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Abstract
The present study was conducted in three districts of Andhra Pradesh viz., Kurnool (from Rayalaseema region), Guntur (from Coastal region) and Vishakapatnam (from North Coastal region). To study the profile characteristics of rural youth agripreneurs a total of 240 respondents were randomly selected and interviewed. The respondents were in upper young age (31-35 years) group (37.50%), illiterate (41.25%)and primary education (20.00%), belong to joint family (71.66%), had medium family support (53.75%), had primary education (20.00%), had medium family support (53.75%), had medium level of family support (57.50%), economic motivation (65.00%), having medical exposure (57.91%), marketing facilities (60.83%), risk orientation (94.58%), economic motivation (65.00%), innovativeness (72.08%), risk taking ability (49.58%), leadership ability (50.83%), decision making ability (50.00%), perception of rural youth towards agri-enterprises (60.00%), attitude towards agri-enterprises (57.91%).
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Introduction
In our country youth constitute a numerically dominant potential, resourceful and also adventurous segment of the population. More than 50.00 per cent of India’s current population is below the age of 25 years and over 65.00 per cent below the age of 35 years. Majority of them live in rural areas. The population in the age group of 15-34 years increased from 351 million in 2001 to 430 million in 2011. Current predictions suggest a steady increase in the youth population to 464 milion by 2021. By 2020, India set to become the world’s youngest country with 64.00 per cent of its population in the working age group (The Hindu, 2013) [24].The younger generation will be interested in taking farming as a profession only if it becomes both economically and intellectually attractive. The future of food security in our country will depend on both strengthening of the ecological foundations essential for sustainable agriculture, as well as attracting the educated youth to farming and allied professions such as animal husbandry, inland and marine fisheries, agro-forestry, agro-processing and agri-business.

Agripreneurship is the need of hour to make agriculture a more attractive and profitable venture. It is clear that there is a great scope for entrepreneurship in agriculture. An individual with risk bearing capacity and a quest for latest knowledge in agriculture sector can prove to be a right agripreneur. The agriculture sector has a large potential to contribute to the national income while at the same time providing direct employment and income to the large and vulnerable section of the society. Employment pressure has made entrepreneurship education in India’s higher education system absolutely important, but the cultural barriers and the difficulties towards start-ups prevent entrepreneurship from being successful. Agripreneurship is not only an opportunity but also a necessity for improving the production and profitability in agriculture and allied sector.

Material and Methods
In the present study exploratory research design was followed. An exploratory study aims to discover “what is” rather than predicts the relations to be found later. According to Kerlinger an exploratory field study is conducted with the aim to discover the significant variables in the field situation, to discover relations among variables and to lay groundwork for later more systematic testing of hypothesis.

Andhra Pradesh state was purposively selected. One district each from three regions of
The state viz., Kurnool (from Rayalaseema region), Guntur (from Coastal region) and Vishakapatnam (from North Coastal region) were selected purposively based on highest number of agri-enterprises. Two mandals from each district were selected purposively based on highest number of young agripreneurs, four villages from each mandal were selected by following lottery method of simple random sampling procedure thus making a total of 6 mandals, 24 villages respectively. From each village, 10 respondents were selected by following simple random sampling procedure, thus making a total of 240 respondents. The data was collected by personal interview method through a structured interview schedule and analyzed by employing suitable statistical methods. Twenty independent variables were identified for the study.

Results and Discussion

1. Age
A perusal of Table 1 that (37.50%) of respondents belong to upper young aged group followed by middle young (36.25%) and lower young age (26.25%) groups respectively. Most of the rural youth belonged to upper young aged group. The above trend also revealed that upper young age group are matured, experienced, energetic, enthusiastic with innovative ideas, responsible towards their family and willing to do work hard than the other category of young age group and middle young age group. This finding is in conformity with the findings of Charan (2014) [10], Shireesha (2016) [19].

2. Education
It is clear from the Table 1 that (41.25%) of respondents were illiterate followed by 20.00 per cent had primary education, 12.91 per cent did diploma, 12.08 per cent did their secondary education, (8.75%) qualified higher secondary education followed by graduation (5.00%) and post graduation (1.66%) respectively. The middle young age and lower young age group with academic aspirations might have undergone secondary education, higher secondary education, diploma, graduation and post graduation which might have helped the rural youth to get attracted towards agripreneurship by utilizing their intellectual potential. The above trend also revealed that majority of the rural youth belonged to upper young age group without education might have remained as illiterates in the society. These findings were in agreement with that of Mubeena (2017) [15], Siddeswari (2018) [11].

