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ABSTRACT

The study was conducted in 4 main agricultural universities in Uttar Pradesh, by interviewing 300 respondents who were selected through proportionate random sampling technique on the criteria of having four year degree programme of B.Sc.(Ag.), two year degree programme M.Sc.(Ag.) and three year degree programme Ph.D.(Ag.). The study depicted that the highest number of respondents in age category of 22 to 26 years belonged to nuclear families (79%) and having 5-10 members in their families (72%) Except 7 per cent respondents all were unmarried and backward caste respondents were more in comparisons to other categories of caste. The economic motivation, risk orientation and value orientations were observed of medium levels. The mobile phone is most useful of communication media. The agriculture was observed as main occupation of majority of the respondent’s families and having annual income of Rs. 100001 to 200000 (31%). The 51% respondents were found having pucca type houses, 35% of the respondents was found in the land holding category of small farmers. 64.66 percent medium level of decision pattern of Father. The maximum number of respondents was observed in medium category of communication technology use in day and most usefulness of communication technologies in career preferences was mobile phone. The majority Purpose in use of communication technology was ‘computer information retrieval or data updating’ at ranked first. The father followed by mother, brother, friends, relative mean score value 2.11, 1.03, 0.71, 0.60 and 0.60 respectively were found to be important motivational sources among all.
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Introduction

Agriculture is still the largest employer of India. However, there was not much education regarding the same in the past. Agricultural education is now given importance so that the farmers can adopt environmentally and technologically advanced farming tactics and consequently increase productivity as well as profitability.
Agricultural universities in India help farmers to make farming viable and profitable. There is a total of 53 Agricultural Universities or 'AUs' in the country, including 46 State Universities, 5 Deemed Universities and 2 central universities which are administered by the Indian Agricultural Universities Association. These universities are engaged in teaching, research and extension of agriculture and related fields.

The young people in the research said parental advice is the most frequently sought and useful of sources for making jobs, careers and course decisions than advice obtained from friends and teachers. Formal advice from career talks and services, college open days and prospectuses were judged the least sought after. Young people know very little about the details of work in particular jobs and about the kind of pay and life style that different jobs offer.

Boys in particular have very basic perceptions of work that is traditionally done by women. Both boys and girls were aware that male dominated work was better paid than female dominated work, but young people’s pay estimates for all kinds or work were very variable and not well related to actual rates of pay. Girls appear to be more open to the use and influence of sources beyond parents including teachers, friends and formal career services consistent with their more social and relationship oriented approach to life generally. The fact boys rely on parental/family sources for their choice of course or career could be due to a more “approval oriented approach” to decision making or simply because they have an anti-school tendency. Parents and other family members can be an important source of support for students making career decisions. Family members can be actively involved in assisting with career choices. Personal friends are also possible resources for students and can help provide support and feedbacks.

Formal sources such as the internet, leaflets, careers talks, do not feature much in young people’s reports of what sources of information or advice have been of most use to them in their occupational decision making of the formal sources of advice, college open days were rated as the most helpful. Overall the relative insignificance of formal career services including and most notably, connections, as a form of contact and source of career advice/guidance. Keeping in view the above facts into consideration this study was undertaken on the following specific objectives; To study the socio-economic profile of respondents. And to study the motivational sources of respondents about career preferences.

Methodology

In Uttar Pradesh, there are working 4 main agricultural universities namely C.S.A.U.A. &T. Kanpur, S.V.B.P.U.A&T., Meerut, N.D.U.A. &T., Kumarganj, Faizabad and M.S.K.J.U.A. &T. Banda. But M.S.K.J.U.A. &T. Banda established in recent years. The other three universities are running different degree programs. The study was purposively confined to State Agricultural Universities, C.S.A.U.A. &T. Kanpur, S.V.B.P.U.A&T., Meerut, N.D.U.A. &T., Kumarganj, Faizabad and M.S.K.J.U.A. &T. Banda, because in this university the M.S.K.J.U.A. &T. Banda, UG, PG programmes started in recent years. This university is not selected under the research criteria. These universities has at present time deferent colleges (College of Agriculture, College of Horticulture & Forestry, College of Fisheries, College of Veterinary Science & Animal Husbandry, College of Home Science, College of Agriculture Engineering & Technology, College of Biotechnology, College of Agri-Business Management) one
of which, college of Agriculture was selected purposively designed to conduct study specially on Agriculture students.

