



Abstract: *The focus of this research paper is to assess the role of intrinsic factors (personal interest, outcome expectations) in shaping youth's attitude towards agricultural occupations. For this purpose, 486 youth under age group 15-29 years were randomly selected from 12 villages in district Mardan. The data were collected through a data collection instrument/ questionnaire. This study revealed that the majority of the respondents were graduates and unemployed. Respondents showed less favorable attitudes towards agricultural occupations though most of them belonged to farming families. Low outcome expectations from agricultural occupations cause unfavorable attitudes towards agricultural occupations among youth.*

Key Words: Agricultural Occupations, Outcome Expectations, Youth's Attitude

Introduction

Like many developing countries, in Pakistan agriculture sector is the backbone of the economy. Analysis of the economic contribution of the agriculture sector in national Gross Domestic Product (GDP) unveils a sharp decline from 40 percent during 2006-2007 to 18.5 percent during the financial year 2019. The same line proportion, employment in the agriculture sector dropped from 42 percent in 2006-2007 to 37.4 percent during 2017-18. The decline of employment in the agriculture sector was witnessed for both genders (from 35 percent to 29.6 percent for males and from 71.4 percent to 66.1 percent for females) during the same period. The labor relieved from the agricultural sector were either engaged in the industrial sector, subjected to migration (inland and overseas), or were constrained to remain unemployed ([Pakistan Economic Survey 2018-19](#)).

At the provincial level, the Khyber Pakhtunkhwa province reflects a high rate of unemployment (7.3 percent) than other provinces (Punjab 5.7 percent, Sindh 5 percent, and Baluchistan 4 percent). At the provincial level, too, there is a sharp decline in the employment share of the agricultural sector from 33.6 percent during 2014-15 to 31.7 percent during 2017-18 ([Pakistan Economic Survey 2018-19](#)).

In Pakistan, the youth constitute one-fourth of the population. Tendencies of youth toward the agricultural profession are discouraging. As the

national statistic witnesses' a substantial decline in the total employment share of agriculture for labor from both gender ([Pakistan Economic Survey 2018-19](#)).

Investing in rural youth is a key to boost agricultural productivity and food security in the country. They have huge potential for adopting modernization and an attitude for risk-taking. As compared to older farmers, young producers have greater entrepreneurship abilities. The emerging requirements of agriculture can be addressed with their capacity ([IFAD, 2010](#)).

Agriculture is not only the remedy to international food insecurity but also a major employment sector for youth, especially in developing nations. The food security policies, therefore, demands sustainable growth in agricultural production using diverse and innovative technologies. It is the young blood that brings most innovation and energy into this sector. Many young farmers engage in high-risk, high-tech, and high-returns agri-ventures adapting new ideas, concepts, and technologies, which are mostly avoided by the aging farmers ([Bhat et al., 2015](#); Akosa, 2011).

Mounting evidence shows that youth are not interested in agriculture or the rural future. Abundant literature on the mismatch between young people's aspirations and agriculture as a career found the reasons for this "falling out of love". Little

* Department of Rural Sociology, The University of Agriculture, Peshawar, KP, Pakistan. Email: nadiakt4@gmail.com

† Department of Rural Sociology, The University of Agriculture, Peshawar, KP, Pakistan.

access to modern techniques, less economic outcomes, low status, lack of services, limited access to agricultural land, and socio-cultural structure in rural areas are some common factors of youth disinterest in agricultural employments ([Leavy and Smith, 2010](#); [Chinsinga and Chasukwa, 2012](#); [White, 2012](#); [Haggblade et al., 2015](#)).

Empirical studies prove that the share of agriculture employment is in inverse relation with the development of a country. It is true that more than 2/3 of the poor countries' population is working in agriculture, however, representation of the aging population (above 29 years) is disproportionately high in the farming profession. Moreover, less than 5 percent population of rich countries are engaged in this profession due to huge productivity and mechanized farming in these developed countries. Developed countries of Asia, America, and Europe have also observed a sharp decline in the agriculture profession ([Acker and Gasperini, 2009](#)). The highest decline was noticed in Japan, where the size of agriculture employment above 16 million dropped to 3 million from 1960 to 2015. In US, the drop was from 12 million (1920) to 2 million in 2015. In the Middle East and North Africa, the share of the person employed in the agriculture sector declined from 30 percent during 1991 to 23 percent in 2017. To dismay, insufficient youth participation in the agriculture sector has remained one of the alarming and prominent issues during the last decade. The same, too, is dominated by illiterate youngsters ([FAO, 2018](#)). This reduced involvement of rural youth in agricultural employment is a potential threat to the sustainability element of future food security. Therefore, some serious efforts are needed to identify the principal challenges that are vital and distracting youth's involvement in the agriculture sector ([MIJARC/IFAD/FAO, 2012](#)).

Outcome expectations with reference to some specific career choices are measured in terms of economic returns, prestige, convenience, or past experiences. Thus under the head of outcome expectations, the youth make a mental comparison of the advantage and disadvantages of different career opportunities and opt for the one which is more advantageous. The economic returns from a job career are of high value to prefer one job over another. Moreover, prestige, convenience, and past experiences are of the adding values ([Rogers, 2003](#)).

