



## Migration Behaviour of Rural Youth from Agriculture in North Coastal Andhra Pradesh

Malluri Sai<sup>1</sup>, Ajay Kumar Prusty<sup>2\*</sup>, Chitrasena Padhy<sup>3</sup> and Idemakanti Chandrakanth Reddy<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup>PG Scholar, <sup>2</sup>Assistant Professor (Agricultural Extension Education), <sup>3</sup>Associate Professor (Agricultural Extension Education), <sup>4</sup>Assistant Professor (Agricultural Economics), M.S. Swaminathan School of Agriculture, Centurion University of Technology and Management, Paralakhemundi-761211, Odisha, India

\*Corresponding author email id: prusty.ajay@gmail.com

### HIGHLIGHTS

- Migration of rural youth is on the rise, particularly in the northern coastal region of Andhra Pradesh.
- Rural youth are migrating to urban places with more aspirations and beyond creativity to achieve their goals.
- Most youths with occupational mobility had no hesitation in picking jobs in unfamiliar places, and they intend remigration within ten years.

### ARTICLE INFO

**Keywords:** Agriculture, Employment opportunities, Migration, Migration indicators, Rural youth.

<https://doi.org/10.48165/IJEE.2024.60406>

**Conflict of Interest:** None

**Research ethics statement(s):**

Informed consent of the participants

### ABSTRACT

Due to increased industrialization, a growing service sector, improved food security, easier access to healthcare and educational opportunities in cities, and growing young ambitions, the migratory norm of rural youth has been continuously rising over the past 25 years. The study conducted during 2023 and 2024 aimed to ascertain youth migration patterns from the rural districts of Srikakulam and Vizianagaram in Andhra Pradesh. The results showed that the main reasons behind youth movement from rural areas were inconsistent income, low employment, and recurrent crop failures. The respondents have shown a medium level of attitude towards agriculture. The Direct indicators with a mean average of (2.23) and perception migration indicators with a mean average of (2.88) have been noticed. Independent variables such as age, farming experience, proximity to towns/cities, annual income, self-reliance, and self-confidence were positively correlated. A positive significance level has been found for education, occupation, farm skill, years of stay in native, migration experience, economic motivation, achievement motivation, and income expectancy, which are negatively correlated with non-farm skills and risk orientation.

### INTRODUCTION

The problem of rural youth migration from North Coastal Andhra Pradesh has attracted much interest recently since it illustrates the intricate relationship between socioeconomic circumstances, ambitions, and the changing possibilities available in the area. Youth are the most engaged demographic and the force behind society's most fruitful endeavors. In this region of Andhra Pradesh, migration from rural to urban areas is frequently motivated by the attraction of greater job chances in metropolitan areas and a

perceived shortage of opportunities in the agricultural sector. However, there are more reasons besides economics for rural youth migration. Whatever the class differences, studies on the education-to-work transition of young rural-urban migrants in Kathmandu, Nepal, have revealed that moving for employment and education is often seen as essential for a seamless transition to adulthood. These findings align with the broader corpus of research on India's rural-urban migration, which has highlighted the impact of financial considerations on youth's choices to move away from their hometowns (Gaikwad et al., 2020). This movement is gaining

traction in North Coastal Andhra Pradesh due to several socioeconomic issues, including poverty, unemployment, and a lack of work prospects. Push factors provide a strong incentive for rural-to-urban migration, especially when paired with the attraction of urbanization and the possibility of income diversification. However, this move is more than straightforward; it represents the hopes, struggles, and resiliency of young migrants as they make their way through the unknowns of migration in search of better living circumstances and job opportunities. Consequently, youth from rural areas are abandoning their family businesses and moving to larger cities to get contemporary education and skills that will enable them to work in the private sector instead of in the fields (Maurya et al., 2021). It would be challenging to keep or draw youth from rural areas into agriculture unless there is a significant shift in agricultural practices and agriculture becomes a viable industry (Som et al., 2018). Olajide (2019) claimed that there was a connection between the movement of youth from rural areas and a number of variables, such as dwindling food production, farming and fishing-related activities, urban congestion, inadequate infrastructure in urban areas, and other issues. However, Tadaro & Harris (2017) believed that given the existence of a positive marginal product of labor in agriculture, especially in the relatively land-abundant economies of other countries, a decline in agricultural output was likely to result from rural-urban migration. To curb rural-to-urban migration among youth, the Government of India has launched ARYA (Attracting and Retaining Youth in Agriculture) programme, which encourages rural youth to pursue profitable agricultural activities through entrepreneurship and modern farming techniques. ARYA aims to create sustainable livelihoods, reduce migration, and make agriculture a more attractive career option by improving skills, market access, and technology use (Sahoo et al., 2023). This research aims to identify the variables affecting the migratory behaviour of youth living in rural areas.

