



E-ISSN: 2278-4136  
P-ISSN: 2349-8234  
JPP 2019; 8(1): 89-92  
Received: 08-11-2018  
Accepted: 10-12-2018

#### Gedam CV

M.Sc. (Agri.) Ex-student,  
Extension Education, College of  
Agriculture, Nagpur,  
Maharashtra, India

#### Tekale VS

Professor and Head,  
Department of Extension  
Education, Dr. PDKV, Akola,  
Maharashtra, India

#### Gandhale AA

Ph.D Student,  
Department of Extension  
Education, Dr. PDKV, Akola,  
Maharashtra, India

## Profile analysis of tribal youth

Gedam CV, Tekale VS and Gandhale AA

#### Abstract

The present study was conducted during the year 2015–2016 in Nagpur, district of Maharashtra state. From Nagpur district Ramtek tahsil was purposively selected as they have maximum population of tribal people i.e. 49856 tribal people which was more than any other tahsil from Nagpur district. From the Ramtek tahsil 10 villages selected purposively having high tribal population. From each village 12 tribal youth selected randomly. Thus total 120 respondents were in the sample of the study, which was able to express their views on participation in agricultural and subsidiary occupational activities. As regard with the profile of tribal youth it was observed that majority of the respondent belong to age group of 20 to 24 years, they were educated up to middle school, they had small land holding. Respondent had medium size of family and belonged to nuclear type of family. It was also observed that respondents family occupation was Agriculture + labour, respondents had low annual income and medium level of social participation, source of information, economic motivation and innovativeness.

**Keywords:** Profile and tribal youth

#### Introduction

Young people bring energy, vitality and innovation into the work force and when their willingness to contribute is matched with opportunity; they can have a transformative impact on economic growth and social development.

Youth population in India with the age group of 15 to 35 years is around 43, 02, 28,000 (35.56%) of the total population. Out of this, 70 percent (301 million) are urban youth. As majority of youth comes from rural area, they are considered as the national builders of tomorrow More than 50 percent of the total population below the age 25. (Census, 2011).

There are forty five notified Scheduled Tribes in the State. Out of the total tribal population, the tribal youth which constitute 33.13 percent is facing the problems of unemployment and quite appropriate that is also considered as an aspect of the state problem. Among the problems faced by the youth, particular reference has been made to unemployment.

According to government of India, Tribal population is 104.3 million in India, which is 8.6 percent of total population. Out of which youth contributes to 50 percent Maharashtra contributes 10.1 percent of tribal population out of India. 930 villages are 100 percent tribal population, 3760 villages constitute more than 90 percent tribal population, and 4836 villages constitute more than 75 percent tribal population, 6738 villages constitute more than 50 percent tribal population and 10257 villages constitute more than 25 percent tribal population. Ramtek tahsil constitute 49856 tribal populations which is 32.88 percent of total population. (Census 2011).

Today's youth are tomorrow workers, entrepreneurs, parents, active citizens and indeed leaders. Therefore, there is now a growing awareness through the world about the role of youth in economic development. In Maharashtra, some scholars have attempted to do research on tribal studies, but studies on youth, particularly tribal youth has not received much attention from the researchers and no major work has been done till now. In this backdrop, there is a need for undertaking a study particularly in employment opportunities that can provide a comprehensive knowledge on tribal youth. This study intends to fill this void. The study on tribal youth is also essentially an exercise in comprehending and combating with their various problems. The tribal youth as a disadvantaged social group suffer from many crippling problems that retard their development keeping them relatively backward and marginalized in growing economy, thus paving the path of dissension and social unrest of which the tribal states have a better experience. Focusing on tribal youth, therefore, makes a sense from a cost-benefit point of view. Young people might lack experience but they tend to be highly motivated and capable of offering new ideas or insights.

India has the second largest concentrated of tribal population after African continent. The tribal population of India is more than 8.00 percent of the total population; however, in Maharashtra it is over 9.00 percent of the state population.

#### Correspondence

#### Tekale VS

Professor and Head,  
Department of Extension  
Education, Dr. PDKV, Akola,  
Maharashtra, India

Among the tribal community Gond, Pardhan, Rajgond, Kolam, Madia and Bhill contributes largest population in Maharashtra. They live in compact areas, which are generally hilly and undulating terrain. The tribal peoples are primarily has occupation as agricultural people, though are said to be hunters since the past. Poor condition of soil, small holdings, poor resources and economic condition, traditional methods of agriculture do not provide them a regular and continuous sustenance throughout the year as such they have to depend on other subsidiary sources of earning. (Ministry of Tribal Development. [www.mahagov.in/tribal](http://www.mahagov.in/tribal)).