**Results and Discussion**

**Socio-personal profile of respondents in table-1**

Maximum number of the respondents (57.33%) was observed in the category of 22 to 26 years of age. The all students/respondents were found in the B.Sc. agriculture in (41.33%), M.Sc. (42.34%) and Ph.D. students in (16%) respectively. The little less than half of the respondents (48.33%) belonged to backward categories of caste followed by (29.67%) General caste and (22.00%) Scheduled caste respectively. The maximum number of the respondents was observed unmarried (93%). It is apparent from the highest number of respondents (69.34%) was found having medium level of economic motivation, while (18.33%) and (12.33%) respondents were such who had high and low levels of economic motivation, respectively. The most use of communication media was Mobile Phone ranked at first with mean score of 3.59 followed by Internet services (3.09) rank II, Computer system (2.71) rank III, Television (2.71) rank IV, Internet via mobile phone (2.39) rank V, respectively. It is apparent from the 64 per cent of the respondents were found having medium level of value orientations followed by (18%) and (18%) who had high and low levels respectively and 71 per cent of the respondents were found having medium level of risk orientation followed by (17.66%) and (11.34%) who had low and high levels, respectively. Shows that maximum number of respondents (62%) were observed in medium (3 to 7 hours) category of communication technology use in day followed by low (up to 2 hours) and high (8 hours and above hours) i.e. 21 and 17 per cent respondents respectively.

**Familial status of respondents**

The 79 per cent respondents were residing in nuclear family system while remaining 21 per cent respondents were observed in joint family system. It is evident from 72.67 per cent of the respondents families were observed such who had 5 to 10 members followed by 14.67 per cent families having up to 4 members and only 12.66 per cent respondents families were found having 11 and above members in their families and one third of the respondents (64.33%) were observed having their family education between high school to intermediate followed by 19.67 per cent graduation and above and 16 per cent up to junior high school respectively. In case of main and subsidiary family occupation the highest number of respondents (39.33%) reported in agriculture followed as their main family service (34.00%) and Business (19.00%) respectively. 31.67 per cent of the respondents were from those families, whose annual income were found in the categories of Rs. 100001 to 200000 followed by other categories viz., 29.00 per cent (up to Rs. 100000), 18.67 per cent (Rs. 200001 to 300000) 10.66 per cent (Rs. 300001 to 400000) and 10 per cent (Rs. 400001 and above) respectively and pertaining to the type of houses possession that 51.00 per cent respondents were found having their houses of pucca types, 47.00 per cent were residing in mixed houses and 02.00 per cent were reported such who had kachcha houses. The majority (35.67%) of the respondents was found in the land holding category of small farmers (2.5 acre to 5 acre) followed by 25.00% in the categories of marginal farmers (below 2.5 acre), 9.67% in the category of medium farmers (5 to 7.5 acre), 9.33% in the category of large farmers (7.5 acre and above) and 20.33% respondents was found in land less respectively. Majority of
respondents (99.67% and 97%) at personal level and family level was observed possessing cellular phone with them. The overall decision pattern of family in Father Involvement is highest.

**Degree of motivational sources about career preferences in Table-2**

The degree of motivational sources about career preferences as indicated by the respondents. The maximum love motivates sources father ranked at first with mean score of 2.38 followed by mother (1.56) ranked II, brother (1.27) ranked III, Friends (1.12) ranked IV, teacher (1.07) ranked V and sister (1.01) ranked VI, respectively were found to be important motivational sources among all. The knowledge motivates sources father ranked at first with mean score of 1.66 followed by teachers (1.49) ranked II, Brother (1.40) ranked III, Seniors (1.19) ranked IV and Newspaper (1.13) ranked V, respectively were found to be important knowledge motivational sources among all. The father followed by, mother, brother, friends and sister mean score value 1.02, 0.79, 0.62, 0.61 and 0.55 respectively were found to be important compassion motivational sources among all. The father followed by mother, brother, friends, relative mean score value 2.11, 1.03, 0.71, 0.60 and 0.60 respectively were found to be important motivational sources among all.

