

Original Research Article

<https://doi.org/10.20546/ijcmas.2020.908.176>

## Vulnerable Employment of Rural Youth-A Profile Analysis

H. Gunashekhar<sup>1\*</sup>, M. Sreenivasulu<sup>2</sup>, P. Prashanth<sup>3</sup> and G. E. Ch. Vidya sagar<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Department of Agricultural Extension, College of Agriculture, Rajendranagar, PJTSAU, Hyderabad- 500030, Telangana, India, India

<sup>2</sup>Agricultural Research Institute (ARI), Rajendranagar, Hyderabad 500 030, India

<sup>3</sup>Department of Agronomy, College of Agriculture, PJTSAU, Rajendranagar, Hyderabad, India

\*Corresponding author

### ABSTRACT

The socio-economic advancement and prosperity of rural areas depends to a significant extent, on the type of youth living in rural areas, because they have ability to orient themselves to go along the main stream of the development cycle and their progress determines the growth of community and nation as a whole. Therefore, the development and harnessing the strength of youth towards constructive channels has always engaged the attention of a policymakers. It is a known fact that the youth practicing in agriculture and allied sector are gradually decreasing, even though, government primary focus on agriculture. As some recent studies shows, this might be happening because of wide spreading of decent work deficit or vulnerability in agriculture sector and it adversely affecting on segment of rural youth. Keeping this in view this study was conducted in Mandya and Ramanagar districts of Karnataka to know the profile of youth by selecting 120 rural youth randomly. The study indicates that, majority of the respondents belonged to upper young age (41.67%) along with majority were male (63.33%) and belonged to backward classes (58.33%). It was found that majority of rural youth had pre-university education (30%), small family size (46.67%), small farm size (36.67%), farming as a sole occupation (59.17%), medium family income (48.33%), medium Cosmopoliteness (60.83%), medium level of change proneness (44.17%), medium level of economic motivation (56.67%), medium level of risk preference (49.17%), medium social participation (45%), and medium level of occupational aspiration (51.67%).

#### Keywords

Vulnerable  
Employment,  
Rural Youth

#### Article Info

Accepted:  
18 July 2020  
Available Online:  
10 August 2020

### Introduction

Youth reflect the national potentiality and life blood of the nation. Hence, the future of the nation lies in their hands. What they will become, what role they will play in a rule of law & democratic society and what they will do, will be confined to a greater extent on the

term between their childhood to adulthood. Therefore, the development and harnessing the strength of youth towards constructive channels has always engaged the attention of a policymakers. But, As International Labor Organization (ILO) Director-General Guy Ryder puts it, "decent work deficits remain widespread", means rising vulnerability

among people in their employment. He added further, this situation more prevalent among rural sector especially in youth. Youth are the future of country with their strength and aspiration but they are more precarious in their employment and experience rapid physical, financial, social and emotional instabilities. Startingly, most of the recent past studies reveal that Indian youth more susceptible to vulnerable employment.

In developing countries, agriculture provides the basis for a major share of employment and constitutes the main source of livelihood for a large fraction of the population. Similarly, about half of the people in developing countries directly or indirectly depend on agriculture for their livelihood. Small-scale farmers, women, youth and vulnerable groups who have little access to formal occupational employment depend on agriculture for employment and social stability. It is therefore crystal clear that betterment of agriculture in agriculture-based countries is crucial for achieving the Sustainable Development Goals (SDG) and egalitarian society. Like above testimonies, Significant proportions of Indian population depend on agriculture for their livelihoods, similarly most of the young Indians continue to be employed in agriculture, although the share of young people aged 15-29 in agriculture decreased from 52.5 per cent in 2005 to 42.0 per cent in 2012, a decrease -10.5 percentage points (ILO, 2018).

There are widespread hardships are the reasons behind the accelerated withdrawal and also greater significance appears to be growing complications with the profession. These rising incidences are to be considered, agriculture seems to have lost its sheen and nudging the youth from the agriculture. For any given youth, the low incomes, high risk and insufficient gains compared to the effort required make an agriculture more vulnerable and very poor proposition. And also, there are

number of interconnected contextual influences that affect youth vulnerabilities, among the most important factors are impoverishment, untrained, health, inequalities, retarded government policies, poor infrastructures, social exclusion, economic insecurity, job insecurity, technological change, climate change, political uprising and conflicts. Hence the study conducted to understand the profile of rural youth.