Outcome expectations are the important personal factor that refers to economic, social, convenience, and prestige-related outcomes for the youth and their immediate groups ([Cheung and Arnold, 2014](#)). In democratic societies like USA and Europe, the confidence of youth, maturity of their

mind, and societal welfare were important outcome expectations to make a career choice. However, in a collectivist culture, the youth outcomes expectations are related more to the guidance from parents ([Lee, 2001](#); [Sawitri et al., 2015](#); [Cheung and Arnold, 2014](#)).

A series of studies on youth attitude towards an agricultural profession in developing nations show that poor wage structure in the agriculture sector, insufficient career information in agriculture, manual labor, and low use of innovative technologies are the main factors that lowered the outcome expectations of youth from the agriculture sector and resulted into their turn away from agricultural professions. Moreover, high prestige and ease in performing the job in other than the agriculture sector added to the youth turn away from agricultural professions ([Muthee, 2010](#); [Abdullah et al., 2012](#); [Ashraf, 2012](#); [ILO, 2012](#)).

Various empirical studies have identified the significance of the 'outcome expectations' factor in shaping youth's attitude towards some specific career choices. Never the less, the effects of these factors may vary with the changing socioeconomic status of the families of youth. Other research studies, in the other way round, described various behavioral characteristics that are specific to a particular socioeconomic group and is exhibited in career choice preferences. Most of these research studies, however, have some common conclusions that the youth from low socioeconomic status groups are the most disadvantaged group in terms of making and exercising employment choices ([Saifi and Mehmood, 2011](#); [Metheny and McWhirter, 2013](#)).

Based on an analysis of a series of empirical researches in the South Asian cultural context, [Wani \(2019\)](#) standardized a few important indicators for determining socioeconomic status in these developing countries, including Pakistan. These factors are monthly family income, literacy level, family occupation, and landholding. Socioeconomic status is one of the significant factors influencing career choice making among the youth based on family income, literacy status, and landholding.

Materials and Methods

The universe of the study was district Mardan. The district has three tehsils, named Katlang, Mardan, and Takhtbhai tehsil, with a total of 75 union councils. For selecting a representative sample, a multistage stratified random sampling technique was adopted. In the first phase, all the three tehsils of the district were selected, then six (06) rural union councils were selected (2 from each tehsil), and lastly, 12

villages 2 from each union council were selected. A pilot survey was conducted in each selected village to estimate the youth population in these villages, which come out to be 7175 youth. For a population of 7175, the sample size was worked out as 486 using Chaudhry (2009) formula.

$$n = \frac{N\hat{p}\hat{q}z^2}{\hat{p}\hat{q}z^2 + Ne^2 - e^2} \quad \text{Equation-1}$$

If, N =total population=71757, p =population portion=0.5 q = opposite proportion $q=(1-p)$ $q=0.5$

z =confidence level=1.96, e =margin of error=0.04, $n=486$

This sample size was proportionally assigned to each village (Table-1) using Bowley [1926] procedure equation -2.

$$nh = (Nh / N) * n \quad \text{Equation-2}$$

Where nh is the sample size for stratum h , Nh is the population size for stratum h , N is the total population size, n is the total sample size

Table 1. Required Sample Allocation to Selected Villages

S. No	Tehsil name	Uc name	Village name	Youth population	Sample size
1	MARDAN	(1) MANGA	1-MANGA	9724	66
			2-SHEIKH YOUSAF	7305	49
		FATIMA	1-GADAR	7266	49
			2-QAZI ABAD	2444	17
			1-SERI BEHLOL	6905	47
			2-AFZAL ABAD	4659	31
2	TAKHT BHAI	(1) SERI BEHLOL	1-SARO SHAH	6457	44
			2-SHAH BAIG	3980	27
		(2) SARO SHAH	1- KATI GARHI	6286	43
			2-SHERO	8122	55
			1-MIAN KHAN	5519	37
			2-SANGO	3090	21
3	KATLANG	TOTAL	71757	486	

Conceptual Framework

There is one independent variable, 'outcomes expectations', one background variable, 'family

socioeconomic status and one dependent variable, 'youth's attitude towards agricultural occupations,' in the conceptual framework of the study, as given in Table 2.

Table 2. Conceptual Framework

Background variable	Independent variables	Dependent variable
Family socioeconomic status	Outcomes expectations	Youth's attitude towards the agricultural occupation

Measurement of Variables

The scale was developed for measuring outcomes expectations of the respondents by combining two different scales by Njeru. (2017) and Hassan et al. 2016. The scale directed the respondents to answer four questions regarding outcome expectations from agriculture using the Likert scale. Outcome expectations were categorized as high outcome expectations, moderate outcome expectations, and low outcome expectations and coded as 0, 1, and 2, respectively. The lowest score of responses for outcome expectations on 5 points Likert scale was 4, and the highest score was 20. All the responses were summed up and then divided into three groups with the help of cut points, so respondents scoring 10 and below had low outcome expectations, those

falling in the range 11-13 had moderate outcome expectations, and those scoring 14 and above were having high outcome expectations from agriculture.

