CropMatrix
International Journal of
Conscious Business Management Studies
International Publication
ISSN: 3139-874X

Rural Youth Agripreneurship as a Pathway to Reducing Seasonal Migration in India: A Conceptual Framework Based on Venture Viability and Entrepreneurial Intention

[1]Urvashi Sahu
Master of Business Administration, Savitribai Phule Pune University (SPPU), Pune, India
Email: urvashisahu250@gmail.com, **Contact Number :** +91 9691874001, **ORCID :** 0009-0006-1439-1104

Abstract

Seasonal migration out of rural areas is intimately linked to constrained employment prospects, agricultural incomes that are low and unpredictable, and the absence of workable livelihood alternatives throughout the agricultural lean season. Rural youth are disproportionately impacted, as they frequently relocate to towns and cities in pursuit of wage-based employment. Simultaneously, agripreneurship is attracting growing attention as a means of generating income and employment within rural areas. This paper investigates whether agripreneurship among rural youth can help diminish seasonal migration through the creation of viable local business opportunities. The study adopts a conceptual, literature-based research design, drawing on secondary academic literature, government reports, institutional publications, and research concerning agripreneurship, entrepreneurial intention, rural entrepreneurship, and migration. The literature is structured around five principal themes: rural youth migration, entrepreneurial intention, agribusiness opportunities, entrepreneurial ecosystem support, and venture viability. Three theoretical perspectives inform the conceptual foundation: the Theory of Planned Behavior, Entrepreneurial Ecosystem Theory, and Push-Pull Migration Theory. A stronger entrepreneurial intention may consequently lessen the intention to migrate seasonally, provided the local enterprise is perceived as a realistic source of income. The paper advances five theoretical propositions and outlines implications for rural development institutions, financial organisations, training agencies, policymakers, and agricultural support organisations.

Keywords: Rural Youth, Agripreneurship, Entrepreneurial Intention, Venture Viability, Seasonal Migration

1 Introduction

Rural employment continues to be a significant concern for India, given that a substantial segment of the population remains reliant on agriculture and allied activities for its livelihood. Agriculture does not consistently furnish stable employment across the entire year. Agricultural labour is frequently shaped by seasonality, rainfall, crop cycles, market prices, the size of landholdings and access to irrigation. In circumstances where employment and income diminish during the agricultural lean season, rural households may seek alternative sources of income. Seasonal migration to towns, cities or other rural areas where temporary work is obtainable constitutes one such response. The decision to migrate is therefore not merely a relocation from one geographical setting to another. It is, in addition, a livelihood decision grounded in the availability and anticipated value of economic opportunities. The Government of India's report Migration in India, 2020–2021 demonstrates that migration constitutes a significant element of the Indian labour and livelihood context. The report estimated an all-India migration rate of 28.9 percent for 2020–2021. It further indicated that employment-related motives are prominent among male migrants, with the search for employment or for better employment figuring among the principal reasons reported for migration. The same report also reveals that a substantial proportion of migrants had rural areas as their previous usual place of residence. Such figures ought not to be construed as proof that all rural migration is seasonal or driven by employment; rather, they illustrate the significance of labour and livelihood opportunities for comprehending migration in India.

Seasonal migration assumes particular importance in regions where agriculture offers employment only during specific periods. Research on Beed district in Maharashtra, for instance, characterises seasonal migration as a response to constrained employment during the dry season. Households operating small and marginal farms may migrate to other districts or beyond the state in search of employment in activities such as sugar factories and brick kilns. The study links seasonal migration to rural livelihood conditions and demonstrates that migration can function as a means of coping with income shortfalls during periods of low agricultural employment. The matter acquires greater salience when attention is directed towards rural youth. Young individuals are generally at a life stage in which they are deliberating upon education, employment and career. Where agriculture is perceived primarily as low-income and precarious work, young people may exhibit a greater readiness to seek employment beyond the village. Migration may yield immediate income, yet it may equally entail the departure of young people from local economic activities and rural enterprises, which then benefit from only limited participation by the next generation. Consequently, the issue encompasses not merely the mobility of labour but equally the constrained expansion of entrepreneurial possibilities at the local level. One conceivable approach to tackling this issue is offered by agripreneurship. Broadly conceived, agripreneurship refers to entrepreneurial undertakings associated with agriculture and related sectors. Its scope may encompass farm-based ventures, food processing, input provision, agricultural services, livestock, poultry, fisheries, horticulture, machinery services, logistics, storage, digital agricultural services, and further activities tied to the agricultural value chain. This wider conceptualisation matters, since rural youth may not invariably aspire to become conventional farmers. Rather, they may be drawn to ventures that merge agriculture with technology, processing, services, marketing, and business management. The increasing significance of agripreneurship for youth is corroborated by recent Indian scholarship. A 2025 investigation of Indian agricultural students analysed determinants including attitudes, subjective norms, perceived behavioural control, agripreneurship education, and

personality traits in their relation to agripreneurial intention.

2 Research Objectives

This conceptual study is primarily aimed at investigating the potential contribution of agripreneurship among rural youth to a reduction in seasonal migration within India. In particular, the study sets out to investigate the conditions that foster rural youth agripreneurship, among them entrepreneurial training, access to finance, market access, digital access and family support. A second objective consists in reviewing how training, financial resources and broader entrepreneurial ecosystem support may shape the perceived viability of rural agripreneurial ventures. The third objective is to analyse how perceived venture viability relates to agripreneurial intention among rural youth. Examining the possible link between agripreneurial intention and the intention to migrate seasonally constitutes the fourth objective. The final objective is to put forward a conceptual framework that integrates these relationships and offers a foundation for subsequent empirical research. These objectives are intentionally conceptual in nature. The study makes no attempt to measure actual reductions in migration by means of primary data. Rather, it draws on existing literature to construct a theoretically grounded account of how viable rural enterprises may shape young people's decisions regarding entrepreneurship and seasonal migration.

