

Print ISSN : 0972-8813
e-ISSN : 2582-2780

[Vol. 23(1) January-April 2025]

Pantnagar Journal of Research

(Formerly International Journal of Basic and
Applied Agricultural Research ISSN : 2349-8765)



G.B. Pant University of Agriculture & Technology, Pantnagar



ADVISORY BOARD

Patron

Prof. Manmohan Singh Chauhan, Ph.D., Vice-Cancellor, G.B. Pant University of Agriculture and Technology, Pantnagar, India

Members

Prof. A.S. Nain, Ph.D., Director Research, G.B. Pant University of Agri. & Tech., Pantnagar, India

Prof. Jitendra Kwatra, Ph.D., Director, Extension Education, G.B. Pant University of Agri. & Tech., Pantnagar, India

Prof. S.S. Gupta, Ph.D., Dean, College of Technology, G.B. Pant University of Agri. & Tech., Pantnagar, India

Prof. A.H. Ahmad, Ph.D., Dean, College of Veterinary & Animal Sciences, G.B. Pant University of Agri. & Tech., Pantnagar, India

Prof. Alka Goel, Ph.D., Dean, College of Community Science, G.B. Pant University of Agri. & Tech., Pantnagar, India

Prof. R.S. Jadoun, Ph.D., Dean, College of Agribusiness Management, G.B. Pant University of Agri. & Tech., Pantnagar, India

Prof. R.P.S. Gangwar, Ph.D., Dean, College of Post Graduate Studies, G.B. Pant University of Agri. & Tech., Pantnagar, India

Prof. Avdhesh Kumar, Ph.D., Dean, College of Fisheries, G.B. Pant University of Agri. & Tech., Pantnagar, India

Prof. Subhash Chandra, Ph.D., Dean, College of Agriculture, G.B. Pant University of Agri. & Tech., Pantnagar, India

Prof. Anil Kumar Gaur, Ph.D., Dean, College of Basic Sciences & Humanities, G.B. Pant University of Agri. & Tech., Pantnagar, India

EDITORIAL BOARD

Members

A.K. Misra, Ph.D., Ex-Chairman, Agricultural Scientists Recruitment Board, Krishi Anusandhan Bhavan I, New Delhi, India & Ex-Vice Chancellor, G.B. Pant University of Agriculture and Technology, Pantnagar

Anand Shukla, Director, Reefberry Foodex Pvt. Ltd., Veraval, Gujarat, India

Anil Kumar, Ph.D., Director, Education, Rani Lakshmi Bai Central Agricultural University, Jhansi, India

Ashok K. Mishra, Ph.D., Kemper and Ethel Marley Foundation Chair, W P Carey Business School, Arizona State University, U.S.A

Binod Kumar Kanaujia, Ph.D., Professor, School of Computational and Integrative Sciences, Jawahar Lal Nehru University, New Delhi, India

D. Ratna Kumari, Ph.D., Associate Dean, College of Community / Home Science, PJTSAU, Hyderabad, India

Deepak Pant, Ph.D., Separation and Conversion Technology, Flemish Institute for Technological Research (VITO), Belgium

Desirazu N. Rao, Ph.D., Honorary Professor, Department of Biochemistry, Indian Institute of Science, Bangalore, India

G.K. Garg, Ph.D., Ex-Dean, College of Basic Sciences & Humanities, G.B. Pant University of Agri. & Tech., Pantnagar, India

Humnath Bhandari, Ph.D., IRRI Representative for Bangladesh, Agricultural Economist, Agrifood Policy Platform, Philippines

Indu S Sawant, Ph.D., Principal Scientist, ICAR National Research Centre for Grapes, Pune, India

Kuldeep Singh, Ph.D., Director, ICAR - National Bureau of Plant Genetic Resources, New Delhi, India

M.P. Pandey, Ph.D., Ex. Vice Chancellor, BAU, Ranchi & IGKV, Raipur, Director General, IAT, Allahabad, India

Muneshwar Singh, Ph.D., Ex-Project Coordinator AICRP- LTFE, ICAR, Indian Institute of Soil Science, Bhopal, India

Omkar, Ph.D., Professor (Retd.), Department of Zoology, University of Lucknow, India

P.C. Srivastav, Ph.D., Professor (Retd.), Department of Soil Science, G.B. Pant University of Agriculture and Technology, Pantnagar, India

Prashant Srivastava, Ph.D., Soil Contaminant Chemist, CSIRO, Australia

Puneet Srivastava, Ph.D., Director, Water Resources Center, Butler-Cunningham Eminent Scholar, Professor, Biosystems Engineering, Auburn University, United States

R.K. Singh, Ph.D., Ex-Director & Vice Chancellor, ICAR-Indian Veterinary Research Institute, Izatnagar, U.P., India

Ramesh Kanwar, Ph.D., Charles F. Curtiss Distinguished Professor of Water Resources Engineering, Iowa State University, U.S.A.