The family socioeconomic status (background variable) of the respondents was measured by following Udai Pareek revised scale and Kuppaswamy modified socioeconomic (SES) scale (2019), which is constructed by combining the score of the four variables i.e. qualification of the respondent, family agricultural land holding, parental occupation and family monthly income respectively (Wani, 2019). There were seven levels of respondent education and were coded as [1=illiterate, 2= primary level, 3=middle level, 4=secondary level, 5=intermediate (12 years), 6=bachelor degree (14 years), 7=master's degree

[16 years), and 8= above the master. The domain of family agricultural landholding was scored as 0= landless, 1=1-4 acres, 2=4.1-8 acres, and 3= 8.1-12 acres. Family monthly income had three levels and was coded as (1= monthly income less than PRs. 20 000, 2 = monthly income PRs. 20,000-50,000 and 3 = monthly income above PRs. 50,000). Four coded levels of variable family major occupation were (1=private job/business, 2=agriculture, 3=remittances, and 4=government job). The lowest possible score was three on the basis of scores level, and the highest score was 18 for measuring the socioeconomic status (SES) of the family. By using a quantitative approach, the score is divided into three groups, according to which respondents from low Socioeconomic status families scored 9 or below on the socioeconomic status scale, respondents from middle socioeconomic status were falling in the range of 10 to 12 on the scale, and those with score 13 and above were respondents from high socioeconomic status families (Wani, 2019). The three categories of socioeconomic status were coded as low SES= 0, middle SES=1, and high SES=2

Indexation

Indexation is used to assess respondent's attitudes about variables under study. A bivariate and multivariate levels, the association between the independent and dependent variables (Youth attitude towards agricultural profession) was measured with the help of indexation and cross-tabulation of above said variables. Moreover, at a multivariate level, to find out that variations in youth's attitude towards agricultural occupations are caused exclusively by outcomes expectations or affected by control variables too, the independent variable showing Cronbach's alpha coefficient value of more than 0.7 was indexed and cross-tabulated with the dependent variable.

Data Analysis

At bi-variate and multivariate analysis, the Chi-square test and Gamma test were applied for measuring the association and Direction of the association between independent and dependent variables. The association between outcome expectations and youth's attitude towards agricultural occupations was analyzed at bi-variate analysis and at multivariate

level analysis, respondents' family socioeconomic status was kept as control variables to find the association.

Ordered Logistic Regression Model

An ordered logistic regression model was used to find functional relationship/cause and effect relationship among study variables. The model is appropriate when the dependent variable has more than two (ordered) categories (Bratti and Staffolani, 2011), as in this study, the youth attitude towards agricultural occupation was investigated on a scale of highly favorable attitude, moderately favorable attitude, and less favorable attitude.

For conducting ordered logistic regression analysis, the items under observation for each variable were tested for their internal consistency by using Cronbach's alpha test and were indexed. The indexed variables were measured on the following scales.

- Youth's attitude (0= low favorable, 1= moderately favorable, 2= high favorable)
- towards agricultural occupation
- Outcome expectations (0= high OE, 1= moderate OE, 2= low OE)

To analyze the variable responsible for youth's attitude towards the agricultural occupation, ordered logistic regression model was used in this study and is written as:

$$y = \beta_0 + \beta_1 x_1 + \epsilon_i$$

Where y represents the dependent variable, β_0 represent the intercept, β_1 represent the regression coefficients for variables, x_1 represent the fixed value of the independent variable, and ϵ_i is the error term (Chaudhry and Kamal, 1996).

The ordered logistic regression model specification for this study is given as below;

$$Y \text{ (youth's attitude towards agricultural occupation)} = \beta_0 + \beta_1 \text{ (outcomes expectations)} + \epsilon_i$$

Results and Discussion

Respondents' Socioeconomic Profile

A perusal of Table 3 shows that most of the respondents were falling in the age category of 25-29 years. Most of them were qualified above Inter level and were unemployed. 51.4 % were from the

nuclear family system, 72.0 % from farming families, and the majority had government jobs as a major income source of family. 39.9 % had monthly family

income up to 20000, and family landholding size was 8.1-12 acres for 37.9 % respondents.

Table 3. Socio Personal Profile of the Respondents (N =486)

Socio Personal characteristics	f	%
Age categories (years)		
15-19 years	106	21.8
20-24 years	117	24.1
25-29 years	263	54.1
Literacy Level		
Illiterate	41	8.4
Primary	19	3.9
Middle	80	16.5
Matriculate	52	10.7
Intermediate	99	20.4
Graduate	141	29.0
Master	54	11.1
employment status		
Unemployed	376	77.4
Employed	110	22.6
Family type		
Joint family	236	48.6
Nuclear Family	250	51.4
Family background		
Farming family	350	72.0
Non-farming Family	136	28.0
A major source of family income		
Agriculture	116	23.9
Government Job	190	39.1
Business	109	22.4
Any other (private job, daily wages, remittances, etc.)	71	14.6
Family monthly Income Category		
Low income(up to PRS 20000)	194	39.9
Medium income(PRS 20001-50000)	150	30.9
High income(above PRS 50000)	142	29.2
Size of landholding		
Landless	92	18.9
0.1 - 4 acres	86	17.7
4.1 - 8 acres	124	25.5
8.1 - 12 acres	184	37.9

Association between outcomes expectation and youth attitude towards agricultural occupation Careers are reported to be associated with positive as well as negative outcomes expectations. Therefore, career choice is a major concern in youth's life as these outcomes persist into an individual's lifetime (Bubić and Ivanišević, 2016). High economic returns, prestige, social acceptance, and associative comforts are the most favorable outcomes linked with any career. The availability of these outcomes in any particular profession shapes a favorable attitude towards the profession, while the absence of anyone or all of these outcomes declines attitude towards the profession. In the current study, the outcomes expectations variable is measured on a few perception statements. Results on outcomes expectation of youth and its association with their attitude towards agricultural occupation are given in Table-4 and explained below.