3 Research Methodology

The present investigation adopts a qualitative research design that is both conceptual and grounded in the literature. Its aim is to synthesise extant scholarship concerning rural youth, agripreneurship, entrepreneurial intention, support for rural enterprises and migration, and to draw upon this body of knowledge in constructing a conceptual framework. As no primary data are gathered in this study, questionnaires, interviews and statistical testing are not employed. Relevant secondary literature was located through academic journals, reputable academic publishers, institutional sources and government publications. The literature search concentrated on studies pertaining to rural youth agripreneurship, agricultural entrepreneurship, entrepreneurial intention, rural entrepreneurship, entrepreneurial ecosystems, migration, seasonal migration and opportunities for rural livelihoods. The search terms comprised combinations such as “rural youth agripreneurship,” “agripreneurship intention,” “agricultural entrepreneurship and youth,” “rural entrepreneurship and migration,” “seasonal migration India,” “entreprenerial ecosystem rural India,” “venture viability entrepreneurship,” “training and agripreneurship,” “finance and agripreneurship,” and “market access and rural entrepreneurship.”

Priority was given to peer-reviewed research and established theoretical works. Recent Indian studies were included where they directly related to youth agripreneurship, enterprise support, migration or entrepreneurial intention. Government and institutional sources were used mainly for policy and contextual information rather than as substitutes for academic theory. For example, the Government of India's migration statistics and ICAR's material on rural youth programmes were used to understand the Indian context. The inclusion criteria were studies that addressed at least one of the major concepts in the research framework. Studies were considered particularly useful when they examined rural youth, agricultural entrepreneurship, entrepreneurial intention, ecosystem support, enterprise viability, migration decisions or Indian rural livelihoods. Foundational theoretical studies were also included even when they were older because their concepts continue to be relevant. Studies were excluded when they had no meaningful connection with the research variables or when the source could not be adequately verified. The selected literature was analysed through thematic synthesis. Instead of discussing each article separately, the literature was grouped into five major themes: rural youth migration, entrepreneurial intention, agribusiness opportunities, entrepreneurial ecosystem support, and

venture viability. Theoretical literature was then used to connect these themes. This approach is appropriate because the study seeks to integrate concepts rather than calculate a statistical effect size. The methodology produces conceptual interpretations and propositions rather than empirical findings. An important limitation of this approach is that the proposed relationships have not been statistically tested in the present study. Thus, the statements about agripreneurship reducing migration are presented as theoretical propositions rather than established causal findings. This distinction is important for research integrity. Existing studies provide evidence that rural entrepreneurship, Although agripreneurship and livelihood opportunities can shape the choices young people make, they do not demonstrate that the precise framework advanced in this paper has already received empirical validation.

4 Theoretical / Conceptual Foundation

4.1 Theory of Planned Behaviour

Developed by Ajzen, the Theory of Planned Behaviour (TPB) constitutes one of the principal theoretical frameworks through which behavioural intention can be understood. Within this theory, intention is shaped by three factors: attitude toward the behaviour, subjective norms, and perceived behavioural control [1]. Attitude concerns the degree to which an individual evaluates a given behaviour favourably or unfavourably. Subjective norms capture the social expectations an individual perceives, whereas perceived behavioural control denotes the individual's assessment of whether the behaviour is feasible given the abilities and resources at their disposal. This theory holds particular relevance for entrepreneurship, since launching a business is typically a planned undertaking rather than an entirely spontaneous behaviour. In research on entrepreneurial intention, intention has served as a key concept for explaining the decision to embark on business creation [2], [3]. The review of entrepreneurial intention research conducted by Liñán and Fayolle likewise indicates that intention has emerged as a central area within entrepreneurship scholarship [2]. Their review illustrates the extensive adoption of intention-based approaches and points to the need for further research that links entrepreneurial intention to a range of different contexts.

In the context of rural youth agripreneurship, the perceived viability of a venture can be linked to perceived behavioural control. A young individual might hold a favourable attitude toward launching an agricultural enterprise, yet may not form the intention to do so when he or she regards finance, skills, markets or technology as inaccessible. Confidence and knowledge may be enhanced through training. The availability of finance may render investment feasible. Access to markets may render anticipated revenue more realistic. Social barriers may be diminished through family support. Access to digital tools may enhance information flows and connections with customers. Such factors can foster the perception that agripreneurship is attainable. The pertinence of the TPB to agro-entrepreneurial intention is corroborated by recent research. Nawi et al. applied the TPB to examine agro-entrepreneurial intention and reported that attitude and perceived behavioural control constituted significant factors in accounting for intention among university students [6]. Recent Indian studies have likewise investigated agripreneurship intention among agricultural students, drawing on attitudes, subjective norms, perceived behavioural control and additional factors. The TPB on its own does not account for the entirety of the rural business environment. An individual's perceived behavioural control may hinge on external resources, including finance, infrastructure, training and markets. This gives rise to the necessity of an ecosystem perspective.

