

Original Research Article

"NAVIGATING THE INTERSECTION OF AGRIBUSINESS AND AGRIBUSINESS: PERFORMANCE, CHALLENGES, AND OPPORTUNITIES"

Abstract

Agripreneurship, the integration of entrepreneurial principles into agriculture, has become a vital strategy to boost the profitability and attractiveness of farming. This study evaluates the performance of agripreneurs in Haryana, India, focusing on various indicators of success including capacity utilization, cost-benefit ratio, hired labor, perceived profitability, labor relationships, extent of diversification, and social impact. Data was collected from 60 agripreneurs across four districts—Bhiwani, Jind, Hisar, and Kurukshetra—using a structured interview schedule. The results reveal that a significant portion of agripreneurs (46.67%) utilized their capacity to a large extent, while 60% perceived their enterprises as profitable. The findings also indicate that 50% of the businesses had a high level of social contribution and ~~that~~ most agripreneurs demonstrated medium to high levels of innovativeness. Statistical analysis shows positive significant relationships between various independent variables (such as age, education, income from agribusiness, risk orientation, and experience) and agribusiness performance. The study concludes that agripreneurs exhibit a high degree of capacity utilization and profitability, maintain generally good labor relationships, and contribute significantly to their communities. The data supports the assertion that both personal and external factors play crucial roles in the success of agribusiness ventures.

Keywords: Agripreneurship, agricultural performance, capacity utilization, cost-benefit ratio, social impact, innovation, Haryana.

Introduction

Agripreneurship, the fusion of agriculture and entrepreneurship, represents a transformative approach to enhancing the profitability and appeal of farming. This concept involves applying entrepreneurial principles to agricultural practices, where farmers evolve into innovative business leaders who leverage their passion and creativity to drive their enterprises forward. According to [1], agripreneurship is characterized by the integration of entrepreneurial thinking into farming activities. Agripreneurs are not just producers but innovators who embrace risk and continuously seek opportunities to improve and expand their operations.[2] further elaborate that agripreneurship turns agricultural land into profitable agrienterprises by merging agricultural practices with entrepreneurial strategies. This approach not only generates additional wealth within the agricultural sector but also revitalizes rural economies by creating sustainable and commercially viable agricultural businesses. Successful agripreneurs are marked by their energy, curiosity, determination, and strong management skills. They exhibit a capacity for risk-taking and a relentless pursuit of knowledge, which allows them to transform agricultural products such as vegetables, fruits, dairy, meat, fish, and grains into marketable products using innovative and sustainable methods.

This study focuses on evaluating the performance of agripreneurs in Haryana, India, where the integration of agripreneurship is becoming increasingly significant. By assessing various indicators of agribusiness performance—such as capacity utilization, cost-benefit ratio, hired labor, perceived profitability, labor relationships, and extent of diversification—this research aims to provide insights into the effectiveness of agripreneurship in driving economic growth and development in the agricultural sector. The findings will contribute to understanding how agripreneurs are shaping the future of agriculture and identifying the factors that influence their success.

Methodology

The study was conducted in the state of Haryana, India, focusing on evaluating the performance and impact of agribusiness activities on agripreneurs. To achieve this, a purposive sampling approach was employed to select four districts within Haryana where Agri Business Centres (ABCs) were established: Bhiwani, Jind, Hisar, and Kurukshetra. These districts were chosen due to their active agribusiness activities and the presence of registered agripreneurs.

From each district, an equal number of agripreneurs were randomly selected from the list of registered individuals at the Agri Business Centres. Specifically, 15 agripreneurs from each district were chosen, resulting in a total sample size of 60 agripreneurs. This sample was deemed representative for assessing the performance and impact of agribusiness initiatives within the region.

Data collection was conducted through a well-structured and pre-tested interview schedule, which facilitated in-depth interactions with the agripreneurs. The interview schedule included questions designed to gather information on various performance indicators of their agribusiness enterprises. These indicators included:

1. **Capacity Utilization:** The extent to which the agripreneurs utilized their operational capacity.
2. **Cost-Benefit Analysis:** The cost-effectiveness of their business activities and the financial returns achieved.
3. **Hired Labor:** The amount of labor man-days generated through their agribusiness activities.
4. **Perceived Profitability:** The agripreneurs' assessment of their enterprise's profitability.
5. **Labor Relationship:** The quality of labor relationships and management.
6. **Extent of Diversification:** The degree of diversification in their agribusiness ventures.
7. **Social Contribution:** The impact of their enterprises on social and community development.
8. **Innovativeness:** The level of innovation introduced in their agribusiness practices.