### Methodology

The present study was conducted in Nagpur district of Maharashtra state. One tahsil was purposively selected on the basis of highest population of tribal people. From Ramtek tahsil 10 villages were purposively selected on the basis of population of tribal people and from each village 12 respondents were randomly selected to comprise 120 respondents. Ex-post facto research design was used for the study. Data were collected by personally interviewing the respondents with the help of pretested structural schedule. Collected data were tabulated properly. Frequency and percentage methods of statistics were used for interpretation of data.

### Result and Discussion

So as to facilitate the comprehension of the sample and interpretation of results, a set of relevant personal, socio-economic and psychological characteristics of the respondents was included in the study. Therefore, the characteristics viz. Age, Education, Land holding, Size of family, Type of family, Family occupation, Annual income, and Social participation, Source of information, Economic motivation and Innovativeness were included in the study. The data on personal profile were sought, computed and discussed accordingly.

It was found from Table 1 that majority of the tribal youth (58.34%) belonged to the 20 to 24 year age group followed by 23.33 percent tribal youth were 25 to 29 year age group and 18.33 percent of the tribal youth were 15 to 19 year age group. This might be due to that 20 to 24 year age group want to settle down immediately and want economic independence. As regard with education it was observed that nearly one third of the respondents (29.16%) were educated upto middle school education level, followed by 17.50 percent had primary school level and 15 percent had high school education. The 14.16 percent respondents had junior college level education, only 07.50 percent of the respondents had degree college level education and 16.66 percent of the tribal youth were found illiterate. As regard with the land holding it was observed that high proportion of the respondents (37.50%) were belonged to the small land holding (1.01 to 2.00 ha), followed by about one fourth of the respondents (25.00%) were having marginal land holding and semi medium land holding (2.01 to 4.00 ha). The 8.33 percent of the respondents were found medium land holding. The only 4.17 percent respondents were belonged to large land holding.

During the study it was also observed that majority of the respondents (52.50%) had medium size of family (4 to 6 members), whereas, 33.34 percent of the respondents had small family (1 to 3 members) and only 14.16 percent of the respondents belong to big family (7 and above members) and regard with the type of family it was observed that the most of the respondents (63.33%) were belonged to the nuclear type of family and remaining 36.67 percent of the respondents were belonged to the joint type of family. As regard with the Family occupation it was observed that, one fourth of the respondents (25.00%) had family occupation as agriculture + labour followed by 20.83 percent of respondents' family occupation was farming only their occupation. Whereas both the 16.67 percent of respondent's family occupation were farming + other subsidiary occupation like i.e. dairy farming, goat farming/ poultry/ apiculture / sericulture/ forest wok and service i.e. job with monthly salary (in govt. and private sector) and also similarly percent (16.67%) of respondents had farming + service occupation, respectively. The 12.50 percent respondents' family was engaged in service only and remaining 08.33 percent were engaged in labour work only. As regard to Annual income it was observed that large proportion of the tribal youth (37.50%) had low annual income up to range of Rs 50000/-, while 29.17 percent of the respondents had low medium annual income of (Rs 50001 to 100000/-) followed by 12.5 percent of the respondents below poverty line and 09.17 percent of the respondents had medium high level of annual income (Rs 150001 to 200000/-), whereas 8.33 percent of the respondents had medium level of annual income (Rs 100001 to 1,50,000/-). The only 0.33 percent respondents had high annual income (Above Rs.2, 00,000/-). It was also noticed that majority of respondents (59.16%) were medium level of social participation followed by 25.00 percent of respondents had low level of social participation, whereas 15.84 percent of respondents had high level of social participation. As regard to the source of information majority of the respondents (55.83%) were belonged to medium level of source of information, followed by 30.00 percent of the respondents who had occupied in low level source of information, whereas 14.17 percent of respondents were belonged to high level of source of information. Economic motivation of tribal youth was 50.84 percent had medium level of economic motivation, followed by one third of the respondents (33.33%) had low economic motivation, while 15.83 percent of the respondents had high level of economic motivation. As regards with the Innovativeness it was observed that that majority of the respondents (67.50%) were included in the category of medium innovativeness, followed by one fifth of (20.83%) respondents with low innovativeness, while 11.66 respondents fell into high level of innovativeness. Majority of the tribal youth had medium level of innovativeness.

These above findings were in accordance with findings of Bhanu (2006) <sup>[1]</sup>, Tarade *et al.* (2009) <sup>[5]</sup>, Savita (2011) <sup>[4]</sup>, Ughade (2006) <sup>[7]</sup>, chiranthan *et al* (2008) <sup>[2]</sup>, Viswanatha, *et al.* (2014) <sup>[8]</sup>, Tekale *et al.* (2015) <sup>[6]</sup> and Kimaro *et al.* (2015) <sup>[3]</sup>.