4.2 Entrepreneurial Ecosystem Theory

The Theory of Entrepreneurial Ecosystems directs analytical attention toward the broader environment within which entrepreneurial activity takes place. Individual traits alone are not what gives rise to entrepreneurship. Rather, it is shaped by the interplay among entrepreneurs and institutions, markets, finance, infrastructure, knowledge, networks, and further actors. Stam's contribution characterizes the entrepreneurial ecosystem approach as a means of comprehending the conditions that underpin productive entrepreneurship [7]. Subsequent scholarship has advanced the notion that entrepreneurial ecosystems comprise interacting elements rather than a solitary support factor [8], [9]. This perspective holds value for rural agripreneurship, given that young people may possess entrepreneurial motivation while nonetheless confronting practical obstacles. A training programme that lacks finance may prove insufficient. Finance in the absence of market access may generate repayment difficulties. Market access without skills may fail to yield a viable business. Digital access lacking dependable infrastructure or knowledge may not generate business value. Accordingly, support for rural entrepreneurship must be conceptualized as an interconnected system. Stam and van de Ven stress that entrepreneurial ecosystems encompass multiple elements which contribute to productive entrepreneurship [8]. Wurth, Stam and Spigel likewise contend for a more robust research approach to entrepreneurial ecosystems, one that acknowledges the interaction among differing ecosystem elements [9]. This lends support to the present paper's emphasis on training, finance, market access, digital access and family support as interconnected conditions rather than isolated variables. The ecosystem perspective accounts for the first component of the proposed framework. Such support conditions may enhance the environment in which rural youth assess and develop enterprises. The effect is anticipated to manifest in part via perceived venture viabilityEntrepreneurial Ecosystem Theory focuses attention on the wider environment in which entrepreneurship occurs. Individual characteristics alone are not what generates entrepreneurship. It is shaped by the interaction between entrepreneurs and institutions, markets, finance, infrastructure, knowledge, networks and other actors. Stam's work characterizes the entrepreneurial ecosystem approach as a means of understanding the conditions that support productive entrepreneurship [7]. Subsequent scholarship has advanced the notion that entrepreneurial ecosystems are composed of elements that interact with one another, rather than resting on any single support factor [8], [9]. Such a perspective proves valuable for rural agripreneurship, since young individuals might possess entrepreneurial motivation yet continue to encounter practical obstacles. A training programme that lacks accompanying finance may prove insufficient. Finance in the absence of market access may give rise to repayment difficulties. Access to markets without the requisite skills may fail to yield a viable business. Digital access lacking dependable infrastructure or knowledge may not generate business value. Consequently, support for rural entrepreneurship must be conceptualised as an interconnected system. Stam and van de Ven stress that entrepreneurial ecosystems comprise multiple elements which contribute to productive entrepreneurship [8]. Wurth, Stam and Spigel likewise contend that research on entrepreneurial ecosystems requires a more robust approach, one that acknowledges how the various ecosystem elements interact [9]. This lends support to the present paper's emphasis on training, finance, market access, digital access and family support as interconnected conditions rather than isolated variables. The ecosystem perspective accounts for the first component of the proposed framework. These support conditions may enhance the environment within which rural youth assess and develop enterprises. The effect is anticipated to manifest in part through perceived venture viability.

4.3 Push-Pull Migration Theory

The third foundational pillar of this study is constituted by migration theories. The theory of migration advanced by Lee distinguishes positive and negative factors at both origin and destination locations, together with intervening obstacles and individual characteristics [4]. Such a framework proves valuable in explaining why a young individual might depart from a rural locality despite maintaining social and familial ties therein. The Harris-Todaro model accounts, in part, for migration via differentials in expected income between rural and urban employment [5]. Even though this model was originally formulated to account for rural-urban migration within developing economies, its fundamental logic is pertinent to the present paper, given that seasonal migration may be shaped by expectations regarding income and employment beyond the village. Where rural employment is uncertain and temporary urban work appears financially more appealing, migration may be regarded as a rational livelihood strategy. A subsequent review of multiple migration theories by Massey et al. demonstrated that migration is shaped by economic, social and structural determinants and cannot be attributed to any single cause [10]. This paper does not conceptualise migration merely as a straightforward reaction to low income. Rather, migration intention is examined in relation to the availability and perceived attractiveness of alternative livelihood opportunities. This consideration is significant for the framework proposed herein. Should a rural youth perceive that an enterprise is capable of generating adequate income, offering employment throughout the lean season and expanding over time, the economic impetus towards seasonal migration may be attenuated. The magnitude of this relationship will be contingent upon the actual viability of the enterprise and the attractiveness of alternative employment.

4.4 Integration of the Three Theories

These three theoretical frameworks offer explanations that differ from one another yet complement each other. TPB accounts for an individual's intention to engage in agripreneurship. Entrepreneurial Ecosystem Theory accounts for the external conditions that either foster or constrain entrepreneurship. Push-Pull Migration Theory accounts for the ways in which livelihood conditions and alternative opportunities may shape decisions about migration. Taken together, these theories underpin the logic proposed here:

Support from the entrepreneurial ecosystem → Perceived venture viability → Agripreneurship intention → Reduced intention to migrate seasonally

Training, finance, market access, digital access and family support are regarded as significant support conditions. Such conditions may shape whether a young person regards the enterprise as practicable and economically viable. Venture viability thus serves as a crucial link between external support and entrepreneurial intention. Agripreneurship intention is ultimately linked to migration intention, since the presence of a credible local livelihood alternative may lessen the need or the desire for seasonal migration.

5 Review Of Literature And Thematic Analysis

5.1 Rural Youth Migration

Rural migration is intimately linked to opportunities for employment, income and livelihood. Agricultural employment is seasonal in numerous rural settings. As agricultural work diminishes, workers may look for temporary jobs in other locations. This holds particular significance for households possessing small landholdings and restricted non-farm income. Research conducted on Maharashtra offers an illustrative case. Investigations in Beed district demonstrate that seasonal migration is linked to unemployment during the dry season, low returns from agriculture and constrained local livelihood options. Migration does not invariably exert a negative effect on all households. It can generate

income and assist households in coping with financial shortfalls. The issue addressed in this paper is narrower: whether recurring seasonal migration among rural youth can be diminished once credible local entrepreneurial opportunities are made available. This distinction matters, since the aim is not to contend that migration ought always to be prevented. Rather, the question concerns whether young people should possess a meaningful choice between seasonal migration and viable local enterprise. Scholarship on rural youth in India likewise suggests that weak economic incentives in agriculture can foster migration. Research in Uttarakhand, for instance, connects the migration of rural youth to low agricultural productivity and constrained local economic incentives. It further identifies the capacity of agriculture and food-system transformation to generate livelihood opportunities where suitable support exists. The literature suggests that decisions to migrate are shaped by the structure of opportunities accessible to young people. Where rural areas offer only low-return and precarious employment, migration may continue to appear attractive. Where rural areas offer productive enterprises with access to skills, markets and finance, the comparative appeal of remaining may shift.