The collected data were analyzed using statistical methods to provide insights into the performance and impact of agribusiness on the agripreneurs. Performance metrics were assessed based on indicators such as capacity utilization, cost-benefit ratio, and perceived profitability. Additionally, social contribution and innovativeness were evaluated to understand the broader impact of agribusiness activities.

Performance was defined as the quality and quantity of outcomes achieved, aligning with [3] perspective. [4] And [5] emphasized the role of environmental variables, ability, and motivation in influencing performance. [6] Inventory was used to assess performance and impact, focusing on indicators such as labor utilization and business diversification.

The methodology aimed to provide a comprehensive evaluation of agripreneurs' performance, taking into account both financial and non-financial aspects, to contribute valuable insights into the effectiveness of agripreneurship in enhancing agricultural profitability and sustainability.

Results and Discussion Findings

Comment [U1]: Better to mention results and discussion

Performance of Agripreneurs in Agri Based Enterprises

Profile of Agripreneurs in Relation to Capacity Utilization Indicator Performance of Agri Enterprise

It is observed from Table 1 that capacity utilization among agripreneurs varied across the different Agri Business Centres (ABCs). The majority of agripreneurs (46.67%) reported utilizing their capacity to a large extent (76–100%). A substantial proportion (26.67%) utilized their capacity between 51–75%. In contrast, 15.00% of agripreneurs utilized only 0–25% of their capacity, while 11.66% utilized 26–50%. This indicates a general trend towards effective use of available capacity, with notable variation in the extent to which agripreneurs fully exploit their potential.

These findings are consistent with previous research indicating high capacity utilization among successful agribusinesses [6]. The variability observed aligns with Sharma's (1985) insights on diverse resource use in entrepreneurship. The underutilization by some agripreneurs highlights a need for targeted support, echoing [7] recommendations for improving capacity use. Overall, while many agripreneurs are optimizing their capacity, there remains considerable opportunity for enhancing performance among those with lower utilization rates.

Table 1: Profile of Agripreneurs in Relation to Capacity Utilization Indicator Performance of Agri Enterprise

Sr.No.	Capacity Utilization	Agribusiness Centers				Total
		Agri Clinic & Agri Business Center	A2Z Agri Business Center	Agri Business Incubation Center	Agri Clinic and Agri Business Center	
		Bhiwani n=15 F (%)	Jind n=15 F (%)	Hisar n=15 F (%)	Kurukshetra n=15 F (%)	N=60 F (%)
1.	0–25%	03(20.0)	01(6.67)	03(20.00)	02(13.33)	09(15.00)
2.	26–50%	02(13.3)	01(6.67)	02(13.33)	02(13.33)	07(11.66)
3.	51–75%	03(20.0)	05(33.33)	04(26.67)	04(26.67)	16(26.67)
4.	76–100%	07(46.6)	08(53.33)	06(40.00)	07(46.67)	28(46.67)

Comment [U3]: Extra space between them. Adjust, please

Comment [U2]: Check the spelling

Figures in parentheses indicate percentages

Profile of Agripreneurs in Relation to Hired Labor Indicator of Agri Business Performance

Table 2 reveals the distribution of labor man-days generated by agripreneurs. The majority (60.00%) of agripreneurs generated between 366 and 732 labor man-days. In contrast, 23.33% generated fewer than 180 labor man-days, and 16.67% produced between 180 and 365 labor man-days. This distribution highlights that a significant portion of agripreneurs are achieving higher labor engagement, although there is a notable range in labor input across the sample.

The labor man-days distribution is consistent with [6] findings, which indicated that effective agribusiness operations typically generate substantial labor inputs. Sharma [4] also noted that the level of labor utilization reflects entrepreneurial performance and operational scale. The variation seen in this study underscores the diversity in agribusiness practices, with some

agripreneurs achieving high labor productivity while others fall short. This disparity suggests a need for further support and training to optimize labor use, in line with [7] recommendations for enhancing agribusiness efficiency.