**Table 1:** Distribution of Tribal youth according to their Profile

S. No.	Category	Frequency (n = 120)	Percentage
<b>A)</b>	<b>Age</b>		
1	15 – 19 year	22	18.33
2	20– 24 year	70	58.34
3	25 –29 year	28	23.33
<b>B)</b>	<b>Education</b>		
1	Illiterate (No Schooling)	20	16.67
2	Primary School (1 <sup>st</sup> -4 <sup>th</sup> Std.)	21	17.50
3	Middle School (5 <sup>th</sup> -7 <sup>th</sup> Std.)	35	29.16
4	High School (8 <sup>th</sup> -10 <sup>th</sup> Std.)	18	15.00
5	Junior College (Above 10 <sup>th</sup> Std.)	17	14.17
6	Degree college (Above 12 <sup>th</sup> std.)	09	07.50
<b>C)</b>	<b>Land holding</b>		
1	Marginal (up to 1.00 ha)	30	25.00
2	Small (1.01 to 2.00 ha)	45	37.50
3	Semi-medium (2.01 to 4.00 ha)	30	25.00
4	Medium (4.01 to 10.00 ha)	10	08.33
5	Large (Above 10ha)	05	04.17
<b>D)</b>	<b>Size of Family</b>		
1	Small (1 to 3)	40	33.34
2	Medium ( 4 to 6)	63	52.50
3	Big ( 7 and above)	17	14.16
<b>E)</b>	<b>Type of Family</b>		
1	Nuclear family	76	63.33
2	Joint family	44	36.67
<b>F)</b>	<b>Family Occupation</b>		
1	Labour only	10	08.33
2	Service only	15	12.50
3	Farming only	25	20.83
4	Farming + Labour	30	25.00
5	Farming + other subsidiary occupation	20	16.67
6	Farming + service	20	16.67
<b>G)</b>	<b>Annual Income</b>		
1	Below poverty line	15	12.50
2	Low (Up to Rs.50,000/-)	45	37.50
3	Low medium (Rs.50,001 to 1,00,000/-)	35	29.17
4	Medium (Rs.1,00,001 to 1,50,000/-)	10	08.33
5	Medium high (Rs1,50,001 to 2,00,000/-)	11	09.17
6	High (Above Rs.2,00,000/-)	04	0.33
<b>H)</b>	<b>Social Participation</b>		
1	Low	30	25.00
2	Medium	71	59.16
3	High	19	15.84
<b>I)</b>	<b>Source of Information</b>		
1	Low	36	30.00
2	Medium	67	55.83
3	High	17	14.17
<b>J)</b>	<b>Economic Motivation</b>		
1	Low	40	33.33
2	Medium	61	50.84
3	High	19	15.83
<b>K)</b>	<b>Innovativeness</b>		
1	Low	25	20.83
2	Medium	81	67.50
3	High	14	11.67

### Conclusion

From the result of research it was observed that majority of the respondent belong to age group of 20 to 24 years, they were educated up to middle school, they had small land holding. Respondent had medium size of family and belonged to nuclear type of family. It was also observed that respondent's family occupation was Agriculture + labour, respondents had low annual income and medium level of social participation, source of information, economic motivation and innovativeness.

### References

1. Bhanu VL. Study on aspirations of rural youth and their attitude towards rural development activities in Dharwad district of Karnataka state, M.Sc. Agriculture, Thesis, University of Agricultural Sciences, Dharwad, 2006.
2. Chiranthan UT, Nataraju, Lakshminarayan MT. Determinants of rural youth's participation in agricultural activities. Indian J of Extn. Edu. 2008; 18(2):23-25.
3. Kimaro Prosper John, Nathaniel Naiman Towo, Benson Moshi H. Determinants of rural youth's participation in agricultural activities: the case of Kahe east ward in

- Moshi rural district, Tanzania. *International Journal of Economics, Commerce and Management*. 2015; 3(2):1-47.
4. Savita BN. Participation and decision making of rural youth in agriculture. M.Sc. (Agri.) Thesis (Unpub.), USA, Dharwad, 2011.
  5. Tarde VJ, Shirke VS, Pharate DN. Empowerment of Rural Women through Self Help Groups engaged in Agro-based Enterprises. *Asian J of Extn. Edu*. 2009; 27:106-112.
  6. Tekale VS, Mali MD, Shaikh JI. Relationship between aspirations and personal, socio-economic and psychological characteristics of rural youth and constraints faced by rural youth towards self-development Hind Agricultural Research and Training Institute. 2015; 10(2):100-104.
  7. Ughade VM. Participation of small and marginal farm women in agriculture and allied activities. M.Sc. (Agri.) Thesis (Unpub.), Dr. PDKV Akola, 2006.
  8. Viswanatha H, Manjunatha BN, Lakshminarayan MT. Participation of rural youth in the agriculture and horticulture. *Mysore J Agric*. 2014; 48(3):464-466.