3. Family type
It could be elucidated from the Table 1 that majority (71.66%) of the respondents belong to joint family followed by nuclear family (28.33%) respectively. Strong attachment to family coupled with enduring affinity toward community living could be the possible explanation for prevalence of joint family. Inspite of that, there is an indication for social change in rural areas. Prioritised individual interests and commercial orientation of the people in rural areas might have encouraged the rural youth to be an independent entity rather than to work as a member of joint family. The present finding of the study was in coherence with Chetan (2002), Vihari (2018) [26].

4. Family support
It is obvious from Table 1 that (43.75%) of the respondents had medium family support followed by (23.75%) low, very low (22.08%) and high family (10.41%) support respectively. The above trend highlights that most of the respondents had medium family support. The reasons for this finding could be families are characterized by shared norms, behaviours, understanding and emotionally intense relationships. Thus it provides strong emotional support which encourages the rural youth in setting up the agri-enterprises. The finding is in partial conformity with the finding of Chaitanya (2004) [3], Charan (2014) [4].

5. Entrepreneurial experience
It is apparent from Table 1 that 35.41 per cent of the respondents had medium entrepreneurial experience followed by low entrepreneurial experience (27.08%), very low entrepreneurial experience (25.00%) and high entrepreneurial experience (12.50%) respectively.

The reason for this might be most of the respondents were upper young age group they were matured, experienced, more energetic, enthusiastic with innovative ideas and previous entrepreneurial experience positively affected the entrepreneurial performance. They made efforts to use their previous knowledge without reflection and proper adjustment in new enterprise which probably lead to optimal results. The above finding is in accordance with the finding of Maroo (2005) [10], Charan (2014) [4].

6. Training received
It is vivid from Table 1 that majority (72.91%) of the respondents had not undergone training followed by 27.08 per cent who had undergone training.

The probable reason for not getting training might be lack of time, lack of entrepreneurial development programmes related to agri-enterprises being organized by MSME development institutes and respondents inability to access entrepreneurship development initiatives. This finding was in conformity with Sreeram (2013) [22], Charan (2014) [4].

7. Annual income
It is apparent from Table 1 that majority (69.58%) of respondents had medium annual income followed by high (15.83%) and low (14.58%) levels of annual income respectively.

Higher annual income of the family might have given scope for free sense of thinking towards the development of the agri enterprise. And these groups will be more enthusiastic to improve upon their standard of living while, the enterprises taken up by these groups added significant amount to their income. On the other side, low annual income shrinks the opportunities and the agripreneurs always must be under defensive state of their agri enterprise. It may be due to no additional sources of income to meet the other expenditures incurred and these groups should be motivated by making them aware of different loan facilities provided by the Government.

The present finding of the study was in partial accordance with Shireesha et al. (2017) [17] Vihari (2018) [26].

8. Material possession
An overview of Table 1 indicated that 69.16 per cent of respondents had medium material possession followed by had high (18.33%) material possession and low (12.50%) material possession.
The probable cause for this trend might be that, the respondents with better financial base may take risks in the enterprises and by virtue of ancestral property some of the rural youth had high material possession. Majority of respondents had medium annual income so they had medium material possession. Besides this, as the rural youth might be in budding stage of enterprise and might have taken up only a limited period in agripreneurship and earned only a part of net worth of their life.

The result is in conformity with the findings of Olaniyi (2013) [13], Roy et al. (2013) [16].

9. Financial support
It is clear from the Table 1 that majority (53.75%) of the respondents had frequently availed financial support followed by very frequently availed (32.50%), rarely availed (8.75%) and never availed (5.00%) financial support respectively.

The reasons for this might be that it plays a vital role in smooth running of any enterprise. Respondents frequently availed financial support from families and relatives and it offers the benefits of lower transaction costs, fewer strings attached, the ability to maintain strategic control over the enterprises. The above trend also revealed that they gained financial support from commercial banks and lead bank and now a day’s most of the banks are coming forward in giving credit for entrepreneurial activities.

The finding is in partial conformity with the finding of Chaitanya (2004) [3], Charan (2014) [4].

10. Extension contact
From Table 1 it is observed that majority (57.50%) of the respondents had medium level of extension contact followed by high level (31.25%) and low (11.25%) levels of extension contact respectively.