5.2 Entrepreneurial Intention among Rural Youth

Entrepreneurial intention refers to the intention to establish or grow a new venture. This matters because launching a business typically demands planning, commitment and preparation. TPB offers an established account of intention by connecting attitude, social norms and perceived behavioural control with behavioural intention [1]. Research on entrepreneurial intention has grown substantially. The literature review by Liñán and Fayolle revealed a substantial and varied body of research and pinpointed multiple domains in which entrepreneurial intention research has progressed [2]. Fayolle and Liñán subsequently contended that the field must advance beyond mere replication and tackle novel questions regarding the development and implementation of entrepreneurial intentions [3]. Such arguments bear relevance to agripreneurship, since intention ought to be analysed within the particular economic and social context in which young people reach decisions. Agricultural entrepreneurship exhibits several distinctive characteristics. Young people might possess agricultural knowledge yet have only limited business knowledge. They might have access to family land yet lack sufficient capital. They might possess production skills yet have limited knowledge of marketing, packaging, digital sales or value addition. Entrepreneurial intention in agriculture may hinge on both personal motivation and the perceived availability of resources.

The study by Nawi et al. on agro-entrepreneurial intention determined that attitude, perceived behavioural control and acceptance of agro-business were significant factors in accounting for intention [6]. Studies among Indian agricultural students have likewise investigated agripreneurial intention and factors including education, personality and TPB-related constructs. These results affirm the significance of intention while also suggesting that moving from intention to an actual enterprise demands a supportive environment. For rural youth, the question is not merely whether they are favourably disposed toward entrepreneurship. It is whether they believe they can genuinely establish a business capable of surviving.

5.3 Agribusiness Opportunities

Agripreneurship goes well beyond the mere cultivation of crops. Rural youth are able to engage in input supply, farm machinery services, nursery development, livestock, poultry, fisheries, food processing, storage, transportation, digital agricultural services, farm advisory services, and direct marketing. Such a broader value-chain perspective is capable of generating opportunities for young people who are unwilling to rely solely on traditional farming. A scoping review concerning entrepreneurship opportunities for agriculture graduates and rural youth in India underscores the potential of

agricultural entrepreneurship as well as the significance of skills, technology, and business opportunities [11]. In a comparable manner, ICAR's ARYA programme concentrates on enterprises in agriculture and allied sectors as a means of creating employment and sustainable income for rural youth. Food processing holds particular relevance, given that it is able to generate value beyond primary agricultural production. Recent ICAR activities in agripreneurship training have concentrated on food processing and agri-tech start-ups, with the training encompassing technologies and practical exposure to processing enterprises. Activities of this kind demonstrate that agripreneurship can be linked to higher-value activities instead of remaining confined to production. Diversification can likewise be supported by agricultural entrepreneurship. Where rural youth establish enterprises connected with agriculture, they may derive income from several activities instead of relying solely on crop income. This may prove especially beneficial during periods in which crop-related work is limited. Nevertheless, diversification does not automatically signify viability. A business needs customers, suitable costs, access to inputs, and adequate margins.

5.4 Training and Entrepreneurial Capability

Training is one of the most frequently discussed support factors in agripreneurship. Young people may need technical agricultural knowledge, business planning skills, financial management, marketing skills, digital skills and knowledge of government schemes. Training can improve both knowledge and confidence. Research on farm youth in Odisha found that agripreneurial training, social media exposure and previous experience were associated with skill levels among youth involved in agripreneurship [12]. Research assessing Agri-Clinic and Agri-Business Centre training also found that exposure visits, case studies and practical components were perceived as useful by participants, while challenges such as market fluctuations and climate uncertainty remained important. The implication is that training should not be limited to classroom instruction. For rural youth, practical exposure can help them understand how an enterprise operates. Training can improve perceived venture viability when it reduces uncertainty about production, costs, customers and business operations. This supports Proposition 1 of the present paper: entrepreneurial training increases perceived venture viability. The proposition does not mean that training guarantees enterprise success. Rather, training may improve the youth's ability to evaluate and manage the business.

5.5 Finance and Agripreneurship

Finance constitutes a further significant component of the entrepreneurial ecosystem. Even the launch of a modest rural enterprise may necessitate investment in equipment, raw materials, livestock, storage, transportation, packaging, working capital or digital infrastructure. Young individuals frequently possess limited personal savings and may lack adequate collateral to secure formal credit. Scholarship on agripreneurship in India has consistently recognised finance as a significant constraint. Research examining training and incubation for agripreneurship in India recognised credit, infrastructure, marketing, technology and regulatory matters as challenges, and emphasised the significance of facilitating access to finance. Finance may exert an influence on entrepreneurship through two distinct pathways. Firstly, it can render the enterprise physically feasible. Secondly, it can shape the perceived attractiveness of entrepreneurship. A young individual may possess a sound business idea yet choose not to pursue it, owing to the perception that the requisite investment is unavailable. Consequently, finance can shape both venture viability and entrepreneurial intention. The framework advanced here positions

finance among the principal support conditions that shape venture viability. The proposed Proposition 2 extends this reasoning by positing that access to finance may additionally reinforce agripreneurship intention in a direct manner. This follows because finance may lessen the perceived barrier separating intention from action.

5.6 Market Access

A rural enterprise cannot be considered viable merely on the grounds that it is capable of producing something. It must be able to sell the product or service at a price that covers costs and provides an acceptable return. Market access is central to venture viability. Constraints related to markets are especially significant for small rural enterprises, since they may be geographically distant from large markets and may possess weak bargaining power. Young entrepreneurs may also lack knowledge of pricing, branding, packaging, distribution and customer acquisition. Recent research on farmer-producer companies in Haryana has examined the relationship between agripreneurship, market access, financial inclusion and digital agriculture. The study highlights the role of organisations such as FPCs in supporting market access while also identifying regulatory and technology-related challenges. Market access can change the perceived viability of an enterprise. If a young person knows where the product can be sold, how customers can be reached and what price can reasonably be obtained, the business may appear more realistic. Conversely, strong production skills without market access can create unsold inventory and financial losses. This supports Proposition 3: market access increases perceived venture viability.

