

Relationship between characteristics of the rural youth and their participation in rural development activities in Bangladesh

Mirza Mobashwerul Haque

Department of Agricultural Extension and Information System, Sher-e-Bangla Agricultural University, Dhaka-1207, Bangladesh

ARTICLE INFO

Article history

Received 30 April
Accepted 27 June 2016
Online release 30 June 2016

Keyword

Rural youth
Characteristics
Rural development activities
Bangladesh

*Corresponding Author

MM Haque
E-mail:
mirzamobashwerulhaque@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

The aim of the study was to explore the relationship between the selected characteristics of the rural youth and their participation in selected rural development activities. The study was conducted in entire Nalitabari Upazila under Sherpur district. Correlation analyses between dependent and independent variables revealed that four (4) independent variables namely family farm size, cosmopolitanness, organizational participation and communication exposure had strong positive relationship with the participation of rural youth in rural development activities. Education, family annual income and family size had non significant positive relationship and age and training experience had non significant negative relationship with the participation of rural youth in rural development activities. The study concluded that all the rural youth had low or medium positive attitude towards participation in rural development activities. There is no need to give special attention in any particular age group for the rural development activities. Education of the rural youth had no influence in rural development activities. The rural youth have high chance to involve with the family development activities. Farm size plays a vital role in case of participation in rural development activities. With increased annual income of the respondents there would have corresponding increase in the participation in rural development activities. Participation of the rural youth in rural development activities will increase, if the youth cosmopolitanness could be enhanced through various development activities. Organizational participation increase knowledge of rural youths and develop self urge and motivation to participate rural development activities. Contact with communication sources could increase participation in rural development activities to the youth which could increase rural development.

Introduction

Population explosion is essentially a youth explosion. It is estimated that 55 to 60 percent of population of Bangladesh are under twenty years of age and this condition will continue for several decades. The proportion of youth in Bangladesh population remained almost constant for last ten years. (Anonymous, 2009). Furthermore, this age group will contribute substantially to the population size in future. According to one estimate, the 15-24 age group will increase by 21% to reach 35 million by 2020 (Barkat and Majid 2003). Therefore, ways must be found out to involve rural youth in the process of national planning to contribute to agricultural production and modernization of rural life. The agricultural extension agencies of the government at upazila level namely, agricultural office (DAE), Livestock office (DLS), Fisheries office (DOF), Department of Youth Development (DYD) and other have hardly any programme and network for the development of the rural youth. Rural youth have often been overlooked, neglected and left out of the main stream of development. When millions of youth live in rural areas, large numbers of them become dropout from schools, remain unskilled and unemployed, face massive poverty and live without sufficient food and shelter. There has been hardly any organized rural youth programme launched by the government.

The present study was dealing with the determining the relationship among the participation of rural

youth in rural development activities in eleven villages of Sarishabari Upazila under Jamalpur District. The findings from the study may be helpful for the Government policy makers and non-Government organizations to design their rural development programme.

Materials and Methods

Study area

Nalitabari Upazila under Sherpur District was purposely selected as the locale of this study. Nalitabari upazila consists of 12 unions namely; Puragoan, Nonni, Rajnagar, Noyabil, Ramchandrokur a, Kakorkandi, Nalitabari, Rupnarayonkura, Morichpur an, Jugania, koloshpur and Baghber. This upazila is situated in the North eastern side of Sherpur Sadar. Entire Nalitabari upazila is the locale of the study.

Collection of data

Data were collected according the procedure described earlier (Islam et al., 2016) during the period of 10 to 30 may, 2015. Correlation (r) analysis was conducted to explore the relationship between the independent and dependent variables. For exploring the relationship between the selected characteristics of the rural youth with their participation on rural development activities Pearson's Product Moment Co-efficient of correlation (r) was used. Five percent (5%) level of probability was used as the basis for rejecting any

null hypothesis. If the computed value of "r" was equal to or greater than the table value of "r" at the designated level of probability for the relevant degree of freedom, the null hypothesis was rejected and it was concluded that there is a relationship between the concerned variables. When the computed value of "r" for the relevant degrees of freedom was smaller than the Table Value at (5%) level of probability, the concerned null hypothesis could not be rejected and the researcher concluded that there is no relationship between the concerned variables. Co-efficient values significant at 5% level was indicated by one as terisk (*), at 1% level by two asterisks (**).

Results and Discussion

Relationship between independent and dependant variables

Correlation analyses between dependent and independent variables revealed that four were statistically positively significant (Table 1). Four (4) independent variables namely: Family farm size, Cosmopoliteness, Organizational participation and Communication exposure had strong positive relationship with the participation of rural youth in rural development activities. Education, family annual income and family size had positively insignificant and age and Training experience had negatively insignificant relationship with the participation of rural youth in rural development activities.