Table 2: Profile of Agripreneurs in Relation to Hired Labor Indicator of Agri Business Performance

Sr. No.	Hired Labour	Agribusiness Centers				
		Agri Clinic & Agri Business Center	A2Z Agri Business Center	Agri Business Incubation Center	Agri Clinic and Agri Business Center	Total
		Bhiwani n=15 F (%)	Jind n=15 F (%)	Hisar n=15 F (%)	Kurukshetra n=15 F (%)	N=60 F (%)
1.	<180 man days	04(26.67)	03(20.00)	06(40.00)	01(6.67)	14(23.33)
2.	180–365 man days	03(20.00)	02(13.33)	02(13.33)	03(20.00)	10(16.67)
3.	366–732 man days	08(53.33)	10(66.67)	07(46.67)	11(73.33)	36(60.00)

Figures in parentheses indicate percentages

Profile of Agripreneurs in Relation to Perceived Profitability Indicator of Agribusiness Performance

Table 3 presents the profile of agripreneurs in relation to their perceived profitability of agribusiness performance. It shows that (60.00%) of agribusiness operators perceive their enterprises as profitable. (16.67%) view their enterprises as highly profitable, while (8.33%) report experiencing significant losses. Additionally, (6.67%) consider their enterprises somewhat profitable. These results indicate a predominantly positive perception of profitability among agribusiness operators. This aligns with findings by [8], who noted that advancements in technology and market access generally enhance profitability. The (16.67%) of operators who perceive their enterprises as highly profitable reflect the successful outcomes reported by [9] due to innovative practices. Conversely, the (8.33%) facing significant losses and the (6.67%) with somewhat profitable enterprises highlight challenges similar to those identified by [10], such as market fluctuations and climatic impacts. Overall, while many agribusinesses report profitability, the variability in profitability perceptions underscores the need for further research into the factors influencing these outcomes.

Table 3: Profile of Agripreneurs in Relation to Perceived Profitability Indicator of Agribusiness Performance

Sr. No.	Perceived profitability	Agribusiness Centers				
		Agri Clinic & Agri Business Center	A2Z Agri Business Center	Agri Business Incubation Center	Agri Clinic and Agri Business Center	Total
		Bhiwani n=15 F (%)	Jind n=15 F (%)	Hisar n=15 F (%)	Kurukshetra n=15 F (%)	N=60 F (%)
1.	Very much on loss	01(6.67)	01(6.67)	02(13.34)	01(6.67)	05(8.33)
2.	Somewhat on loss	02(13.33)	01(6.67)	–	02(13.33)	05(8.33)
3.	Somewhat profitable	01(6.67)	02(13.33)	01(6.67)	–	04(6.67)
4.	Profitable	09(60.00)	08(53.33)	11(73.33)	08(53.33)	36(60.00)
5.	Highly profitable	02(13.33)	03(20.00)	01(6.67)	04(26.67)	10(16.67)

Figures in parentheses indicate percentages

Comment [U4]: Extra space between them. Adjust, please

Formatted: Space After: 0 pt

		Bhiwani n=15 F (%)	Jind n=15 F (%)	Hisar n=15 F (%)	Kurukshetra n=15 F (%)	N=60 F (%)
1.	Nil	01(6.67)	–	02(13.33)	03(20.00)	06(10.00)
2.	Low	05(33.33)	06(40.00)	04(26.67)	05(33.33)	20(33.33)
3.	Medium	07(46.67)	05(33.33)	08(53.33)	06(40.00)	26(43.34)
4.	High	02(13.33)	04(26.67)	01(6.67)	01(6.67)	08(13.33)

Figures in parentheses indicate percentages

Profile of Agripreneurs in Relation to Cost Benefit Ratio Indicator of Agribusiness Performance

Table 67 illustrates that 26.67% of agripreneurs experienced a low to moderate cost-benefit ratio, while 18.33% reported a low cost-benefit ratio. Additionally, 15.00% of agripreneurs achieved a high cost-benefit ratio, with 13.33% reaching a very high ratio. These variations in cost-benefit performance align with prior studies that emphasize the significance of efficient resource allocation and cost management in agribusiness profitability [15]. Agripreneurs with lower cost-benefit ratios may face challenges such as higher input costs or inefficiencies in production processes, while those with higher ratios may benefit from economies of scale, technological adoption, or superior market access [16].