## METHODOLOGY

The research was restricted to the districts of Vizianagaram and Srikakulam. 180 rural youth from Andhra Pradesh formed part of the respondents' sample. A multistage random sampling strategy was used in the research since the sample units, which were districts and manuals, were selected purposively. With a sample size of fifteen youths per gram panchayat, six gram panchayats and three mandals were selected from each district. Using an ex-post-facto research design and a simple random sampling approach, data were gathered from youth living in rural areas. A single youth from a single household served as the data-gathering unit. The data were collected through a structured interview schedule and were analyzed using descriptive statistics, such as frequency, mean, percentage, correlation coefficient, and linear multiple regression.

In order to create the migration behavior index, the indicator scores for the following were added: distance from the workplace, degree of social embeddedness, parental and peer influence, creative aspiration, occupational mobility, migration intention, nature of migration, type of work in the migrated destination, migration network, family migration norm, remittances, and remigration intention.

$$MBI = \frac{(I_{1x} + I_{2x} + I_{3x} + \dots + I_{14x})}{(I_{1y} + I_{2y} + I_{3y} + \dots + I_{14y})}$$

Where, MBI- Migration behavior index,  $I_{1x}$  – Total score obtained for the first indicator,  $I_{14x}$  – Total score obtained for 14<sup>th</sup> indicator,  $I_{1y}$  – Total possible score obtained for the first indicator,  $I_{14y}$  – Total Maximum score possible for the 14<sup>th</sup> indicator

The degree of the association and the direction of the relationship (positive or negative) between the variables was revealed by the correlation coefficient. Multiple regression analysis determined the functional connection between the independent and dependent variables.

## RESULTS

### Direct migration indicators

Table 1 revealed that in the direct migration indicators, the young primarily migrated temporarily to urban regions (37.2%), followed by circular movement (36.1%), according to the type of

**Table 1.** Direct migration indicators of youth in North Coastal Andhra Pradesh

S.No.	Migration Behaviour Indicators	Percentage
1	Migration nature	2.11/3.0
	Temporary	37.8
	Circular	36.1
	Permanent	26.1
2	Work in migrated area	1.55/2.0
	Agriculture	45.1
	Non-agriculture	54.9
3	Workplace Distance	2.48/4.0
	Less than 25 km	18
	25-50 km	16.1
	50-100 km	23.3
	More than 100 km	40.0
4	Migration decision making	2.00/3.0
	By self	32.2%
	Family members	33.9%
	Others	32.2%
5	Migration Network	2.83/5.0
	Relations	15.0
	Friends	20.0
	Neighbors	19.4
	Agencies	21.1
	Family	22.7
6	Family migration norm	2.05/3.0
	Encourage to migrate	35.5
	No idea	31.1
	Don't want to migrate	31.6
7	Return intention	3.02/5.0
	I intend to return within a year	21.1
	I intended to return in five years	18.3
	Intended to return in 5-10 years	21.6
	I intend to return after ten years	17.2
	No intention to return	20

