Sujeet Kumar Jha. Return Migration of Rural Youth: A New Trend in Rural India. *Journal OF Global Communication*. 2018;11(2):124-127.
2. Smoliner S, Forschner M, Nova J. Re-Turn. *Comparative Report on Re-Migration Trends in Central Europe*; 2012. Available:http://www.iom.cz/files/comparative_Report_on_Re-Migration.pdf
3. Cassarino J. Theorizing Return Migration – The conceptual Approach to return migration revisited. *International Journal of Multicultural Societies*. 2004; 6(2): 253-257.

4. Waldorf B. Determination of International Return migration intentions. *The Professional Geographer*. 1995;47(2):125-136.
5. Rajan S Irudaya. Internal Migration and Youth in India: Main Features, Trends and Emerging Challenges, Discussion paper, Commissioned by UNESCO, Centre for Development Studies (CDS), Kerala, India; 2013.
6. Garrett E, Woodworth RS. *Statistics in psychology and education*. Bombay: VakilsFeffer and Simons Private Limited. 1969;329.
7. Ramasubramanian M. Developing strategies for sustainable dry farming. Ph.D. Thesis, Tamil Nadu Agricultural University, Coimbatore; 2003.
8. Anamica M. Migration of Rural Youth-An Analysis, PhD, Thesis (unpub). Tamil Nadu Agricultural University, Coimbatore; 2013.
9. Nag Arindam. Crop farming and Dairying as an occupation among rural youth in Eastern India: An exploratory study. PhD Thesis (unpub.). ICAR-National Dairy Research Institute, Karnal; 2015.
10. Adekunle OA, Adefalu LL, Oladipo FO, Adisa RS, Fatoye AD. Constraints to Youths Involvement in Agricultural Production in Kwara State, Nigeria. *Journal of agricultural extension*. 2009;13(1).

© 2019 Parameswaranaik et al.; This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0>), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

Peer-review history:

The peer review history for this paper can be accessed here:
<https://sdiarticle4.com/review-history/49860>