Results in Table-4 show a highly significant ($P=0.000$) and weak negative ($\gamma = -0.222$) association between 'Agriculture is a high-status career' and youth attitude towards the agricultural occupation. Furthermore, an association of 'Agriculture is profitable' with youth attitude towards agricultural occupation was found highly significant ($P=0.000$) and moderately negative ($\gamma = -0.384$). People's tendency towards any profession is greatly influenced by the outcomes in terms of social and economic benefits associated with the profession. Youth are attracted more towards the profession, which reflects the image of high social status and brings comparably high economic returns to persons and their families. Agricultural professions often lack such features and are perceived as low status and less profitable career by the majority of respondents, especially for the smallholding subsistence farming levels. Such perceptions of low prestige and economic returns about agriculture develop a moderately negative attitude towards agricultural occupation among youth, as shown by the value of gamma. The results are supported by the study findings of Kritzinger (2002), who recorded that youth perceive agriculture as a low-status career. Their hard work at farm brought little prestige and economic returns to them and their families. The youth perceived those agricultural occupations had very little or no vertical mobility associated with it. For them, the agricultural profession is like a frozen statue to which they are stuck throughout their lives. Most youth, therefore, are interested in finding full-time employment outside farm work. Sharma and Bhaduri (2009) noted a rising trend in youth departure from farming due to low production and less profit after a season-long

wait. The profession is not as honored as it was in the past. Mehrotra et al. (2012) and Foster (2014) further added that a number of factors are responsible for youth's shift out of agriculture, among which common are better job opportunities in cities and relatively high and stable income in industrial jobs. In many cases, the wage rates for laborers in [even] unorganized sector are much better than those prevailing in agricultural occupations.

The results further show the association of youth attitude towards agricultural occupation and 'Agriculture as a socially acceptable field' was highly significant ($P=0.000$) and moderately negative ($\gamma = -0.385$). Moreover, the association of 'Farming as a respectable business' was significant ($P=0.037$) and weak negative ($\gamma = -0.016$) with youth attitude towards agricultural occupation. While living in a society, people look forward to social acceptance when stepping in certain roles and statuses. Every society has established certain standards of acceptance and respect for a different profession. Often professions with more income, power, prestige, and comfort are considered respectable and socially acceptable. A person engaged in socially valued occupation are likely to be more respectable and acquire high social acceptance. Agricultural professions are associated with low income, low power, low level of prestige and comforts, and such a poor image already built-in youth's mind shape a negative attitude towards agricultural professions among youth as shown by the negative values of gamma [Table-4.26]. The results are in line with the findings of ILO (2012) and Obayelu and Fadele (2019), which reported that the lifestyles, respect, and status that young people desire and expect from any occupation are the important dimensions of attractiveness and agricultural occupation is not perceived to bring up such expected status. Agricultural working conditions, income, lifestyles are not the same as desired by the youth of the 21st century. The revolutionary advances in communications technology make visible the modern lifestyles to (almost) all, even to rural people. In this whole situation, agricultural occupations are downgraded in the social status hierarchy. If agriculture is not able to deliver mobility and desired lifestyles upward, then the probability of attracting youth to agriculture or retaining them in the sector is low. Sharma (2007) further added that negative attitude towards agricultural profession is high among higher caste and highly educated youth as they perceive corporate sector more charming and profitable as compared to the agriculture sector. Therefore, there is high youth erosion from agricultural professions. Research showed that

youth already involved in agriculture are searching for other job opportunities. Furthermore, the ratio of occupational mobility is higher among young farmers, and it is witnessed that shifting out of farming is more among farmers below 30 years of age. The common reasons for such shifting out is low-income return and prestige in farming (Mahawar et al. 2021).

The findings of this study suggest that the youth are at a low level of satisfaction from the outcome expectations of the agricultural sector as compared to other sectors. The low social value of the agricultural profession is due to the downfall of

income, success, social acceptance, and respect of this important profession. Consequently, there is a gradual downfall in outcome expectations from this profession. The lowered outcomes expectations from agricultural occupations develop negative attitudinal tendencies among youth towards the sector that drag the youth away from agricultural employment. To attract the youth to the life-giving sector the agriculture and youth policies needs to be reviewed, and the social, especially the economic institutions needs to be mobilize to bring agricultural professions at par with other professions in terms of socio economic returns to meet the outcome expectations, especially of youth.

Table 4. Association between Outcomes Expectation and Youth Attitude towards Agricultural Occupation

Independent variables (Outcomes expectation)	Dependent variable	Statistics χ^2 (P-Value) Gamma γ
Agriculture is a high status career.	youth attitude towards agricultural occupation	$\chi^2=72.35$ (0.000) $\gamma = -0.222$
Agriculture is profitable.	youth attitude towards agricultural occupation	$\chi^2=63.87$ (0.000) $\gamma = -0.384$
Agriculture is socially acceptable field.	youth attitude towards agricultural occupation	$\chi^2=83.71$ (0.000) $\gamma = -0.385$
Farming is a respectable business.	youth attitude towards agricultural occupation	$\chi^2=16.41$ (0.037) $\gamma = -0.016$

Association between outcomes expectation and youth attitude towards agricultural occupation (Keeping family socioeconomic status of the respondents as control variable)