Table 1. Correlations between independent and dependent variables (N = 80)

Independent variables	Participation of rural youth in rural development activities
Age	-0.0082 ^{NS}
Education	0.0236 ^{Nb}
Family farm size	0.3433 **
Family annual income	0.1704 ^{NS}
Training experience	-0.0237 ^m
Cosmopoliteness	0.7932 **
Organizational participation	0.6395 **
Communication exposure	0.8189 **
Family size	0.0966 ^{Nb}

** =Correlation is significant at the 1% (0.01) level of probability = 0.291

* = Correlation is significant at the 5% (0.05) level of probability = 0.217

NS = Not significant

Age

Age of the rural youth did not have significant ($p > 0.05$) relationship ($r = -0.0082$) with their participation in rural development activities. More than 68% of the rural youth were early youth aged and only 31.2% were late youth aged (Islam et al., 2016). The study indicated that there is no need to

give special attention in any particular age group for the rural development activities.

Education

Education of rural youth had non significant ($p > 0.05$) relationship ($r = 0.0236$) with their participation in rural development activities. In the rural areas high educated youth get involved to a less extent in rural development activities. With increased level of education, rural youth might leave the community for other places for higher education or seeking job. On the other hand, low educated youth would less likely to leave their community for other places. Hence they would continue traditional agricultural activities. That's why education of rural youth has no significant relationship with their participation in rural development activities. Data from the previous study of Islam et al. (2016) showed that 96.3% of the rural youth had either high school-education or minor-school education. But the rest 3.7% had education upto secondary education or above level education. In fact, without going to school rural youths have education through observation, experience, training and the like.

Family farm size

Farm size of the youth had significant positive relationship ($r = 0.3433$) with their participation in rural development activities. This implies that youth with large farm size were more likely to participate in rural development activities. Initially they have chance to involve in the family development activities later they could participate in rural development activities.

Family annual income

Annual income of the rural youth had no significant positive relationship ($r = 0.1704$) with their participation in rural development activities. Rural youth belong to families having good annual income are in better position to undertake a business or entrepreneurship when they discontinue schooling. But parents have to invest money for farming activities and for the maintenance of their families. Hence, these families having more cash can explore further income earning planning. Other hand rural youth from poorer families have no economic backing to undertake income earning works. Thus, family income had no relationship with rural development activities. Although the relationship was insignificant, there was a positive trend in it which means higher income in the family leads to participation in rural development activities.

Training exposure

Training experience of the rural youth had no significant relationship ($r = -0.0237$) with their participation in rural development activities. Training is one of the most important components of cognitive development activities among youth in rural areas. Training in rural development had increased knowledge of the youth. But the rural

youth had not received any training and there is not enough training institution in the rural areas.

Cosmopolitaness

Cosmopolitaness of the rural youth had significant ($p < 0.05$) positive relationship ($r = 0.7932$) with their participation in rural development activities. Rural youth had a trend to move everywhere. They went to upazila, district and capital for their various purposes. The communication facility is very good in the study area. Youth programmes and activities would obviously render cosmopolitaness to rural youth which would be very helpful to develop their practical outlook and be innovative in rural development activities. This implies that youth with high cosmopolitaness were more likely to participate in rural development activities.

Organizational participation

Organizational participation of the rural youth had significant ($p < 0.01$) relationship ($r = 0.6395$) with their participation in rural development activities. Organizational participation makes the rural youth active, exposed to various useful activities and inspires them to undertake useful projects. Besides, this attribute makes rural youth aware of the social, political, professional and rural development activities. Thus, rural youth had more organizational participation were likely to have more participation in rural development activities.

The positive significant relationship between the variables in rural development activities bears consistency in the findings. Based on the above findings it may be concluded that higher organizational involvement leads to the rural youth participation in rural development activities.

Communication exposure

Communication exposure of the rural youth had highly significant ($p < 0.01$) relationship (r value 0.8189) with their participation in rural development activities. This implies that youth with high communication exposure were more likely to participate in rural development activities. It is evident from the fact that about 87.5 percent of the rural youth had low to medium communication exposure (Islam et al., 2016). It may thus be concluded that contact with communication sources could increase participation in rural development

activities to the youth which could increase rural development.

Family size

Family size of the rural youth had no significant ($p > 0.05$) relationship ($r = 0.0966$) with their participation in rural development activities. A bigger family size in the rural community has advantage as they have manpower for various activities. But might become burden when most of their younger members remain unemployed or underemployed. Youth Development Department must launch youth programmes to effectively use these younger members of the rural communities to make them self-employed and messengers of new technology by organizing youth in rural development activities. Although the relationship was insignificant, there was a positive trend in it which means large family size leads to participation in rural development activities.

Conclusion

Family farm size, cosmopolitaness, organizational participation and communication exposure had positive significant relationship with their participation in rural development activities. Whereas there was no relationship of age, education, family annual income, training experience and family size of rural youth were observed with their participation in rural development activities. The study suggest It is recommended that Department of Youth Development and various agencies should arrange training programmes related to modern rural development practices to increase their knowledge and skills on different aspects of rural development activities.

References

- Anonymous. (2009). Youth Entrepreneurship in Bangladesh. [Online] Available: <http://www.fyse.org/2009/06/rural-youth-entrepreneurship-in-bangladesh/> (12 May, 2012).
- Barkat A and Majid M (2003). Adolescent reproductive health in Bangladesh: status, policies, programs, and issues. Dhaka: POLICY Project.
- Islam MR, Haque MM and Bostami M (2016). Participation of rural youth in rural development activities in Bangladesh. International Journal of Natural and Social Sciences, 3(2): 12-20.