**Table.1 Socio-personal, economic and psychological profile of the respondents**

| S. No. | Variables                      | Percentage of the respondents | Mean  | Standard Deviation | Minimum | Maximum |
|-------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|-------|--------------------|---------|---------|
|       | **Socio-personal profile of respondents** |                               |       |                    |         |         |
| A.    | **Age.**                       |                                |       |                    |         |         |
|       | I. 17 to 21 years              | 29.33                          | 23.17 | 2.73               | 17      | 32      |
|       | II. 22 to 26 years             | 57.33                          |       |                    |         |         |
|       | III. 27 and above years        | 13.34                          |       |                    |         |         |
| B.    | **Education.**                 |                                |       |                    |         |         |
|       | I. B.Sc.(Ag.) II, III, IV Year | 41.33                          |       |                    |         |         |
|       | II. M.Sc.(Ag.) I, II Year      | 42.34                          |       |                    |         |         |
|       | III. Ph.D.(Ag.) I, II, III Year| 16.33                          |       |                    |         |         |
| C.    | **Caste composition.**         |                                |       |                    |         |         |
|       | I. General caste               | 29.67                          | 22.00 |                    |         |         |
|       | II. Backward caste             | 48.33                          |       |                    |         |         |
|       | III. Scheduled caste           | 22.00                          |       |                    |         |         |
| D.    | **Marital status.**           |                                |       |                    |         |         |
|       | I. Married                     | 07.00                          | 02.52 |                    | 10      | 29      |
|       | II. Unmarried                  | 93.00                          |       |                    |         |         |
| E.    | **Economic motivation (scores).** |                               |       |                    |         |         |
|       | I. Low (up to 20)              | 12.33                          | 22.84 | 02.52              | 10      | 29      |
|       | II. Medium (21 to 25)          | 69.34                          |       |                    |         |         |
|       | III. High (26 and above)       | 18.33                          |       |                    |         |         |
| F. Communication media use. |  |
|--------------------------|---|
| I. Mobile Phone          | 3.59 |
| II. Internet services    | 3.09 |
| III. Computer system     | 2.71 |
| IV. Television           | 2.70 |
| V. Internet via mobile phone | 2.39 |

| G. Value orientation. |  |
|----------------------|---|
| I. Low (27 to 35 score) | 18.00 |
| II. Medium (36 to 43 score) | 64.00 |
| III. High (44 to 50 score) | 18.00 |

| H. Risk orientation. |  |
|---------------------|---|
| I. Low (12 to 20 score) | 17.66 |
| II. Medium (21 to 25 score) | 71.00 |
| III. High (26 to 28 score) | 11.34 |

| Familial status of respondents |  |
|---------------------------------|---|
| I. Family type. |  |
| I. Single family | 79.00 |
| II. Joint family | 21.00 |

| J. Family size. |  |
|-----------------|---|
| I. Small (up to 4 members) | 14.67 |
| II. Medium (5 to 10 members) | 72.67 |
| III. Large (11 and above members) | 12.66 |

| K. Family education status. |  |
|----------------------------|---|
| I. Up to junior high school (Upto 11 score) | 16.00 |
| II. High school to intermediate (12 to 31 scores) | 64.33 |
| III. Graduation to above (32 to above scores) | 19.69 |

| L. Occupation. |  |
|----------------|---|
| I. Agriculture based labour | 05.33 |
| II. Caste based occupation | 01.00 |
| III. Service | 34.00 |
| IV. Agriculture | 39.33 |
| V. Business | 19.00 |
| VI. Dairying | 00.00 |
| VII. Agro based enterprise | 01.33 |

| M. Family annual income (Rs.). |  |
|-------------------------------|---|
| I. Up to 100000 | 29.00 |
| II. 100001 to 200000 | 31.67 |
| III. 200001 to 300000 | 18.67 |
| IV. 300001 to 400000 | 10.66 |
| V. 400001 and above | 10.00 |

|   |  |
|---|---|
| 202183 | 20000 |
| 780000 | 21 |

|   |  |
|---|---|
| 21.13 | 10.06 |
| 60 | 3 |
| N.       | Housing pattern. |          |          |          |          |
|---------|------------------|----------|----------|----------|----------|
|        | I. Hut           | 00.00    |          |          |          |
|        | II. Kachcha      | 02.00    |          |          |          |
|        | III. Mixed       | 47.00    |          |          |          |
|        | IV. Pucca        | 51.00    |          |          |          |
| O.      | Land holding.    |          |          | 03.34    | 00.00    | 26       |
|        | I. Land less     |          |          |          |          |
|        | II. Marginal(below 2.5 acre) | 20.33    |          |          |          |
|        | III. Small(2.5 to 5.0 acre) | 25.00    |          |          |          |
|        | IV. Medium(5.0 to 7.5 acre) | 35.67    |          |          |          |
|        | V. Large(7.5 acre and above) | 09.67    |          |          |          |
| P.      | Communication media possession (average percent) | 03.34    | 00.00    | 26       |
|        | I. At family level | 44.51    |          |          |          |
|        | II. At personal level | 43.69    |          |          |          |
| Q.      | Decision pattern of family. | 03.34    | 00.00    | 26       |
|        | I. Father        | 64.33    |          |          |          |
|        | II. Mother       | 15.47    |          |          |          |
|        | III. Brother     | 10.52    |          |          |          |
|        | IV. Self         | 09.00    |          |          |          |
|        | V. Sister        | 00.94    |          |          |          |
| R.      | Communication technology use in day (in hours). | 03.34    | 00.00    | 26       |
|        | I. Low (up to 2 hours) | 44.51    | 03.34    | 00.00    | 26       |
|        | II. Medium (3 to 7 hours) | 43.69    | 03.34    | 00.00    | 26       |
|        | III. High (8 hours and above hours) | 42.86    | 03.34    | 00.00    | 26       |
| S.      | Satisfaction with availability of communication technologies. | 44.51    | 03.34    | 00.00    | 26       |
|        | I. Not satisfied | 06.33    |          |          |          |
|        | II. Highly satisfied | 21.00    |          |          |          |
|        | III. Moderately satisfied | 28.33    |          |          |          |
|        | IV. Satisfied    | 35.00    |          |          |          |
|        | V. No opinion    | 09.34    |          |          |          |
| T.      | Familiarity with communication technologies. | 44.51    | 03.34    | 00.00    | 26       |
|        | I. Television    | 3.05     |          |          |          |
|        | II. Internet services | 2.38     |          |          |          |
|        | III. Mobile Phone | 2.01     |          |          |          |
|        | IV. Community Radio | 2.00     |          |          |          |
|        | V. Internet via mobile phone | 1.55     |          |          |          |
Table 2: Degree of motivational sources about career preferences