Above trend indicated that medium level of extension contact prevailed among rural youth. Contacting the extension officers pertaining to their field of occupation is important for the agripreneurs. Extension contact results in purposeful action which is largely contingent upon an individual’s belief in his ability to perform that action correctly and effectively and thus, rural youth contacts various departmental officials to seek more information and to clarify the doubts pertaining to improving agri-enterprises.

The findings of this study are in agreement with the findings of study conducted by Mubeena (2017) [17], Shireesha et al. (2017) [20].

Table 1: Distribution of rural youth agripreneurs according to their profile characteristics (n=240)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S. No.</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Class Interval</th>
<th>Frequency (f)</th>
<th>Percentage (%)</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Lower young age</td>
<td>(18-25 years)</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>26.25</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Middle young age</td>
<td>(26-30 years)</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>36.25</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Upper young age</td>
<td>(31-35 years)</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>37.50</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Illiterate</td>
<td></td>
<td>95</td>
<td>41.25</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Primary education</td>
<td></td>
<td>48</td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Secondary education</td>
<td></td>
<td>29</td>
<td>12.08</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Higher Secondary education</td>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
<td>8.75</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Diploma</td>
<td></td>
<td>31</td>
<td>12.91</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Graduation</td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Post graduation</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.66</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>Family type</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Nuclear</td>
<td></td>
<td>68</td>
<td>28.33</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Joint</td>
<td></td>
<td>172</td>
<td>71.66</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td>Family support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Very low family support</td>
<td></td>
<td>5-8</td>
<td>22.08</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Low family support</td>
<td></td>
<td>9-12</td>
<td>23.75</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Medium family support</td>
<td></td>
<td>13-16</td>
<td>43.75</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>High family support</td>
<td></td>
<td>17-20</td>
<td>10.41</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>Entrepreneurial experience</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Very low experience</td>
<td></td>
<td>1-5 years</td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Low experience</td>
<td></td>
<td>6-10 years</td>
<td>27.08</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Medium experience</td>
<td></td>
<td>11-15 years</td>
<td>35.41</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>High experience</td>
<td></td>
<td>&gt;15 years</td>
<td>12.50</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI</td>
<td>Training received</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Undergone training</td>
<td></td>
<td>65</td>
<td>27.08</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Not undergone training</td>
<td></td>
<td>175</td>
<td>72.91</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII</td>
<td>Annual income</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Low annual income</td>
<td></td>
<td>35</td>
<td>14.58</td>
<td>143.82</td>
<td>217.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Medium annual income</td>
<td></td>
<td>167</td>
<td>69.58</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>High annual income</td>
<td></td>
<td>38</td>
<td>15.83</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIII</td>
<td>Material possession</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Low material possession</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 – 11</td>
<td>12.50</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Medium material possession</td>
<td></td>
<td>12 – 22</td>
<td>69.16</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>High material possession</td>
<td></td>
<td>23 – 33</td>
<td>18.33</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IX</td>
<td>Financial support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Never availed financial support</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Rarely availed financial support</td>
<td></td>
<td>1-6</td>
<td>8.75</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Frequently availed financial support</td>
<td></td>
<td>7-12</td>
<td>53.75</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
11. Mass media exposure
It is transparent from Table 1 that majority (57.91%) of respondents had medium level of mass media exposure followed by high (39.58%) and low (2.50%) levels of mass media exposure respectively. Rural youth who have high accessibility to internet, have time and cosmopolite might be attracted towards different mass media and utilizing them in befitting way. Rural youth are easily accessible to the mass media such as television, radio, newspapers and farm magazines. They have the habit of reading newspaper and farm magazines, listening to radio programmes and watching television for agricultural programmes. Medium level mass media utilization explains that they are very much dependent on mass media as a source of news and information, but also as a source of entertainment and leisure.
This finding was in agreement with the findings of Kudare (2012) [9], Umunnakwe (2014) [25].

12. Marketing facilities
Table 1 depict that majority (60.83%) of the respondents had medium level of marketing facilities followed by low (25.00%) and high (14.16%) levels of marketing facilities respectively. The reasons for above trend might be that the majority of respondents had tie up with the other companies for their products. It was known from that majority of the respondents had tie up with the other companies for their produce. Market facilities could be increased by providing adequate transport facilities and creation of more number of outlets in nearby towns to sell their products.
The finding is in accordance with the findings of Sreeram (2013) [22], Mubeena (2017) [17].