5.7 Digital Access

Rural entrepreneurship is becoming ever more closely connected with digital technology. Through digital platforms, individuals may gain access to information, customers, suppliers, market prices, financial services, and advisory services. Since rural youth tend to be more accustomed to smartphones and digital platforms than older generations are, digital access may constitute a significant entrepreneurial resource for them. A study of digital agripreneurship in India points to opportunities for agri-tech enterprises to integrate advisory services, market linkages, supply-chain services, and financial inclusion. Consequently, digital tools are capable of assisting rural entrepreneurs in surmounting certain geographical obstacles. Digital access ought not to be regarded as synonymous with digital entrepreneurship. Merely possessing a smartphone or an internet connection does not in itself generate business value. Young entrepreneurs require digital skills, dependable connectivity, suitable platforms, and an understanding of how to employ technology for business purposes. Within the proposed framework, digital access is conceptualized as an ecosystem condition that may foster venture viability. It is able to enhance the availability of information and the reach of customers, yet the magnitude of its effect will hinge on the entrepreneur's capacity to utilize it effectively.

5.8 Family Support

Family support holds particular significance within rural entrepreneurship, given that family members are able to supply labour, land, knowledge, finance, social networks and emotional support. Conversely, families may likewise deter entrepreneurial activity when they perceive wage employment or migration as the more secure option. The subjective norm component of TPB offers a theoretical foundation for comprehending the influence exerted by family. The entrepreneurial decisions of young people may be shaped by whether family members regard entrepreneurship as respectable, safe and worthwhile [1]. Scholarship on agro-entrepreneurial intention similarly suggests that family, parents, teachers and other social actors are capable of shaping young people's perceptions of agricultural entrepreneurship. Family support is likewise able to lower the initial cost associated with enterprise creation. A young entrepreneur may draw upon family land, family labour or agricultural equipment that already exists. For this reason, family support may serve to strengthen perceived venture viability.

5.9 Venture Viability

Within the proposed framework, venture viability functions as the core concept that links the various elements together. It denotes the extent to which a rural young person regards the proposed enterprise as able to produce sufficient income and to persist over time. It encompasses both practical feasibility and economic attractiveness. Scholarship indicates that viability is shaped by a number of factors. Operational uncertainty can be diminished through skills. Resources can be supplied by finance. Revenue opportunities can be generated by market access. Information and market connections can be enhanced through digital access. Resource and social barriers can be alleviated by family support. Venture viability is distinct from the actual performance of an enterprise. A business may be regarded as viable yet subsequently fail. In a similar vein, an enterprise may at first seem difficult but, with suitable support, go on to succeed. Since this paper is conceptual, perceived venture viability constitutes a more suitable immediate construct than actual business survival. This concept also serves to link entrepreneurial intention with migration. A young person may hold a general interest in entrepreneurship and yet opt for migration if the enterprise appears excessively risky. Where the same enterprise is perceived as viable because training, finance and market support are available, that young person may be more inclined to view it as a serious career option..

5.10 Agripreneurship and Migration

The connection between entrepreneurship and migration, taken directly, is still less thoroughly elaborated than the separate bodies of literature devoted to each of these topics. Evidence of relevance is supplied by research conducted in Dahanu, Maharashtra, since that work focused explicitly on rural entrepreneurship and migration. According to the findings of that study, seasonal migration was widespread owing to the seasonal character of agriculture, and the study identified a number of entrepreneurial opportunities, both those grounded in agriculture and those outside it. The study reported that, for certain individuals, engagement in entrepreneurship served to lessen migration. A connection between migration experience and interest in agricultural entrepreneurship is likewise demonstrated by research on return migration and agripreneurship conducted in southern India. Parameswaranaik, Jha and Lal studied rural youth who had returned after migrating and reported that such youth may regard agriculture and allied activities as possible livelihood options upon returning to rural areas. These studies matter because they link entrepreneurship with migration; nevertheless, the mechanism advanced in this paper is not fully accounted for by them. No general causal pathway is established by these studies, one in which improved support conditions raise venture viability, greater venture viability strengthens entrepreneurial intention, and stronger entrepreneurial intention lowers the intention to migrate seasonally. It is at this point that the proposed framework seeks to offer a conceptual contribution.

6 Critical Discussion

The body of literature examined in this research suggests that the migration of rural youth and engagement in agripreneurship are shaped by economic and social circumstances that intersect with one another. The first significant pattern identified is that rural migration tends to be associated with the absence of dependable employment and income opportunities at the local level. One may conceptualise seasonal migration as a livelihood strategy adopted in response to a scarcity of appealing alternatives within the local area. This is not to suggest, however, that migration is invariably motivated by hardship. Young individuals may choose to migrate of their own volition in pursuit of improved earnings, experience, or career prospects. In contexts where migration constitutes primarily a reaction to seasonal unemployment, the presence of local income-generating opportunities assumes particular significance. The second pattern identified is that agripreneurship demands more than mere entrepreneurial motivation. An individual may possess the intention to establish an