| S. No. | Sources          | Love motivates | Knowledge motivates | Compassion motivates | Economic motivates |
|-------|------------------|----------------|---------------------|----------------------|--------------------|
|       |                  | Mean score value | Rank | Mean score value | Rank | Mean score value | Rank | Mean score value | Rank |
| 1.    | Father           | 2.38 | I             | 1.66 | I             | 1.02 | I             | 2.11 | I             |
| 2.    | Mother           | 1.56 | II            | 1.12 | VI            | 0.79 | II            | 1.03 | II            |
| 3.    | Brother          | 1.27 | III           | 1.40 | III           | 0.62 | III           | 0.71 | III           |
| 4.    | Sister           | 1.01 | VI            | 0.79 | XI            | 0.55 | V             | 0.40 | X             |
| 5.    | Friends          | 1.12 | IV            | 0.97 | IX            | 0.61 | IV            | 0.60 | IV a           |
| 6.    | Relatives        | 0.78 | VIII          | 0.74 | XII           | 0.50 | VII           | 0.60 | IV b           |
| 7.    | Seniors          | 0.60 | XII           | 1.19 | IV            | 0.48 | VIII          | 0.46 | VI            |
| 8.    | Teachers         | 1.07 | V             | 1.49 | II            | 0.55 | VI            | 0.59 | V             |
| 9.    | Ideal person     | 0.87 | VII           | 0.90 | X             | 0.37 | X             | 0.45 | VII           |
| 10.   | Leader           | 0.43 | XIV           | 0.53 | XV            | 0.36 | XI            | 0.45 | VIII          |
| 11.   | Business person  | 0.24 | XVII          | 0.42 | XVIII         | 0.34 | XII           | 0.44 | IX            |
| 12.   | Purohit/Guru     | 0.26 | XVI           | 0.46 | XVI           | 0.30 | XIV           | 0.31 | XIII          |
| 13.   | Self             | 0.62 | XI            | 0.61 | XIV           | 0.43 | IX            | 0.30 | XIV           |
| 14.   | T.V.             | 0.54 | XIII          | 0.62 | XIII          | 0.29 | XV            | 0.24 | XVI           |
| 15.   | Newspaper        | 0.76 | IX            | 1.13 | V             | 0.26 | XVII          | 0.36 | XI            |
| 16.   | Magazines        | 0.75 | X a           | 1.07 | VII           | 0.27 | XVI           | 0.27 | XV            |
| 17.   | Internet         | 0.75 | X b           | 1.02 | VIII          | 0.32 | XIII          | 0.36 | XII           |
| 18.   | Seminars         | 0.37 | XV            | 0.43 | XVII          | 0.24 | XVIII         | 0.14 | XVII          |

In conclusion, it can be concluded the maximum students opted the agriculture stream as education for their career. The data depicted that there was no caste discrimination as far as admission in Agriculture is concerned. Majority of students were found more conscious for their married life and participation in economic motivations was found most of the majority medium level. Mobile Phone was observed most important use of communication media. The value orientations and risk orientations were observed of medium level means that there was no discrimination in the observed data. Most of the family nuclear type, medium size categories and high school to intermediate was observed family education status. The maximum guardians were small size of land holding, having agriculture as family occupation. Possess the communication media at family level and father was found most decision pattern of family. The majority of students medium level communication technology use in a day and most majorities was observed satisfied with availability of communication technology. The television was found to familiarity with communication technology. The father followed by mother, brother, friends, relative respectively were found to be important motivational sources.
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