Table-5 results highlight that the association of outcomes expectation and youth attitude towards agricultural occupation in the context of respondents socioeconomic status showed negative ($\gamma=-0.626$) and highly significant association ($P=0.000$) between outcomes expectation and youth attitude towards agricultural occupation for low socioeconomic status respondents. A negative ($\gamma=-0.204$) and significant ($P=0.040$) association was found in the above said variables for respondents from middle socioeconomic status and the association of the same variables was negative ($\gamma=-0.564$) and highly significant ($P=0.000$) for respondents from high socioeconomic status. A highly significant and

negative association ($P=0.000$ & $\gamma=-0.459$) was found for the entire table between outcomes expectation and attitude towards agricultural occupation for respondents from low, middle and high socioeconomic statuses. Variation in gamma value and chi-square significance values for respondents from all the three categories, i.e., low, middle, and high socioeconomic statuses indicated that association of outcomes expectation and attitude towards agricultural occupation is spurious on the basis of respondents' socioeconomic status. The inclination towards any profession among people, especially in youth, is largely influenced by the outcomes associated with that profession. The fame, respect, social status, power, income, profit and benefits are the major outcomes of every profession. Therefore, every individual measure every profession on this scale. Profession with higher indicators on this scale is more attractive for youth as compared

to that which lack them. Unfortunately, the agricultural profession is largely perceived as a profession with low social status, low income, less profit and less power. The sector is further labeled as dirty, dusty and laborious. So these physical and social realities affect youth attitude towards this profession. Youth from low socioeconomic status perceive relatively high outcome expectations from another profession with less physical labor involved. Therefore, they prefer to migrate to cities and disengage from the agricultural profession. On the other side, youth from high socioeconomic status, due to their high income and education level, are resistant to socioeconomic shocks. Therefore, they opt for taking risks in other professions with high outcome expectations than staying in the agricultural profession. Youth from middle socioeconomic status are those who develop least negative attitude towards agriculture profession due to low outcome expectations and are more likely to continue this profession. These results are consistent with other research findings stating that wages or salary is the main element for interest formation towards any profession. A profession with more income and profit is considered more prestigious as well, unfortunately, agriculture is not perceived as a profession with more income and associated with low outcome expectations. Low outcome expectations, therefore, declines interest of youth in this sector especially for youth from high socioeconomic status (Silva et al., 2009). In addition, other employment opportunities associated with the agricultural industry are having insufficient income. During unemployment, the youth may temporarily enter to agricultural employment. However, their stay in agricultural employment is brief, until an alternate and improved employment opportunities with better financial rewards are found. Some of the youth, especially those from middle socioeconomic status group, are more faithful to this

profession than low and high socioeconomic status groups due to their personal interest and income expectations. They are better opt and confident for agricultural profession and, therefore, are in better position to earn higher income from this profession. Contrarily, youth from high socioeconomic status groups are more vulnerable to depart from the agricultural profession due to incompatible life preferences, lack of skills and low outcome expectations. On the other side, the toil of low socioeconomic status youth is generally pocketed by the owners of land resources which is discouraging and disengaging these youth from the agricultural profession (Hytia and Kola, 2006; Man, 2007).

Lifestyle preferences, vocational interests, and expected outcomes have a great influence on career choice of an individual. People from low socioeconomic status are usually overrepresented in lower-paid occupations as they do not have more choices like that of high class (Robertson et al., 2010). Thus outcome expectations are differently shaping youth attitude to agricultural profession from different socioeconomic status groups (Gottfredson, 2005; Ommami, 2011). This gives the idea that as the amount of agricultural income increases the probability of youth involvement in the agricultural sector also increases. Therefore, to attract the most energetic portion of population towards agriculture, more remuneration and rewards in the sector in terms of profitability and income is needed (Ahaibwe et al., 2013). Otherwise, youth from high socioeconomic status will opt for agriculture as a side business instead of their primary profession. While, middle socioeconomic status youth are more willing to perform agriculture with supportive alternate professions (Stephenson and Lev, 2004; Hyttia and Kola, 2006).

Table 5. Association between Outcomes Expectation and Youth Attitude towards Agricultural Occupation (Keeping Family Socioeconomic Status of the Respondents as Control Variable)

Family socioeconomic status	Independent Variable	Dependent Variable	Statistics χ^2 (P-Value) Gamma γ	Statistics χ^2 (P-Value) Gamma γ for entire table
Low SES	Outcomes expectation	Youth attitude towards agricultural occupation	$\chi^2=49.26$ (0.000) $\gamma = -0.626$	
Middle SES	Outcomes expectation	Youth attitude towards agricultural occupation	$\chi^2=10.02$ (0.040) $\gamma = -0.204$	$\chi^2=60.93$ (0.000) $\gamma = -0.459$
High SES	Outcomes expectation	Youth attitude towards agricultural occupation	$\chi^2=31.69$ (0.000) $\gamma = -0.564$	

Factor influencing youth's attitude towards Agricultural occupation using ordered logistic regression model Results given in parameter estimates table (Table 6) gives specific relationship between the explanatory and outcome variables of this study. Wald test results (Table 6) and its corresponding p-values validate that the independent variables was significant in predicting of youth's attitude towards agricultural occupations.