enterprise yet lack the resources necessary to realise it. The entrepreneurial ecosystem perspective offers a useful lens for explaining this difficulty. Training, finance, markets, technology, and social support operate in interaction with one another. The availability of a single factor may not fully offset the absence of another. By way of illustration, training may enhance skills but is unable to remedy a total absence of working capital. Finance may supply capital but is incapable of generating customers. Access to markets may generate customers but cannot make up for deficient business management. Digital access may enhance information availability but may be of limited assistance to a young entrepreneur who lacks the knowledge required to utilise digital platforms. The notion of venture viability is valuable in that it permits these diverse conditions to be considered in conjunction with one another. The third pattern pertains to entrepreneurial intention. TPB posits that individuals are more inclined to develop intentions when they hold favourable attitudes, perceive supportive social norms, and experience a sense of control over the behaviour [1]. Within rural agripreneurship, perceived venture viability may serve to reinforce this sense of control. Where young people believe that an enterprise can realistically be launched and sustained, their intention may be strengthened accordingly. The fourth pattern pertains to the connection between entrepreneurship and migration. Available evidence indicates that rural entrepreneurship may help lessen migration in particular contexts; however, this evidence is insufficient to support the conclusion that agripreneurship reduces seasonal migration in all cases. The Maharashtra study conducted by Patil and Bhurke holds particular relevance, as it establishes a direct link between rural entrepreneurship and migration, whereas research on return-migrated youth links migration experiences to aspirations for agripreneurship. The proposed framework advances a guarded argument. It does not claim that all rural entrepreneurs will stay in the village. Nor does it imply that migration ought to be eliminated. Rather, it contends that viable rural enterprise can enhance the availability of a local livelihood alternative. Where such an alternative is regarded as sufficiently attractive, the intention to migrate seasonally may diminish. An important distinction also exists between migration intention and actual migration behaviour. A young person may intend to stay and yet still migrate, because the enterprise has not produced sufficient income. Conversely, an individual may intend to migrate but subsequently remain owing to a new business opportunity. This distinction underscores the need for longitudinal research in the future. Actual migration behaviour ought to be tracked over time rather than inferred solely from entrepreneurial intention. The role of venture viability constitutes another significant issue. The framework presumes that viability functions as a bridge linking ecosystem support to entrepreneurial intention. This is theoretically valuable, as it accounts for why support does not automatically generate entrepreneurship. Support acquires meaning when it alters the entrepreneur's assessment of whether the business can succeed. The framework also carries a management implication. Rural entrepreneurship programmes should not be assessed solely by the number of individuals trained or the number of loans disbursed. A more adequate assessment might examine whether participants have developed businesses, reached customers, generated income and remained active following the initial support period. Put differently, the emphasis ought to shift away from the provision of support and toward the viability of the enterprise.

7 Indian Context

The proposed framework gains particular relevance within the Indian setting, given the close interconnections among rural employment, agriculture, youth aspirations and migration. Migration data from the Government of India indicate that employment-related factors constitute a significant component of migration decisions, especially in the case of male migrants. Concurrently, rural regions encompass considerable opportunities in agricultural diversification, food processing, agricultural

services and technology-enabled enterprises. Maharashtra constitutes an especially pertinent context within which to examine seasonal migration. Research conducted on Beed indicates that seasonal migration is linked to unemployment during the dry season, rainfed agriculture and constrained local livelihood prospects. Maharashtra additionally possesses a diversified agricultural economy, with opportunities spanning horticulture, food processing, dairy, poultry, fisheries, agricultural services and other value-chain activities. This renders the state pertinent for subsequent empirical research examining whether rural enterprise opportunities are capable of influencing migration decisions. Certain components of the proposed ecosystem are already supplied through governmental and institutional programmes. The ARYA programme of ICAR is directed at attracting and retaining youth in agriculture via entrepreneurial activities, and training and hand-holding have likewise been integrated into agricultural entrepreneurship programmes. The National Youth Policy framework further identifies employment, skill development and entrepreneurship as significant domains of youth development. Nevertheless, the mere existence of programmes does not in itself imply that young people regard rural enterprises as viable. The effectiveness of programmes is contingent upon whether training is relevant, finance is accessible, markets are available, digital tools can be utilised and families extend support to the enterprise. Accordingly, policy ought to take into account the entrepreneurial ecosystem in its entirety rather than concentrating on a single intervention. The Indian context likewise necessitates attention to regional disparities. Rural India is neither economically nor socially homogeneous. Conditions vary across states, districts and villages with respect to irrigation, landholding, distance to markets, infrastructure, education, digital access and migration patterns. Consequently, a model formulated at the conceptual level ought to be tested within specific local contexts prior to the drawing of broad policy conclusions. The draft National Youth Policy 2025 likewise emphasises local youth employment, entrepreneurship, digital literacy and the enhancement of livelihood opportunities in rural areas. It explicitly links local employment opportunities with the reduction of migration pressures and acknowledges agriculture as a domain that can be modernised and rendered more appealing to youth. As this constitutes a draft policy document rather than a final policy, it ought to be regarded as an indication of policy direction rather than as established policy implementation.

8 Managerial Implications

The results of this conceptual review carry implications for organisations engaged in rural entrepreneurship and agricultural development. A first implication is that programmes designed to support rural youth ought to extend beyond single, one-off training sessions. Such training should integrate agricultural knowledge with business planning, costing, financial management, marketing, digital skills and an understanding of customers. Hands-on exposure and mentoring may prove more beneficial than classroom instruction alone, since young people must grasp how a business actually functions under real conditions. Evidence drawn from Indian agripreneurship training programmes corroborates the value of practical exposure and enterprise-oriented learning. A second implication pertains to finance. Financial institutions and rural development organisations ought to assess whether the credit products currently available are appropriate for young entrepreneurs. Small enterprises may need working capital in addition to initial investment. The manner in which loan processes, repayment schedules and collateral requirements are structured can shape whether young people regard entrepreneurship as a feasible option. Credit support ought to be paired with business guidance rather than being delivered as a stand-alone intervention. A third implication pertains to market access. Programmes for rural enterprises should assist entrepreneurs in identifying customers prior to

committing to major investments. Market linkages can be provided by producer organisations, cooperatives, farmer-producer companies, local retailers, digital marketplaces and institutional buyers. Recent research on farmer-producer companies underscores the significance of market access and financial inclusion in fostering agripreneurship. A fourth implication pertains to incubation and mentoring. Support during the early phase of enterprise development may be necessary for rural youth, given that the initial business idea can shift following interaction with customers and suppliers. Technical advice, business planning, networking and access to experts can be supplied through incubation centres. Mentoring can likewise lessen uncertainty and assist young entrepreneurs in grasping common business risks. A fifth implication is that programme evaluation ought to encompass enterprise viability and outcomes related to migration. Rather than measuring solely the number of youth trained or loans sanctioned, organisations could investigate whether the enterprises supported remain active, generate income, create local employment and lessen the need for seasonal migration. Measures of this kind would yield a more thorough comprehension of whether entrepreneurship programmes are fulfilling their broader objectives concerning rural development. Lastly, rural entrepreneurship ought not to be regarded as the duty of any single institution. It may be necessary for agricultural departments, banks, training institutions, local governments, universities, incubation centres, producer organisations and private businesses to collaborate. From the standpoint of the entrepreneurial ecosystem, entrepreneurship is sustained through institutions and resources that interact with one another, rather than through an isolated intervention [7]–[9].