**Table 2.** Indicators of perception migration of youth in North Coastal Andhra Pradesh

S.No.	Indicators	Percentage
I	Aspiration	2.99/5.0
	Money earns in 5 years	22.2
	Possession increased in area	19.4
	To alter the house and to construct a new house	15
	To purchase lands within the next five years	22.7
	For having better standard of living	18.8
II	Creativity	3.12/5.0
	Desire to go beyond convention.	22.2
	Fascinating new tasks and areas.	21.6
	Restructuring problems and recognizing ideas.	18.8
	Working on several ideas simultaneously.	15.5
	Elaborating and expanding ideas.	20.0
III	Occupational mobility	2.88/5.0
	Fondness to travel to unknown destinations in search of a job.	17.2
	No hesitation to pick jobs in unfamiliar areas	25.0
	There is no vacillation to mingle with people in unfamiliar surroundings	19.4
	Easiness in getting accommodated to the new culture and customs.	20.5
	Readiness to grasp job-oriented skills that are new.	16.1
IV	Migration intention	1.92/3.0
	Intention to migrate in the past.	28.9
	Intention to migrate currently.	35.7
	Intention to migrate in the future.	35.5
V	Degree of social embeddedness	2.88/5.0
	Preference to stay in the migrated area than home	21
	Feeling safe and secure in the migrated area	23.8
	Feeling comfortable, I was surrounded by people belonging to other communities	19.4
	Leaving family in native when moving to unfamiliar places	20.0

migration, which had a mean score of (2.11/3.0). Regarding the type of work being done at the transferred destination (1.55/2.0), most migrated youth were engaged in non-agricultural work, with 54.9 per cent being in jobs, studies, coaching, etc. 18 per cent of respondent youth migrated to areas in a distance of more than 100 kms, 40 per cent of which was followed by 23.3 per cent of migrates between 50-100 kms, with a mean score of (2.48/4.0). For migration decision-making (2.00/3.0), it was stated that the migration decision-making was taken mainly by the family members (33.9%) and by self-decision (32.2%). The migration network (2.83/5.0) revealed that most of the migration network was by family 22.7 per cent and by agencies 21.1 per cent for the search for better educational qualifications and higher standards of living. The family migration norm (2.05/3.0), with 35.5 per cent of rural families encouraged their children to migrate to urban areas for a better standard of living and high-income expectancy. For remigration intention, the mean score (3.02/5.0) for the migrated rural youth said that they intended to return to their native places within 5-10 years of span after completing their studies or to work with their contracts.

#### Perception migration indicators

According to Table 2, the respondents had an aspiration of 2.99/5.0, 22.7 per cent for those who want to buy land within the next five years, followed by 22.2 per cent earning money within the next five years. For creativity (3.12/5.0), the desire to go beyond convention was 22.2 per cent, as most of the rural youth wanted to explore the outer urban areas with their knowledge skills and for a better understanding of society. Regarding occupational mobility (2.88/5.0), there was no hesitation in picking jobs in unfamiliar areas. 25 per cent responded that the migrated youth did not hesitate to go anywhere to work for a better standard of living in search of job locations. Moreover, in migration intention (1.92/3.0), most rural youth had intentions to migrate in the current stage, 35.5 per cent, closely followed by the intention to migrate in the future, 35 per

**Table 3.** Linear multiple regression and Correlation coefficient of profile of rural youth with the migration behaviour

S.No.	Independent variables	'B' value	't' value	Std. error	Correlation coefficient
1	Age	0.601	0.604	0.120	0.376*
2	Education	1.062	1.394	0.361	0.424**
3	Occupation	-0.246	0.349	0.4006	0.268**
4	Farm size	1.433	2.482	0.577	0.387**
5	Farm skill	6.654	1.991	0.467	0.411**
6	Farming experience	-0.069	0.090	0.768	0.355*
7	Non-farm skill	0.776	0.938	0.626	0.68 <sup>NS</sup>
8	Years of stay in native	1.179	1.788	0.219	0.357**
9	Proximity to towns/cities	1.227	1.330	0.269	0.196*
10	Migration experience	-0.086	-0.127	0.679	0.341**
11	Annual income	-0.337	1.917	0.801	0.155*
12	Economic motivation	0.924	2.965	0.312	0.471**
13	Achievement motivation	1.164	2.562	0.454	0.378**
14	Risk orientation	-0.008	-0.297	0.027	-0.031 <sup>NS</sup>
15	Self-reliance	0.825	0.909	0.908	0.352*
16	Self-confidence	-0.068	-0.316	0.216	0.106*
17	Income expectancy	1.381	5.626	0.245	0.315**
18	Comfort expectancy	1.807	7.716	0.234	0.338 <sup>NS</sup>

R<sup>2</sup> = 0.639

cent. Moreover, in the degree of embeddedness (2.88/5.0), most of the rural youth that was migrating said that they have security in the migrated area 23.8 per cent and also said that they prefer to stay in the migrated areas area better than in the rural areas 21 per cent due to because of the work in the homeland and the standards of living and the way of living in the urban areas.