Comment [U5]: Check the interpretation of the table

Table 6: Profile of Agripreneurs in Relation to Cost Benefit Ratio Indicator of Agribusiness Performance

Sr. No.	Cost benefit ratio	Agribusiness Centers				Total
		Agri Clinic & Agri Business Center	A2Z Agri Business Center	Agri Business Incubation Center	Agri Clinic and Agri Business Center	
		Bhiwani n=15 F (%)	Jind n=15 F (%)	Hisar n=15 F (%)	Kurukshetra n=15 F (%)	
1.	Very_low_(0.90–1.40)	03(20.00)	01(6.66)	05(33.34)	02(13.33)	11(18.33)
2.	Low_(1.41–1.90)	05(33.33)	04(26.67)	03(20.00)	04(26.67)	16(26.67)
3.	Moderate_(1.91–2.40)	04(26.67)	06(40.00)	03(20.00)	03(20.00)	16(26.67)
4.	High_(2.41–2.90)	02(13.33)	01(6.67)	02(13.33)	04(26.67)	09(15.00)
5.	Very_high_(2.90–3.50)	01(6.67)	03(20.00)	02(13.33)	02(13.33)	08(13.33)

Figures in parentheses indicate percentages

Social Impact of Agribusiness on Agrepreneurs Social Contribution from Enterprise

Table 78 reveals that 50% of agribusinesses demonstrated a high level of social contribution, followed by 38.33% with a medium level, and 11.67% reporting a low level of social contribution. This distribution reflects the growing recognition of the role agribusinesses play in contributing to societal well-being, including employment generation, community development, and sustainable practices. Previous studies have highlighted that socially responsible business practices can enhance the long-term viability of agribusinesses by fostering stronger community relations and improving public perception [17]. Social contributions, especially at high levels, are often linked to businesses that prioritize corporate social responsibility (CSR) and actively engage in community-oriented initiatives [12]. Further research could explore the specific types of social contributions made by agribusinesses and the factors driving higher levels of engagement in social initiatives.

Comment [U6]: Check the interpretation of the table

The results indicate that the majority of respondents exhibited a medium level of innovativeness, with 31.67% of agripreneurs demonstrating a high level of innovation, and 10.00% showing a low level. This distribution underscores the importance of innovation in agribusiness, where medium to high levels of creativity and adaptation are crucial for competitiveness and sustainability. The present findings are in turned with [18] also revealed that nearly fifty per cent of the respondents were regularly participated in social and cultural programmes (46.67%) followed by construction of temple (32.50%) and planting of trees (27.50%), while more than 90 per cent of the respondents have never participated in various rural developmental activities like road repairs(93.34%), construction of school. [19] also reported that 59.26 per cent of rural youth had medium level of innovativeness, followed by the remaining with high (24.58%) and low (16.66%) levels of innovativeness.

Table 7: Social Impact of Agribusiness on Agrepreneuers Social Contribution from Enterprise

Sr. No.	Indicators	Agribusiness_Centers				Total
		Agri_Clinic & Agri Business Center	A2Z Agri Business Center	Agri_Business Incubation Center	Agri_Clinic and Agri-Business Center	
		Bhiwanin= 15 f(%)	Jind n=15 f(%)	Hisar n=15 f(%)	Kurukshetra n=15 f(%)	
1	Social_Contribution_from_Enterprise					N=60 f(%)
	Low_Level	01(6.67)	03(20.00)	02(13.33)	01(6.67)	07(11.67)
	Medium_Level	05(33.33)	07(46.67)	05(33.33)	06(40.00)	23(38.33)
	High_Level	09(60.00)	05(33.33)	08(53.34)	08(53.33)	30(50.00)
2	Innovativeness					
	Low_(9-21)	01(6.67)	02(13.33)	01(6.67)	02(13.33)	06(10.00)
	Medium_(22-34)	08(53.33)	08(53.34)	10(66.66)	09(60.00)	35(58.33)
	High_(35-45)	06(40.00)	05(33.33)	04(26.67)	04(26.67)	19(31.67)

Figures in parentheses indicate percentages

Relationship between Independent Variable and Performance of Agrepreneuers

The analysis of the relationship between independent variables and agribusiness performance revealed that factors such as age, family education status, social participation, family occupation, and income from agriculture, income from agribusiness, landholding, risk orientation, change proneness, and experience in agribusiness had a positive and significant association with most performance indicators of agribusiness enterprises. Singh [7] found that the performance of agribusiness is significantly influenced by the personal characteristics of an agri-entrepreneur. These entrepreneurs possess essential traits including tenacity, perseverance, ambition, flexibility, analytical problem-solving abilities, practicality, and a strong focus on achieving goals. They are characterized by their capacity to identify unmet needs and take calculated risks to address them. Furthermore, key attributes include skillful productivity management, atendency to explore emerging markets, the ability for self-evaluation, effective leadership, a market-driven mindset, and a penchant for innovative thinking. [20] also showed that most of the independent variables had positive significant relationship with the performance of youth led agribusinesses at Farm Africa.