13. Risk orientation
It is obvious from Table 1 that (70.83%) of the respondents had medium level of risk orientation followed by high level (25.00%) and had (5.41%) low level of risk orientation. The rural youth in these category might have made up to their mind to take risk and have put efforts to adopt new agricultural technology. Rural youth through their dynamic
and responsive behaviour might be geared up to endure risk in agripreneurship so as to entertain exalted profits. On the contrary, the existing technological gap and other policy issues might have dragging the rural youth away from bearing risk in agripreneurship. The studies of Viswanatha et al. (2014a) [28] and Viswanatha et al. (2014b) [27] expressed the similar trend.

14. Economic motivation

It is depicted from Table 1 that (65.00%) of the respondents had medium level of economic motivation followed by high (22.50%) level and (12.50%) were found in low level economic motivation. Youth having medium economic motivation were willing to take calculated risk for their field operations. Economic motivation might have motivated them to get more economic return, resulting in profit making behaviour. Hence, these factors might have motivated the respondents to gain more economic returns. The present findings of the study were in agreement with the findings of Bhosale (2010) [29], Naidu (2012) [12].

15. Innovativeness

It is clear from Table 1 that (72.08%) of the respondents had medium level of innovativeness followed by high (20.83%) level and low (7.08%) level of innovativeness respectively. Innovativeness will encourage the rural youth towards adoption of modern technologies which replace age old technologies. This change might have reflected on the evolutionary impact in productivity. The reason for medium innovativeness might be due to medium annual income, economic motivation and risk orientation. The finding draws support with the studies of Naidu (2012) [12] and Devalatha et al. (2013) [9].

16. Risk taking ability

It is apparent from Table 1 that 49.58 per cent of the respondents had medium level of risk taking ability followed by high (36.25%) level and low (14.16%) level of risk taking ability respectively.

The agripreneurs might be more tuned towards taking risk keeping in view of their present situation. On the other side, the low risk taking ability can be attributed to poor moral support for the agripreneurs from their family members and friends. Low risk taking ability would lead to low economic gain and did not take risk to introduce a transformation or change unless others tried and used them. Hence, the above trend was noticed. The present finding of the study was in conformation of Sharma (2011) [19], Pakhmode et al. (2018) [15].

17. Leadership ability

It is manifested from Table 1 that (50.83%) of the respondents had medium level of leadership ability followed by high (37.50%) and low (11.66%) levels of leadership ability respectively. The possible reason for the above trend might be that they can influence, help, guide and support the members in solving their problems and the group leaders usually play a major role in identifying the members and forming the group and in keeping all the members together for its smooth functioning and also all groups need a formal leader who can play an important role in the group’s success in terms of achieving high group satisfaction and participatory leadership to be more effective than autocratic style. This result is similar to the findings of Subodh (2012) [23], Mubeena (2017) [17],

18. Decision making ability

In majority of cases they might not be frightened for failures rather desperately anticipated for accomplishment of their ambition. Group decision have been found to be better than those that would be reached by the average individual. In terms of accuracy, group decisions were more accurate. On the other side, personal, economic issues and youth shouldering family errands with limited resources might not be bold enough to take decisions at appropriate time. This result was in agreement with Selvarani (2006) [17], Naidu (2012) [12].

19. Perception of rural youth towards agri –enterprises

It is distinct from Table 1 that 60.00 per cent of the respondents had medium level of perception followed by high (25.00%) level and low (15.00%) level of perception respectively.

Perception is the process whereby sensory input is organized into meaningful experience. An attempt was made to assess the perception of rural youth towards agri-enterprises. Perception plays an important role in influencing the interests of the rural youth in agripreneurship. The above trend revealed that medium level of perception and probable reason might be economic, social, psychological, informational and technological aspects were found to be strongly influencing the intention of the rural youth to participate in agripreneurship. These findings are in agreement with Duncan (2004) [17], Olaniyi et al. (2011) [14].

Attitude of rural youth towards agri-enterprises

It is self-evident from Table 1 that 75.00 per cent of the respondents had moderately favourable attitude followed by highly favourable attitude (20.00%) and less favourable attitude (5.00%) respectively. It is obvious that most of the rural youth had moderately favourable attitude towards agripreneurship. The reason for this is most of the youth were not much aware of entrepreneurial development programmes. Though they have interest in agripreneurship, due to lack of technology, capital, capacity building and family support they had moderately favourable attitude. The finding is in accordance with Angaitkar et al. (2013) [1], Kitturmath et al. (2014) [8].
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