9 Research Gap And Future Research Directions

The principal research lacuna delineated in this review concerns an integration gap linking agripreneurship with migration scholarship. The extant body of literature furnishes substantial evidence regarding the determinants of entrepreneurial intention, the contribution of entrepreneurial education, support for rural enterprises, and the drivers of migration. These domains are frequently investigated in isolation from one another. Scholarship on entrepreneurial intention primarily accounts for the reasons individuals contemplate engaging in entrepreneurship. Work on entrepreneurial ecosystems investigates the ways in which finance, institutions, networks, markets and further resources underpin entrepreneurship. Migration scholarship analyses the economic, social and structural determinants that shape movement. Research into agripreneurship analyses agricultural enterprises together with the conditions that condition their development. There exists comparatively scant conceptual scholarship that links these domains via the notion of venture viability. The Maharashtra evidence drawn from Dahanu is particularly pertinent, since it furnishes a direct linkage between rural entrepreneurship and migration, whereas investigations of return-migrated youth connect migration experiences to agripreneurship. These investigations do not comprehensively establish the posited pathway running from ecosystem support through venture viability and entrepreneurial intention to migration intention. Consequently, the proposed framework addresses the following question: when rural youth regard an agripreneurial venture as viable, are they more inclined to view entrepreneurship as an alternative to seasonal migration? This question furnishes a foundation for subsequent empirical inquiry. Future investigations should initially test the proposed framework by means of surveys administered to rural youth. Scholars could operationalise measures of training access, finance access, market access, digital access, family support, perceived venture viability, agripreneurship intention and seasonal migration intention. Structural equation modelling could subsequently be employed to scrutinise direct and indirect relationships. Secondly, subsequent research should adopt longitudinal designs. A principal limitation of intention-based scholarship is that intention

does not invariably translate into behaviour. Scholars could track rural youth across two or three agricultural cycles in order to ascertain whether those reporting high agripreneurship intention actually establish enterprises and whether their migration behaviour alters. Thirdly, subsequent investigations should scrutinise enterprise survival. A rural enterprise that remains operational for merely a few months may fail to constitute a sustainable alternative to migration. Accordingly, subsequent investigations ought to investigate the survival of enterprises, stability of income, profitability and the creation of employment. Fourthly, comparative analyses could be conducted across various districts and states. The agricultural systems and patterns of migration differ across Maharashtra, Odisha, Uttar Pradesh, Bihar, Karnataka and other regions. A comparison of these regions could assist in determining which conditions of the ecosystem are most significant within differing rural contexts. Fifthly, subsequent investigations ought to investigate differences between genders. Young rural women may encounter distinct constraints concerning mobility, familial expectations, finance and access to markets. The association between agripreneurship and migration may differ between male and female youth. Lastly, subsequent studies ought to differentiate among the intention to migrate seasonally, the intention to migrate permanently, return migration and actual behaviour of migration. These constitute distinct outcomes and ought not to be regarded as a single construct.

Proposed Theoretical Propositions

P1: Among rural youth, entrepreneurial training raises the perceived viability of ventures.

The reasoning behind this proposition is that training has the capacity to enhance knowledge, skills and confidence. Findings from Indian research indicate an association between agripreneurial training and the development of youth skills and enterprises. [12]

P2: For rural youth, improved access to finance strengthens agripreneurship intention.

The availability of finance can lower the financial barrier that is perceived in connection with launching an enterprise. A young individual might be interested in entrepreneurship yet lack the intention to start a business when the capital required seems out of reach.

P3: Among rural youth, market access raises the perceived viability of ventures.

An enterprise appears more realistic once entrepreneurs are able to identify customers, comprehend prices and reach distribution channels. Venture viability is affected by market access on the expected revenue side.

P4: Among rural youth, perceived venture viability strengthens agripreneurship intention.

This proposition is consistent with the logic of TPB, given that perceived feasibility and control are able to shape intention. Where young people consider that an enterprise can realistically function and produce income, their intention to pursue it may grow stronger [1], [6].

P5: Among rural youth, agripreneurship intention lowers the intention to migrate seasonally.

This constitutes the framework's central proposition. If a rural enterprise is regarded as a credible local livelihood option, the economic necessity or appeal of temporary migration may diminish. Empirical testing is required for this proposition, and it should not be regarded as an established causal relationship.

10 Conclusion

For rural development in India, the migration of rural youth and the pursuit of agripreneurship constitute significant concerns. Seasonal migration tends to be associated with scarce employment and income opportunities during intervals when agricultural employment is unavailable. Concurrently, agripreneurship offers rural youth avenues to engage in agriculture and allied value chains via production, processing, services, marketing, and technology-driven activities. According to the literature examined in this paper, entrepreneurial intention cannot be comprehended in isolation from the environment within which rural youth arrive at decisions. Training, finance, market

access, digital access, and family support are capable of shaping whether a young individual regards an enterprise as practicable and economically feasible. The entrepreneurial ecosystem perspective assists in accounting for these external conditions, whereas the Theory of Planned Behaviour accounts for the formation of entrepreneurial intention. Push-Pull Migration Theory offers a means of understanding why the presence of a credible local livelihood alternative may shape migration decisions. The principal contribution of this paper is the proposed function of perceived venture viability as a connective concept. The paper advances the proposition that ecosystem support is able to enhance the perceived viability of rural enterprises. Stronger perceived viability may reinforce agripreneurship intention, and more robust agripreneurship intention may diminish seasonal migration intention where the enterprise furnishes a credible alternative to temporary employment beyond the village. The paper does not assert that agripreneurship is capable of eliminating migration. Migration can supply essential income and may constitute a rational choice for numerous households. The aim ought to be the creation of meaningful livelihood choices rather than the mere prevention of migration. Where rural youth are able to choose between migration and a viable local enterprise, the decision is more likely to mirror genuine economic preference rather than an absence of alternatives.