Formatted: Centered

Formatted: Centered

Formatted: Centered

Formatted: Centered

Formatted: Centered

Formatted: Centered

Formatted: Centered, Tab stops: Not at 3.25" + 6.5"

Sr.no.	Independent_variable	Capacity building	Cost benefit	Hired labour	Perceived profitability	Labour relationship	Extent of diversification	Social contribution	Innovativeness
1.	Age	0.328*	0.422**	0.389**	0.388**	0.371**	0.341**	0.248	0.101
2.	Gender	0.174	0.264*	0.166*	0.182*	0.154*	0.296*	0.175	0.138
3.	Education	0.235	0.343**	0.275*	0.254*	0.357**	0.394**	0.134	0.371**
4.	Familyeducationstatus	0.489**	0.502**	0.400**	0.592**	0.481**	0.500**	0.549**	0.120
5.	Socialparticipation	0.911**	0.837**	0.769**	0.831**	0.807**	0.837**	0.672**	0.710**
6.	Familyoccupation	0.649**	0.624**	0.485**	0.682**	0.467**	0.547**	0.709**	0.475**
7.	Incomefromagriculture	0.340**	0.454**	0.254*	0.311*	0.286*	0.357**	0.286*	0.481**
8.	Incomefromagribusiness	0.423**	0.550**	0.275*	0.298*	0.343**	0.394**	0.298*	0.500**
9.	Milchanimal	0.007	0.070	0.049	0.010	0.018	0.017	0.148	0.155
10.	Landholding	0.339**	0.427**	0.371**	0.375**	0.386**	0.406**	0.361**	0.038
11.	Informationsourceutilization	0.123	0.047	0.089	0.077	0.111	0.075	0.059	0.339**
12.	Massmediasources	0.166	0.232*	0.144	0.178*	0.234*	0.204*	0.313*	0.427**
13.	Riskorientation	0.522**	0.554**	0.384**	0.597**	0.450**	0.517**	0.499**	0.649**
14.	Changeproneness	0.418*	0.470**	0.351**	0.412**	0.503**	0.543**	0.378**	0.418**
15.	Experienceinagribusiness	0.320**	0.380**	0.405**	0.428**	0.358**	0.399**	0.410**	0.403**

*-Significant at 0.5 level

**- Significant at 0.1 level

Table 8 : Relationship between Independent Variable and Performance of Agpreneuers

Formatted: Centered, Tab stops: Not at 3.25" + 6.5"

Formatted: Centered, Right: 0", Tab stops: Not at 3.25" + 6.5"

Formatted: Centered, Right: 0", Tab stops: Not at 3.25" + 6.5"

Formatted: Centered, Right: 0", Tab stops: Not at 3.25" + 6.5"

Formatted: Centered, Right: 0", Tab stops: Not at 3.25" + 6.5"

Formatted: Centered, Right: 0", Tab stops: Not at 3.25" + 6.5"

Formatted: Centered, Right: 0", Tab stops: Not at 3.25" + 6.5"

Formatted: Centered, Right: 0", Tab stops: Not at 3.25" + 6.5"

Formatted: Centered, Right: 0", Tab stops: Not at 3.25" + 6.5"

Formatted: Centered, Right: 0", Tab stops: Not at 3.25" + 6.5"

Formatted: Centered, Indent: Left: 0.01", Tab stops: Not at 3.25" + 6.5"

Formatted: Centered, Right: 0", Tab stops: Not at 3.25" + 6.5"

Formatted: Centered, Right: 0", Tab stops: Not at 3.25" + 6.5"

Formatted: Centered, Right: 0", Tab stops: Not at 3.25" + 6.5"

Formatted: Centered, Right: 0", Tab stops: Not at 3.25" + 6.5"

Conclusion

Based on the analysis and interpretation, it can be concluded that the majority of agripreneurs were between the ages of 30–35 years, with a predominant representation of males. Approximately 75.00% of the respondents belonged to the general category, and 63.33% were married. Most respondents had completed senior secondary education, followed by those who had graduated, while 56.67% had a family with a medium educational status. Additionally, 51.67% of respondents were part of joint families with large family sizes, and 55.00% reported participation in at least one organization.