The values of co-efficient estimate given in table-6 are interpreted as; the negative sign of co-efficient estimate show that youth from low and high socioeconomic status group are less likely to form a positive attitude towards agricultural occupation as compared to youth from middle socioeconomic status group (low SES co-efficient estimate = -0.374, OR = 0.68, P = 0.023) [High SES Co-efficient estimate = -0.366, OR = 0.69, P = 0.025]. Thus, youth from middle socioeconomic status are more likely to form a favorable attitude towards agricultural profession than those from low and high socioeconomic status groups. Youth from high socioeconomic status group has multiple options for their career. Open access to finance and different educational programs make them capable to choose the career of their choice from a list of attractive options, whereas agriculture is not in their priority list. On the other hand, for low socioeconomic status group, there are too much constraints in continuing agricultural practices which discourage them and, as a result, such youth from low socioeconomic status develop unfavorable attitude towards the sector. Low socioeconomic status always act as a barrier to buying quality agricultural inputs, timely agricultural operations, tolerate agriculture associated uncertainties and many more. Such situation distract low socioeconomic status youth from the agriculture sector as evident from other studies. [The World Bank \(2016\)](#) reported that family's socioeconomic status directly influenced a person's desire, ability and drive to enter the agricultural sector. Person's education and career related interest is greatly determined by his family's socioeconomic status. Lower class youth often have limited access to educational programs and career paths. As a result, they have limited opportunities ([Ngesi, 2003](#)). Those who intend to make a career in agriculture are discouraged by limited access to resources due to their low socioeconomic status ([Grissmer, 2003](#)). On the other side, high socioeconomic status youth perceive agriculture as a poor man's job as they could approach unlimited and attractive career opportunities on the basis of their family socioeconomic status ([Adebo and Sekumade, 2013](#)). Family income is found negatively related to agricultural profession. Therefore, high class youth

are the most reluctant to this laborious sector with low profit. Lower class make entry to the sector due to less education or as a family profession but limited access to resources disjoint them from the sector. While, middle socioeconomic status youth are more willing to perform agriculture with supportive alternate professions ([Stephenson and Lev, 2004](#); [Hyttia and Kola, 2006](#)).

Factors Influencing Youth's Attitude towards Agricultural Occupation using Ordered Logistic Model

By keeping high outcomes expectations as base category, the negative co-efficient estimate value indicate that the log odds for forming a favorable attitude towards agricultural occupation decreased among youth from moderate outcome expectations group (co-efficient estimate = -0.0348, OR = 0.70, P = 0.040) and youth with low outcome expectations from agricultural profession (co-efficient estimate = -0.628, OR = 0.53, P = 0.001). Thus, while comparing to the youth having high outcome expectations from agricultural profession, youth with moderate outcome expectations are less likely to form a favorable attitude towards agricultural occupation while youth with low outcome expectations are least likely to form favorable attitude towards agricultural occupation. Tendency towards any career is largely determined by the associated outcomes. Outcomes in terms of income, prestige, comforts and other incentives makes any profession favorable or unfavorable. Agriculture sector is perceived as a sector of more physical work, less income and low prestige. This sector does not meet the living criteria of today's youth who are addicted to comforts and quick returns to their efforts. Consequently, youth express low outcome expectations from agricultural profession and show unfavorable attitude towards employment opportunities available in agriculture sector. Many studies revealed the same. Research showed that shifting out of farming is common among young farmers due to low income return and low prestige ([Mahawar et al. 2021](#)). Low production and low profit after a season long waiting cause youth departure from farming ([Sharma and Bhaduri, 2009](#)). Studies by [Mehrotra et al., \(2012\)](#) and Foster (2014) revealed that better job opportunities in cities with relatively high and stable income attract youth to migrate to urban areas and left rural and farming lifestyles. In some cases, even an unorganized sector offer much better wage rates than those prevailing in agricultural occupations. Youth joining the agricultural profession is mostly due to failure in finding suitable employment opportunities outside agriculture. The youth engaged

in agricultural occupations are ready to join alternate employment opportunities with high outcomes as compared to the agricultural profession (Sumberg

and Okali, 2013; Biriwasha 2012; Chidoko and Zhou, 2012; Njenga et al., 2014).

Table 6. Factors Influencing Youth's Attitude towards Agricultural Occupation using Ordered Logistic Model

	Estimate	Odds Ratio	Std. Error	Wald	df	Sig
[Youth attitude towards agricultural profession] low favorable	-0.858		.241	12.644	1	.000
[Youth attitude towards agricultural profession] moderately favorable	0.540		.241	5.009	1	.025
Low Socioeconomic Status	-0.374	0.68	.165	5.163	1	.023
High Socioeconomic Status	-0.366	0.69	.163	5.051	1	.025
Middle Socioeconomic Status	0a		.	.	0	.
Low Outcome Expectations	-0.628	0.53	.192	10.646	1	.001
Moderate Outcome Expectations	-0.348	0.70	.170	4.211	1	.040
High Outcome expectations	0a		.	.	0	.

Conclusion and Recommendations

The main goal of this study was to find the effect of outcomes expectations from an agricultural occupation, on shaping the attitude of a person towards agricultural occupation. The study variables included outcomes expectations as independent variables and youth's attitude towards agricultural occupation as dependent variable. Another significant part of the study was to determine whether the socioeconomic status as control variables, influenced the relationship of outcomes expectations with youth attitude towards agricultural occupation or not.

The study findings helped to depict an important role played by outcomes expectations, to shape a favorable and unfavorable attitude towards the agricultural profession. The low outcome expectation from agriculture in terms of economic profitability, social acceptance and prestige element were negatively influencing the youth attitude towards agricultural occupation. Furthermore, the current study found that outcomes expectations varied in explaining youth attitude towards agricultural

professions when socioeconomic status was added as control variables. The study findings indicated that the negative influence of outcome expectations was specifically high for youth from high and low socioeconomic status groups than those from middle socioeconomic status group.