## **Materials and Methods**

*Ex-post* facto research design was followed for the study. Mandya and Ramanagara districts of Karnataka state was selected to conduct the research and according to state district profile data both the district has registered the negative rural population growth. Two talukas in each district and two villages from each taluka were selected using simple random sampling technique. Thus, a total of eight villages were selected. From each village 15 respondents were selected using simple random sampling technique thus constituting 120 respondents for the study.

Data were collected by personal interview method with the help of structured interview schedule. The collected data was analyzed and interpretations were drawn based on results. The statistical techniques frequency, percentage, mean, and inclusive class interval method were followed for analyses data, and accordingly, respondents were classified into different groups.

## **Results and Discussion**

The data was collected from the respondents on the selected profile characteristics were analyzed, interpreted, and accordingly the following results and conclusion were drawn. It has comprised the profile characteristics viz., age, gender, caste, education, family size, farm size, type of employment, family

income, cosmopolitanism, change proneness, economic motivation, risk preference, social participation and occupational aspiration which are discussed as follows:

### **Age**

Age was operationalized as the chronological age of the respondent in terms of the total number of years completed at the time of conducting the study. From the Table 1 it was found that, majority of the respondents 41.67 per cent were upper young age followed by 36.67 per cent middle young age and 21.67 per cent were lower young age group. This might be because of fall in rate of entry of lower young aged into the agricultural sector and they are more interested to migrating for near cities like Bengaluru & Mysore and engaging themselves in non-farm activities.

### **Gender**

As mentioned in the table 1, majority (63.33 per cent) of the respondents were male and 36.66 per cent were female. The reason may be that men are the heads of the home and are supported by women counterparts at house.

### **Caste**

From the table 1 reveals that more than half (58.33%) of the respondents belonged to other backward class (OBC) followed by 18.33 per cent of the respondents belonged to scheduled caste, 17.50 per cent of respondents belonged to general category and 05.83 per cent of them belonged to schedule tribe. his study was confirmed that the study area of Mandya and Ramanagara districts have dominated by the Vokkaliga's, Kuruba's and lingayat's community belongs to OBC; hence, in this present study the majority of respondents belonged to OBC.

### **Education**

The data presented in table 1 indicated that 30

per cent of the rural youth had education up to pre-university level, followed by 24.17 per cent up to graduate or above, high school (22.50%), 9.17 per cent up to middle school, 7.50 per cent were illiterates and 6.67 per cent had primary education. The probable reason was, importance of formal and higher education for individual's development in today's competitive world is realized by the parents of youth.

### **Family size**

From the Table 1 it was found that, majority of respondents had small family (46.67%), followed by medium family (34.17%) and (19.17%) were living in joint family. It clearly shows that majority of the respondents possessed small family, this scenario is usually common now a days.

### **Farm size**

Table 1 depicted that 36.67 per cent of the youth were small farmers, followed by 25.83 per cent marginal farmers, 20 per cent semi-medium farmers, 12.5 per cent were medium farmers and 5 per cent of respondents were large farmers. Fragmentation of land holding might be the major reason for having majority of small and marginal farmers among the rural youth. As we know in the state, landholding have decreased in size, almost halving in the last 20 years.

### **Type of employment**

A glance at Table 1 clearly depicts that the respondents mainly engaged in farming is 67.50 per cent, followed by farming + service (16.66 %), farming + labor (8.33 %) and only 7.50 per cent were engaged in farming + business as an employment. This result might be due to less awareness regarding advantages of diverse occupation, lack of interest in youth and also due to lack of investment support from the government.

### **Family income**

From the Table 1 it was found that, majority of the respondents (48.33%) had medium family income followed by low family income (34.17%) and high family income (17.50%).

It could be concluded from that majority of the respondents had medium and low farm income. This might be due to frequently go with monocropping like sugar cane, paddy, cocoon production etc. Apart from this, high cost of basic inputs and lack of marketing facilities for their produce.