It can be observed from Table 3 that there was a significantly positive relationship between age, education, occupation, farm size, farm skill, farming experience, years of native residence, proximity to towns/cities, annual income, migration experience, economic motivation, achievement motivation, self-reliance, self-confidence, and income expectancy with migration behavior of youths. From Table 3, it was observed that the  $R^2$  value of 0.639, which represented that the data collected varied by 63.9 per cent.

### DISCUSSION

Srikakulam and Vizianagaram are the top two destinations for youth migrating to cities. Large-scale urbanization and increased economic indignation are the results of this tendency. Youth who are not literate enough lack agricultural information and technological expertise, and the necessary skills to operate contemporary agricultural technologies cannot reach the intended level of productivity. Tekale et al., (2021) claimed that teenagers' economic motive and risk orientation had a beneficial impact on their migrating behavior. In the next five years, the goals of rural youth were to acquire land and make money (Chinchmalatpure & Takele, 2019). These were their low and high expectations, respectively. Youths who were temporary migrants scored higher than youths who were circular migrants; the findings are in line with Kumari et al. (2022). Many youth from rural areas have moved elsewhere, following in the footsteps of their peers who left earlier. Most youth from rural areas who plan to remigrate do so within the next five to ten years (21.6%); Tufis & Sandhu (2023) corroborate these findings. Furthermore, the outcome illustrates the necessity of compensation for migration (Maurya et al., 2022). The leading indicator of remigration intention is at the top of the list of factors that encouraged youth to migrate from rural areas; Maurya et al., (2021) found that the main reasons youth moved were higher pay levels and better employment opportunities in towns. This result is consistent with that of (Tiwari, 2016), who found that respondents' educational attainment and familial background are favorable. As opposed to moving now (35.7%), most adolescents aspire to relocate soon (35.5%). Comparable outcomes were seen among young city dwellers (Bakina et al., 2018) who desired to relocate (47%). Regarding socioeconomic profile, the young who have moved have high expectations for their comfort level and economic incentive; similar findings are also observed by Skosyreva et al., (2021), who claimed that migrating behavior is more prevalent in rural regions closer to metropolitan areas. Regarding social embeddedness, most youth feel comfortable and safe remaining in their new location. Our results align with the study of Tripathi et al., (2018), demonstrating that individuals are more inclined to migrate if they have personal or cultural ties outside their parents' communities. The socioeconomic factors and profile traits positively and negatively correlate with migrating behaviour. Consequently, the variance fluctuates by 63.9 per cent, as indicated by the  $R^2$  value

of 0.639. The results align Jena and Kanungo (2021), demonstrating the positive relationship between migration decisions and relatives who have settled in the target country. According to Lamine et al., (2021), youths from agriculture intend to move at a higher rate than youths from other educational programs. Around 20 per cent of individuals in each group are undecided about moving or staying put and might be convinced to move. For females, migration is primarily brought about by marriage or family relocation. However, the underlying causes may vary.

### CONCLUSION

The significant role of direct and perception-based migration indicators influencing rural youth migration in North Coastal Andhra Pradesh was observed. The economic motives, better employment opportunities, and the search for improved living standards are the primary drivers. The proximity to urban centres, educational attainment, and family influence also play a critical role in migration decisions. Youths tend to migrate temporarily or circularly, with many intending to return after achieving their goals. Socioeconomic factors, such as income expectancy and economic motivation, strongly correlate with migration behaviour. These factors significantly influence the variance in migration behaviour, as indicated by an  $R^2$  value of 0.639. The study's findings imply that targeted policy interventions addressing economic incentives, education, and employment opportunities could effectively manage rural youth migration and support sustainable development in their home regions.