The outcomes expectations of the youth from agricultural professions is the most important factor that push youth towards forming a positive attitude regarding agricultural professions through provision of psychological support in its favor. High outcome expectations provides the best motivational scenario to compel youth towards agricultural professions.

Agricultural occupations has poor image which must be made over. The sector is characterized by fewer opportunities, low income and unsuccessful career. Youth are often reluctant to agriculture due to less outcomes of the sector like low income, low social status, less profit etc. By providing more incentives to young farmers by government and easing off the formal lending process can make the sector attractive to youngsters.

References

- Acker, D., & Gasperini, L. (2009). Education for rural people: the role of education, training and capacity development in poverty reduction and food security. Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO).
- Abdullah, F. A. (2012). Inclination toward Agriculture among Rural Youth in Malaysia. *Journal of Basic and Applied Scientific Research*, 2(11), 892-898.
- Adebo, G. M., & Sekumade, A. B. (2013). Determinants of career choice of Agricultural profession among the Students of the Faculty of Agricultural Sciences in Ekiti State University, Nigeria. *Journal of agricultural extension and rural development*, 5(11), 249-255.
- Adedapo A. O., Sawant P. A., Kobba F., & Bhise R. N. (2014). Determinants of career choice of agricultural profession among the students of College of Agriculture in Maharashtra State, India. *IOSR Journal of Agriculture and Veterinary Science* 7, 12-18.
- Ahaibwe, G., Mbowa, S., & Lwanga, M. M. (2013). Youth engagement in agriculture in Uganda: Challenges and prospects
- Ashraf, S. (2012). Assessment of Communication Gap Regarding Citrus Production Technology among the Farmers of Tehsil Kot Momin District Sargodha. M.Sc. Thesis (Unpublished), Institute of Agri. Extension and Rural Development, University of Agriculture, Faisalabad.
- Bhat, P. S., Bhat, & Shayana, A. (2015). "Retaining Youths in Agriculture – Opportunities and Challenges." *International Journal in Management and Social Science* 3(2), 1001-1015.
- Biriwasha, L. (2012). 'Agriculture and the school curriculum in Zimbabwe'. International Conference on Young People, Farming and Food: The Future of the Agrifood Sector in Africa, 19-21 March, Accra
- Bowley, A. L. (1926). Measurements of precision attained in sampling. *Bull. Int. Stat. Inst.*, Amsterdam, 22, p.1-62
- Bubić, A., & Ivanišević, K. (2016). The role of emotional stability and competence in young adolescents' career judgments. *Journal of Career Development*, 43(6), 498-511.
- Cheung, R., & Arnold, J. (2014). The impact of career exploration on career development among Hong Kong Chinese University students. *J. Coll. Stud.Dev.* 55, 732-748. DOI: 10.1353/csd.2014.0067
- Chidoko, C., & Zhou, S. (2012). 'Impact of agricultural development on youth employment in Zimbabwe: The case of Masvingo Province'. *Russian Journal of Agricultural and Socio-Economic Sciences* 11, 24-7
- Chinsinga, B., & Chasukwa, M. (2012). Youth, Agriculture and Land Grabs in Malawi. *IDS Bulletin*, 43(6), 67-77.
- Chaudhry, S. M. (2009). Introduction to statistical theory, 8th edition, Publisher: Lahore, Pakistan:Ilmi_Kitab_Khana
- Chaudhry, S. M., & Kamal, S. (1996). Introduction to Statistical Theory Part-II, 2nd Edition, Ilmi Kitab Khana Kabeer Street, Urdu Bazaar, Lahore, Pakistan
- FAO, (2018). Youth in Agriculture as Solid Solution to ending Hunger and Poverty in Africa
- Forster, K. M. (2014). Researching Youth Disinterest in Agriculture in Peninsular India: Evidences from VDSA Villages: A Case of Dokur and Aurepalle, Telangana. Project report, International Crops Research Institute for the Semi-Arid Tropics (ICRISAT), AP, India
- Gottfredson, L. (2005). "Using Gottfredson's Theory of Circumscription and Compromise in Career Guidance and Counselling." In *Career Development and Counseling: Putting Theory and Research to Work*, edited by Stephen Brown and Robert Lent, 71-100.
- Grissmer, R. H. (2003). Beyond helping with homework: Parents and children doing mathematics at home. *Teaching children mathematics*, 14, 120-131.
- Haggblade S., Chapoto A., Drame-Yayé A., Hendriks S. L., Kabwe S., Minde I., Mugisha J., & Terblanche S. (2015). Motivating and preparing African youth for successful careers in agribusiness: Insights from agricultural role models. *Journal of Agribusiness in Developing and Emerging Economies* 5, 170-189.
- Hyttia, N., & Kola, J. (2006). Finish citizens' attitude towards multifunctional agriculture. Paper Presented at 2005 International Congress, Aug. 23- 27, Copenhagen, Denmark
- IFAD. (2010). Rural poverty report 2011: New realities, new challenges: new opportunities for tomorrow's generation. Overview. Rome.
- ILO. (2012). Guidance on How to Address Rural Employment and Decent Work Concerns in FAO Country Activities, 2011
- Kritzinger, A. (2002). Rural youth and risk society: Future perceptions and life chances of teenage girls on *South African farms*. *Youth & Society*, 33(4), 545-572.