11 Bibliography

[1] I. Ajzen, "The theory of planned behaviour," Organizational Behaviour and Human Decision Processes, vol. 50, no. 2, pp. 179–211, 1991, Doi: 10.1016/0749-5978(91)90020-T. (DOI)

[2] F. Liñán and A. Fayolle, "A systematic literature review on entrepreneurial intentions: Citation, thematic analyses, and research agenda," International Entrepreneurship and Management Journal, vol. 11, no. 4, pp. 907–933, 2015, Doi: 10.1007/s11365-015-0356-5. (EM Lyon Research)

[3] A. Fayolle and F. Liñán, "The future of research on entrepreneurial intentions," Journal of Business Research, vol. 67, no. 5, pp. 663–666, 2014, Doi: 10.1016/j.jbusres.2013.11.024. (ScienceDirect)

[4] E. S. Lee, "A theory of migration," Demography, vol. 3, no. 1, pp. 47–57, 1966, Doi: 10.2307/2060063. (IDEAS/RePEc)

[5] J. R. Harris and M. P. Todaro, "Migration, unemployment and development: A two-sector analysis," The American Economic Review, vol. 60, no. 1, pp. 126–142, 1970. (EconBiz)

[6] N. C. Nawi, A. A. Mamun, A. A. Hassan, W. S. A. A. W. Ibrahim, A. F. Mohamed, and P. Y. Permarupan, "Agro-entrepreneurial intention among university students: A study under the premises of Theory of Planned Behaviour," SAGE Open, 2022, Doi: 10.1177/21582440211069144. (Sage Journals)

[7] E. Stam, "Entrepreneurial ecosystems and regional policy: A sympathetic critique," European Planning Studies, vol. 23, no. 9, pp. 1759–1769, 2015, Doi: 10.1080/09654313.2015.1061484. (ResearchGate)

[8] E. Stam and A. van de Ven, "Entrepreneurial ecosystem elements," Small Business Economics, vol. 56, no. 2, pp. 809–832, 2021, Doi: 10.1007/s11187-019-00270-6. (Universiteit Utrecht)

[9] B. Wurth, E. Stam, and B. Spigel, "Toward an entrepreneurial ecosystem research program," Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice, vol. 46, no. 3, pp. 729–778, 2022. (Universiteit Utrecht)

[10] D. S. Massey, J. Arango, G. Hugo, A. Kouaouci, A. Pellegrino, and J. E. Taylor, "Theories of international migration: A review and appraisal," Population and Development Review, vol. 19, no. 3, pp. 431–466, 1993, Doi: 10.2307/2938462. (Princeton University)

[11] S. M. Haldhar, T. Hussain, N. Thaochan, R. S. Bana, M. K. Jat, N. N. Sivalingam, I. Sarangthem, P. N. Sivalingam, D. K. Samadia, M. Nagesh, B. Singh, and A. Sunpapao, "Entrepreneurship opportunities for agriculture graduate and rural youth in India: A scoping review," Journal of Agriculture and Ecology, 2023, Doi: 10.58628/JAE-2315-101. (SAAER)

[12] P. Ray, R. S. Panigrahi, and S. Shasani, "Determinants of skill levels of farm youth with regard to agripreneurship: A multinomial regression approach," Indian Journal of Extension Education, vol. 58, no. 1, pp. 58–62, 2022, Doi: 10.48165/IJEE.2022.58113. (ACS Publisher)

[13] R. Patil and V. Bhurke, "Impact of rural entrepreneurship on migration: A case study of Dahanu, Maharashtra, India," Indian Journal of Agricultural Research, vol. 53, no. 4, pp. 500–503, 2019, Doi: 10.18805/IJARe.A-5014. (ARCC Journals)

[14] A. Jaleel C. P. and A. Chattopadhyay, "Livelihood crisis and distress seasonal migration: A study of Beed district in Maharashtra," National Geographical Journal of India, vol. 64, no. 3–4, pp. 201–214, 2018/2022 publication record. (National Geographical Journal)

[15] J. Parameswaranaik, S. K. Jha, and S. P. Lal, "Return migration of rural youth vis-à-vis agripreneurship development in southern India," National Academy Science Letters, vol. 43, no. 1, 2020, Doi: 10.1007/s40009-020-00935-x. (ResearchGate)

[16] J. Parameswaranaik, "Factors influencing the attitude of return migrated rural youths towards agripreneurship development," International Journal of Current Microbiology and Applied Sciences, vol. 8, no. 7, pp. 2810–2817, 2019, Doi: 10.20546/ijcmas.2019.807.351. (IJCMAS)

[17] P. R. Mohanty, M. Sahoo, and S. Ghosh, "Empowered by enterprise: Evaluating livelihood status improvement through attracting and retaining youth in agriculture (ARYA)," Indian Journal of Extension Education, vol. 61, no. 2, pp. 56–61, 2025, Doi: 10.48165/IJEE.2025.61211. (ICAR E-Pubs)

[18] S. Dahiya and M. B. Khandare, "The role of farmer-producer companies in fostering agripreneurship: A case study of Haryana," SEDME (Small Enterprises Development, Management & Extension Journal), vol. 52, no. 2, pp. 154–163, 2025, Doi: 10.1177/09708464251334893. (Sage Journals)