### REFERENCES

- Bakina, A. V., Yaramtchuk, S. V., Orlova, O. A., & Krasnoperova, Y. V. (2018). Life satisfaction and migration intention of Youth. *International Scientific Conference "Far East Con"*. 47.
- Chinchmalatpure, U. R., & Tekale, V. S. (2019). Aspiration of rural youth towards agriculture. *Indian Journal of Extension Education*, 55(2), 25–30. Retrieved from <https://acspublisher.com/journals/index.php/ijee/article/view/4588>
- Gaikwad, A. B., Bhamare, M. G., & Ban, S. H. (2020). Migration behaviour of rural youth. *Gujarat Journal of Extension Education*, 31(1), 190-196.
- Jena, A., & Kanungo, A. P. (2021). Factors associated with Intergenerational occupational mobility in farming sector in coastal and tribal districts of Odisha of India. *Indian Journal of Extension Education*, 57(2), 123-127. <https://doi.org/10.48165/IJEE.2022.58123>
- Kumari, K., Singh, K. M., & Ahmad, N. (2022). Impact of migration on women empowerment: a situational analysis of North-Bihar. *Indian Journal of Extension Education*, 58(1), 101-105. <https://doi.org/10.48165/IJEE.2022.58123>
- Lamine, J. P., Boren Alpizar, A., Millares Forno, C., & Quijada Landaverde, R. (2021). Agricultural education and migration: A comparison of rural youth in El Salvador and Honduras. *Advancements in Agricultural Development*, 2(1), 70-82. <https://doi.org/10.37433/aad.v2i1.77>
- Maurya, A. S., Malik, J. S., & Yadav, R. N. (2021). Relationship between profile of rural youth and attitude towards agriculture. *Indian Journal of Extension Education*, 57(3), 12-15. <https://doi.org/10.48165/IJEE.2021.57303>
- Maurya, S., Mishra, A., & Malik, J. S. (2022). Migration behavior of

- rural youth in Haryana. *Indian Journal of Extension Education*, 58(3), 93–98. <https://doi.org/10.48165/IJEE.2022.58320>
- Olajide, D. W. (2019). Rural-urban migration and agriculture development in Nigeria. *Arts in Society Research Network*, 1(30), 8-49.
- Sahoo, M., Acharya, S., Nayak, A. P., & Sethy, S. (2023). Effect of ARYA Programme in Employment and Income Generation of the Rural Youths. *Indian Journal of Extension Education*, 59(4), 109-113. <https://doi.org/10.48165/IJEE/2023.59422>
- Skosyрева, N. D., Zinich, A. V., Revyakina, Y. N., Gefner, O. V., & Kuznetsova, O. Z. (2021). modern rural youth: values, motives, attitudes in professional self-determination. *International Conference Land Economy and Rural Studies Essentials*. <https://doi.org/10.15405/epsbs.2021.07.15>
- Som, S., Burman, R. R., Sharma, J. P., Padaria, R. N., Paul, S., & Singh, A. K. (2018). Attracting and retaining youth in agriculture: challenges and prospects. *Journal of Community Mobilization and Sustainable Development*, 13(3), 385–395.
- Tadaro, M. P., & Harris, R. G. (2017). Labor force migration, unemployment, and urban poverty: A study of the urban informal sector in Kenya. *Journal of Development Studies*, 9, 1258-1276.
- Tekale, V. S., Chavhan, P. D., & Pimpalkar, R. D. (2021). Impact of sorghum demonstrations on the beneficiary farmers. *Journal of Pharmacognosy and Phytochemistry*, 10(1S), 359-361.
- Tiwari, C. (2016). Factors behind Intergenerational Occupational Mobility: Evidences from Uttar Pradesh, India. *Journal of Business Management & Social Sciences Research*, 5(1), 21-27.
- Tripathi, H., Dixit, V., Singh, S., Yadav, R., & Singh, I. (2018). An Analysis of causes for rural youth migrations. *Indian Journal of Extension Education*, 54(3), 53–58. Retrieved from <https://acspublisher.com/journals/index.php/ijee/article/view/4714>
- Tufis, P. A., Sandu, D. (2023). Motivation in the dynamics of European youth migration. *European Societies*, 25(5), 829-858. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14616696.2023.2183231>