S.N. Maurya, Ph.D., Professor (Retired), Department of Gynaecology & Obstetrics, G.B. Pant University of Agri. & Tech., Pantnagar, India

Sham S. Goyal, Ph.D., Professor Emeritus, Faculty of Agriculture and Environmental Sciences, University of California, Davis, U.S.A.

Umesh Varshney, Ph.D., Honorary Professor, Department of Microbiology and Cell Biology, Indian Institute of Science, Bangalore, India

V.D. Sharma, Ph.D., Dean Life Sciences, SAI Group of Institutions, Dehradun, India

V.K. Singh, Ph.D., Director, ICAR-Central Research Institute for Dryland Agriculture, Hyderabad, India

Vijay P. Singh, Ph.D., Distinguished Professor, Caroline and William N. Lehrer Distinguished Chair in Water Engineering, Department of Biological and Agricultural Engineering, Texas A & M University, U.S.A.

Editor-in-Chief

Manoranjan Dutta, Ph.D., Ex Head, Germplasm Evaluation Division, National Bureau of Plant Genetic Resources, New Delhi, India

Managing Editor

S.N. Tiwari, Ph.D., Professor (Retd.) & Ex-Director Research, G.B. Pant University of Agriculture and Technology, Pantnagar, India

Assistant Managing Editor

Jyotsna Yadav, Ph.D., Research Editor, Directorate of Research, G.B. Pant University of Agriculture and Technology, Pantnagar, India

Technical Manager

S.D. Samantaray, Ph.D., Professor & Head, Department of Computer Engineering, G.B. Pant University of Agriculture and Technology, Pantnagar, India

Development

Dr. S.D. Samantaray, Professor & Head

Brijesh Dumka, Developer & Programmer

CONTENTS

<i>In-silico</i> analysis of curcumin conjugates targeting the Wnt signaling pathway in Breast Cancer Stem Cells	1
KANCHAN GAIROLA and SHIV KUMAR DUBEY	
Investigating <i>in vitro</i> direct antagonistic effect of endophytic bacteria against <i>Alternaria brassicicola</i>	8
SHIVANGI KRISHNATRA and A. K SHARMA	
Impact of altitude on photosynthetic and biochemical profile of <i>Didymocarpus pedicellatus</i> R.Br.: an antiurolithiatic Himalayan herb	18
DIVYA and PREETI CHATURVEDI	
Impact of Integrated Nutrient Management (INM) on growth, yield, quality and soil fertility status in sugarcane-ratoon system	25
JYOTI PAWAR and DHEER SINGH	
Mapping and evaluation of soil macronutrient and micronutrient status in Muzaffarnagar district of India	32
RAUSHAN KUMAR and G. R. SINGH	
Study of shift in cropping pattern in northern dry zone of Karnataka	45
ASHWINI HEBBAR and SUMA A. P.	
Changing weather conditions during summer and early monsoon season in the <i>Tarai</i> region of Uttarakhand	51
SHIVANI KOTHIYAL and R.K. SINGH	
Nutrients enhancing flowering characteristics in Mango (<i>Mangifera indica</i> cv. Dashehari) under medium density planting	57
KULDEEP, ASHOK KUMAR SINGH and SHAILESH CHANDRA SHANKHDHAR	
Nutrients and antioxidants potential of star fruit (<i>Averrhoa carambola</i> L.)	66
ABHIMA K. MOORTHY and LAKSHMY P. S.	
Physico-chemical and anti-nutritional properties of predigested composite flour mix from corn and green gram	76
MANISHA RANI and ANJU KUMARI	
Standardisation and quality evaluation of coconut milk yoghurt	84
RINIYA THAJ and LAKSHMY P. S.	
Study on growth performance and morphometric traits of Chaugarkha goat kids in Almora hills of Uttarakhand	93
UMA NAULIA and B. N. SHAHI	

Bacterial isolates from tracheo-bronchial aspirates of healthy and pneumonic cattle ASMITA NARANG, CHARANJIT SINGH, MUDIT CHANDRA and DHIRAJ KUMAR GUPTA	99
Successful management of notoedric mange in two domestic cats: A case report ASMITA NARANG, GURPREET SINGH PREET, JASNIT SINGH and HARKIRAT SINGH	106
Dietary supplementation of formulated fish-specific mineral mixtures improved the growth, nutrient composition and health status of <i>Cyprinus carpio</i> fingerlings ABHED PANDEY, UDEYBIR SINGH CHAHAL and ANJU VIJAYAN	110
Impact of deep cryogenic treatment on microstructural and electrical properties of recycled aluminium alloys BIRENDRA SINGH KARKI and ANADI MISRA	118
Assessing farmers' attitudes and factors influencing livelihood diversification in Nainital District of Uttarakhand NEHA PANDEY, AMARDEEP and V.L.V. KAMESWARI	126
Perceived Benefits of Tribal Sub Plan (TSP) Project on tribal beneficiaries in Udham Singh Nagar District of Uttarakhand ARPITA SHARMA KANDPAL, JITENDRA KWATRA, VLV KAMESWARI and AMARDEEP	133