### **Cosmopoliteness**

It is observed from Table 1 that majority (60.83%) of the respondents had medium level of Cosmopoliteness; whereas 20.83 per cent of respondents had low level of Cosmopoliteness followed by 18.33 per cent of the respondents were having high level of Cosmopoliteness.

Because of government investment on infrastructure through some initiatives like Suvarna Gram Yojana, Rural Infrastructure Development Fund (RFID), etc., are creating more semi urbans or small cities in rural proximity, this facilitating to establish more agro-companies like pesticide, seed, farm machinery company etc., in nearby villages. Hence availability and accessibility of dealers of these companies are increased at significant level and this leads to high contact with external network.

### **Change proneness**

It is clear from the given data in table 1 that majority of the respondents (44.17%) displayed medium level of change proneness followed by 31.67 per cent with high level of

change proneness and 24.17 per cent respondents had a low level of change proneness. Change proneness is the key success factor for progressive development of any occupation. It can be concluded that youth are comparatively more precursors towards any optimistic changes than elder people.

### **Economic motivation**

The data in table1 revealed that majority (56.67%) of the rural youth belongs to medium economic motivation category followed by 30.83 per cent of the rural youth belongs to high economic motivation category and 12.50 per cent of the rural youth had low economic motivation. It could be concluded that most of the rural youth (87.50%) had medium to high economic motivation. The probable reason might be the youth are very enthusiastic to invest money towards profit maximization and also good market intelligence, regular extension contacts & good natural resources in selected districts may helps to increase the returns to invest.

### **Risk preference**

It is observed from the table 1 revealed that majority (49.17%) of the rural youth belongs to medium level of risk preference category; whereas remaining 25.83 and 25.00 per cent of them had low and high level of risk preference, respectively. It could be concluded that approximately three fourth of the rural youth had medium to high level of risk preference. This might be attributed to good education, good contact with external networks and optimistic towards the technology. On the contrary, the deprivation of policies to address rural youth might have dragging the youth away from bearing the risk in their occupations like farming, business etc.

**Table.1** Distribution of rural youth according to their Profile

S.No.	Category	Frequency (n = 120)	Percentage
<b>A)</b>	<b>Age</b>		
1	Lower young age	26	21.67
2	Middle young age	44	36.67
3	Upper young age	50	41.67
<b>B)</b>	<b>Gender</b>		
1.	Male	76	63.33
2.	Female	44	36.66
<b>C)</b>	<b>Caste</b>		
1	Schedule Caste	22	18.33
2	Schedule Tribe	07	05.83
3	Other Backward Caste (O.B.C.)	70	58.33
4	General	21	17.50
<b>D)</b>	<b>Education</b>		
1	Illiterate	9	7.50
2	Primary school	8	6.67
3	Middle school	11	9.17
4	High school	27	22.50
5	Pre-university	36	30.00
6	Graduate and above	29	24.17
<b>E)</b>	<b>Family size</b>		
1	Small family	56	46.67
2	Medium family	41	34.17
3	Large family	23	19.17
<b>F)</b>	<b>Farm size</b>		
1	Marginal	31	25.83
2	Small	44	36.67
3	Semi medium	24	20.00
4	Medium	15	12.50
5	Large	6	5.00
<b>G)</b>	<b>Type of employment</b>		
1	Farming	71	59.17
2	Farming + Labour	26	21.67
3	Farming + Service	14	11.67
4	Farming + Business	09	07.50
<b>H)</b>	<b>Family income</b>		
1	Low	41	34.17

2	Medium	58	48.33
3	High	21	17.50
<b>I)</b>	<b>Cosmopoliteness</b>		
1	Low	25	20.83
2	Medium	73	60.83
3	High	22	18.33
<b>J)</b>	<b>Change proneness</b>		
1	Low	29	24.17
2	Medium	53	44.17
3	High	38	31.67
<b>K)</b>	<b>Economic motivation</b>		
1	Low	15	12.50
2	Medium	68	56.67
3	High	37	30.83
<b>L)</b>	<b>Risk preference</b>		
1	Low	31	25.83
2	Medium	59	49.17
3	High	30	25
<b>M)</b>	<b>Social participation</b>		
1	Low	50	41.67
2	Medium	54	45.00
3	High	16	13.33
<b>N)</b>	<b>Occupational aspiration</b>		
1	Low	24	20.00
2	Medium	62	51.67
3	High	34	28.33