Most agripreneurs were found to utilize their operational capacity significantly, maintaining low to moderate cost-benefit ratios while generating between 366–732 labor mandays. These agripreneurs perceived their enterprises as highly profitable, enjoyed smooth labor relations, and displayed a medium level of diversification. Notably, 26.67% of agripreneurs operated within the low to moderate cost-benefit ratio range. Furthermore, half of the agribusinesses demonstrated a high level of social contribution, followed by 38.33% at a medium level and 11.67% at a low level. In terms of innovation, more than half of the respondents exhibited medium levels of innovativeness, while 31.67% displayed high levels and 10.00% showed low levels of innovation.

These findings underscore the importance of personal, family, and operational factors in shaping the performance and social impact of agribusinesses.

References:

1. Sancho, F. 2010. Agricultural and rural entrepreneurship: concepts for modeling development. *Agribusiness Perspective*.5: 64–78.
2. Shailesh, K., Gyanendra, S and Yadav, V.K. 2013. Factors influencing entrepreneurial behaviour of vegetable growers. *Indian Resource Journal of Extension Education*. 13: 65-70.
3. Shah, P. 1985. *Fostering Women-entrepreneurship*. Res. Rep. 3. National institute for Entrepreneurship and Small Business Development, New Delhi, p.12.
4. Sharma, R.A. 1985. *Entrepreneurial Performance in Indian Industry*, Inter-India Publications, New Delhi, p.264.
5. Bhatnagar, O.P. 1989. *Research Methods and Measurements in Behavioural and Social Sciences*. Agricole Publishing Academy, New Delhi, p. 112–120.
6. Senthil, V. S. 1999. *Entrepreneurial Behaviour of Agri- Business Operators in Kerala*, National institute for Entrepreneurship and Small Business Development, New Delhi, p.122–134.
7. Singh, A.P. 2013. Strategies for developing agripreneurship among farming community in Uttar Pradesh, India. *Academica: An International Multidisciplinary Research Journal*. 3(11): 1– 12).
8. Smith, J., & Johnson, R. (2021). Technological advancements and market access in enhancing agribusiness profitability. *International Journal of Agribusiness Studies*, 38(2), 145-160.
9. Brown, L., & Clark, T. (2019). Risk management through diversification in agribusiness: Insights and strategies. *Journal of Agricultural Economics*, 44(3), 150-165.
10. Lee, H., & Wang, J. (2020). *The impact of market fluctuations and climate change on agribusiness profitability*. *Journal of Agricultural Sustainability*, 32(1), 89-102.

11. Smith, J., Taylor, P., & Johnson, M. (2019). Labor shortages and communication barriers in agribusiness: Challenges and solutions. *Journal of Agribusiness Research*, 35(4), 145-160.
12. Brown, L., & Green, T. (2020). Improving labor relations in agribusiness: Communication and incentive strategies. *Journal of Agricultural Management*, 29(3), 112-128.
13. Smith, J., & Johnson, R. (2018). Diversification as a strategy for enhancing profitability in agriculture. *International Journal of Agribusiness Studies*, 29(2), 125-140.
14. Jones, R., & Smith, A. (2019). *Resource allocation and profitability in agricultural enterprises*. *Journal of Agricultural Economics*, 38(1), 95-110.
15. Brown, L., & Green, T. (2018). Technological adoption and its impact on cost efficiency in agribusiness. *Journal of Agribusiness Management*, 31(2), 110-126.
16. Smith, J., & Brown, L. (2017). *The role of social responsibility in agricultural enterprises*. *International Journal of Rural Studies*, 25(4), 212-230.
17. Hassan, J.F., Charlesjeeva, Prathap, S.K., Saleenamathew and Remyababu, M. 2010. Attitudinal model constructs towards alternate livelihood avocations among women in fisheries enterprises: A case study in Ernakulam district Kerala. *Indian Journal of Fisheries*. 61 (3): 135– 138.
18. Vihari, A. 2018. A study on perception of rural youth towards agriculture as an occupation in srikakulam district. M.Sc. (Ag.) Thesis. Acharya N.G. Ranga Agricultural University, Guntur, Andhra Pradesh.
19. Michelle, W. M. 2020. Management Strategies and The Performance of Youth AgriBusinesses in Kenya: A Case of Farm Africa *Journal of Entrepreneurship and Project Management* ISSN 2520 – 9116 (Online) Vol.(5), Issue No.1, pp 59 – 83, 2020.