- Lee, K. H. (2001). A cross-cultural study of the career maturity of Korean and United States high school students. *J. Career Dev.* 28, 43–57. DOI: 10.1177/089484530102800104
- Leavy, J., & Smith, S. (2010). 'Future Farmers: Youth Aspirations, Expectations and Life Choices.' Future Agricultures Discussion Paper 13. Brighton: Institute of Development Studies
- Mahawar, N., Sri Sai Siddhartha Naik, B., Rupesh, T., Yadav, S. K., Meena, R. S., & Dhegavath, S. (2021). Challenges in Attracting and Retaining Rural Youth in the Near Future in Agriculture, *Curr. Rese. Agri. Far.* 2(1), 7-16. DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.18782/2582-7146.127>
- Man, N. (2007). The Agricultural Community, 50 years of Malaysia Agriculture: Transformation Issues. Challenges and Direction (pp:128-213). Serdang, Selangor. UPM Publisher
- Mehrotra, S., Gandhi, A., Sahoo, B. K., & Saha, P. (2012). Creating employment in 12th five year plan. IAMR Occasional Paper No. 3. Institute of Applied Manpower Research, Planning Commission, Govt. of India.
- Metheny, J., & Mcwhirter, E. H. 2013. Contributions of social status and family support to college students' career decision self-efficacy and outcome expectations. *Journal of Career Assessment*, 21(3), 378-394.
- Muthee, M. (2010). Hitting the Target, Missing the Point: Youth Policies and Programmes in Kenya. Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars: Washington, DC
- Hassan, M. Z. Y. et al. (2016). Constraints Of Rural Youth Involvement In Agricultural Activities In The Punjab Pakistan: Redefining Youth Policy, *J Agric. Res.*, 2016. 54(4), 861-871.
- Njenga, P., Mugo, F., & Opiyo, R. (2014). Youth and Women Empowerment through Agriculture in Kenya. Nairobi: VSO Jitolee.
- Njeru, L. K. (2017). Youth in Agriculture; Perceptions and Challenges for Enhanced Participation in Kajjado North Sub-County, Kenya. *Greener Journal of Agricultural Sciences*, 7(8), 203-209, <http://doi.org/10.15580/GJAS.2017.8.10.0117141>
- Ngesi, M. (2003). A study of systematic processes influencing educational change in a sample of isiZulu medium schools. University of Natal, Pietermaritzburg, South Africa
- Obayelu, O. A., & Fadele, I. O. (2019). Choosing a career path in agriculture: A tough calling for youths in Ibadan metropolis, Nigeria. *Agricultura Tropica et Subtropica*, 52(1), 27-37.
- Ommani, A. R. (2011). Strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats (SWOT) analysis for farming system businesses management: Case of wheat farmers of Shadervan District, Shoushtar Township, Iran. *African journal of business management*, 5(22), pp.9448-9454. Pakistan Economic Survey. (2018-19). https://www.finance.gov.pk/survey_1819.html
- Robertson, K. S., Smeets, D., Lubinski, & Benbow, C. (2010). "Beyond the Threshold Hypothesis Even Among the Gifted and Top Math/Science Graduate Students, Cognitive Abilities, Vocational Interests, and Lifestyle Preferences Matter for Career Choice, Performance, and Persistence." *Current Directions in Psychological Science* 19(6), 346–351.
- Rogers, E. M. (2003). *Diffusion of innovations (5th ed.)*. New York: Free Press.
- Sawitri, D. R., Creed, P. A., & Zimmer-Gembeck, M. J. (2015). Longitudinal relations of parental influences and adolescent career aspirations and actions in a collectivist society. *J. Res. Adolesc.* 25, 551–563. DOI: 10.1111/jora.12145
- Saifi, S., & Mehmood, T. (2011). Effects of socioeconomic status on students achievement. *International Journal of Social Sciences and Education*, 12, 119-128.
- Silva, J. L., Mohamad Saffril, H. A, Uli, J., & Abu Samah, B. (2009). A review of contract farming and factors that impinge youths acceptance to contract farming, *European Journal of Social Sciences*, 11(2), 328-338.
- Sharma, A. (2007). 'The changing agricultural demography of India: evidence from a rural youth perception survey'. *International Journal of Rural Management* 3(1) 27-41.
- Sharma, A., & Bhaduri, A. (2009). 'The 'tipping point' in Indian Agriculture: Understanding the withdrawal of the Indian rural youth'. *Asian Journal of Agriculture and Development* 6(1), 83-97.
- Sumberg, J., & Okali, C. (2013). 'Young people, agriculture, and transformation in rural Africa: An "opportunity space" approach'. Innovations, Special Issue for the 2013 Global Youth Economic Opportunities Conference, 10–12 September
- Stephenson, G., & Lev, L. (2004). Common support for local agriculture in two contrasting Oregon communities. *Renew. Agric. Food Syst.*, 19: 210-217. DOI: 10.1079/RAFS200481

- The World Bank. (2016). Unemployment, total (% of total labor force). <http://data.worldbank.org/indicator/SL.UEM.TOTL.ZS?locations=ZA>
- Wani, R. T. (2019). Socioeconomic status scales-modified Kuppuswamy and Udai Pareekh's scale updated for 2019. *J Family Med Prim Care*. 8, 1846-9.
- White, B. (2012). Agriculture and the generation problem: rural youth, employment and the future of farming. *IDS Bulletin*, 43(6), 9-19.