### **Social participation**

It could be seen from table 1 that 45.00 per cent had medium social participation followed by low (41.67%) and high (13.33%) social participation. The existence of different kinds of the village and community-oriented organisations are open avenues for rural youth. But it is evident from above table that more than four fifth of rural youth had medium to low level of social participation. It might be due to lack awareness of the importance of these organisations in terms of roles, functions and advantages. In this aspect,

the role of extension workers is very essential to motivate the rural youth towards social participation through different kinds of awareness programmes and are directly facilitating them to form such a social organisation and this may empower rural youth in different ways.

### **Occupational aspiration**

It is observed from the table 1 revealed that majority (51.67%) of the rural youth belongs to medium level of occupational category; whereas remaining 28.33 per cent and 20.00



per cent of them had high and low level of occupational aspiration, respectively. In the present context, we have been experiencing a huge unemployment situation in India, especially in rural India, hence rural youth are not able to get their aspired jobs easily. And another side rural youth fails to get education and coaching's at the level their aspired jobs and most of all youth would like to continue their father's occupation/traditional occupation apart from other occupational aspirations.

In conclusion from the result of research, it was observed that majority of the respondent belong to middle and upper young age along with majority were male and backward classes, they were educated up to pre-university and they had small size family. Respondent had small farm size and majority belonged to only farming as a sole occupation. It was also observed that majority respondent's had medium family income, and had medium cosmopolitaness, medium level of change proneness, economic motivation, risk preference, social participation and medium level of occupational aspiration. Hence, this research study clears that the youth in study area needs immense technical support from extension agents for increasing their ability and to reduce prevailing hardships in occupation, diversify the occupation for economic sustain, improve the external contact of rural youth through imparting digital literacy to use social media, arranging field trips and farmer's-scientist's discussion, etc. It's also essential to impart skill in necessary areas of farming by facilitating more vocational trainings, motivate them to participate in different social organization's and also for rational usage of their community resources to overcome their vulnerable employment in selected districts of Karnataka.

## References

- Adekunle, O.A., Oladipo, L.L., Adisa, R.S and Fatoye, A.D. 2009. Constraints to youth's involvement in agricultural production in Kwara state, Nigeria. *Journal of Agricultural Extension*. 13(1): 102-108.
- Biradar, R. R and Bagalkoti, S. T. 2001 Changing Facets of Employment in Rural India: Emerging Issues and Challenges. *Indian Journal of Agricultural Economics*. 56: 538-552.
- Chaykowski, R. 2005. Non-standard work and economic vulnerability. Vulnerable workers series, no. 3, Canadian Policy Research Networks.
- DFID. 1999. Sustainable livelihoods guidance sheets: The livelihoods learning platform. [www.livelihoods.org](http://www.livelihoods.org).
- FAO. 2008. Socio-economic and Livelihood analysis in investing planning. FAO policy learning programme, FAO, Rome, Italy.
- International Labour Organization. 2014. Youth employment: Decent work for youth in India. Geneva.
- Kimaro, J.P., Towo, N.N and Moshi, H.B. 2015. Determinants of Rural Youth's Participation in Agricultural Activities. *International Journal of Economics, Commerce and Management* 3(2): 1-47.
- Reddy, V. M. 2001. Participatory watershed development in India: Can it sustain rural livelihoods? *Development and Change*, 35(2): 297-326.
- Umeh, G.N and Odon, C.N. 2011. Role and Constraints of Youth Associations in Agricultural and Rural Development. *World Journal of Agricultural Sciences*. 7 (5): 515-519.

**How to cite this article:**

Gunasekhar, H., M. Sreenivasulu, P. Prashanth and Vidya Sagar, G. E. Ch. 2020. Vulnerable Employment of Rural Youth – A Profile Analysis. *Int.J.Curr.Microbiol.App.Sci.* 9(08): 1520-1527. doi: <https://doi.org/10.20546/ijcmas.2020.908.176>