Assessing farmers' attitudes and factors influencing livelihood diversification in Nainital District of Uttarakhand

NEHA PANDEY*, AMARDEEP and V.L.V. KAMESWARI

Department of Agricultural Communication, College of Agriculture, G.B Pant University of Agriculture and Technology, Pantnagar-263145 (U.S. Nagar, Uttarakhand)

**Corresponding author's email id: nehaapandey612@gmail.com*

ABSTRACT: The livelihood diversification has emerged as a key strategy for enhancing the resilience and economic stability of rural households particularly in hill regions like Nainital district of Uttarakhand. This study therefore aims to assess the attitudes of farmers towards livelihood diversification and identify the key factors influencing their decision to diversify. This investigation focuses on farmers residing in the Nainital district of Uttarakhand, specifically their attitudes towards the diversification of livelihoods. To gather relevant data, a sample of (191) farmers were subjected to both structured and semi-structured interview methodologies. The study findings exhibit positive attitudes towards livelihood diversification. Key economic variables, such as insufficient financial resources and the necessity to alleviate risks associated with climate change, emerged as significant motivators for this shift. Furthermore, social and cultural factors such as familial support and the observed success of peers, were identified as influential elements driving the diversification process. Conversely, the study identified institutional obstacles that impede progress, namely limited access to credit and the inadequacy of government initiatives aimed at supporting diversification. Additionally, personal attributes, such as an entrepreneurial mindset and the willingness to undertake risks, play a critical role in shaping the decisions made by farmers. The insights from this research can be helpful to guide policymakers and agricultural extension agencies in formulating appropriate and relevant strategies to strengthen rural livelihoods and enhance farmers adaptive capacity and develop entrepreneurial competencies to facilitate the diversification in the face of economic and environmental uncertainties.

Keywords: Entrepreneurial mindset, institutional barriers, livelihood diversification, rural development, social and cultural influences

Agriculture has historically served as the predominant means of livelihood in rural areas. Nevertheless, particularly within the context of developing nations such as India, there has been a notable shift towards income diversification among farmers. This shift has been driven by numerous challenges confronting the agricultural sector, including climate change, land fragmentation, market fluctuations, and socio-economic pressures (Ellis, 2000). Livelihood diversification can be defined as the process through which rural households expand their income-generating activities beyond conventional agricultural practices. This may involve not only augmenting income through non-farm activities but also partaking in various farming-related enterprises (Barrett *et al.*, 2001). This strategy has gained recognition as a vital mechanism for bolstering resilience and mitigating vulnerability within rural communities, particularly in areas susceptible to environmental and economic

disruptions (Scoones, 2009). The state of Uttarakhand, specifically its rural districts such as Nainital, serves as an illustrative example of the urgent need for livelihood diversification. Uttarakhand, situated in the northern region of India, encompasses predominantly rural areas where a significant segment of the population relies on agriculture for sustenance. The agrarian economy, however, is experiencing considerable stress attributable to factors such as steep and fragmented landholdings, erratic rainfall patterns, frequent landslides, and rising temperatures (Sharma *et al.*, 2023). Compounding these challenges are issues related to limited irrigation facilities, inadequate infrastructure, and the migration of younger generations to urban centers in pursuit of enhanced employment prospects. Consequently, farmers in Uttarakhand are increasingly compelled to seek alternative livelihoods to either supplement or supplant traditional agricultural income.

The Nainital district, which is part of the Kumaon region, provides a compelling case study for analyzing farmers' perspectives on livelihood diversification. Historically, the economy of Nainital was predominantly agrarian, characterized by the cultivation of crops such as rice, wheat, pulses, and various fruits. However, in recent decades, agricultural productivity has been detrimentally impacted by climatic shifts, soil erosion, and alterations in crop patterns (Singh *et al.*, 2023). Additionally, demographic transformations due to migration have resulted in a scenario where younger individuals favour employment in urban settings or tourism-related industries, often leaving elder family members to oversee agricultural land. In light of these challenges, rural households have increasingly engaged in non-agricultural pursuits, which include tourism services, handicrafts, livestock farming, and small-scale industrial activities (Jha *et al.*, 2002). However, the inclination towards livelihood diversification among farmers is not solely dictated by economic factors. The decision-making process regarding diversification is significantly influenced by an intricate interplay of social, cultural, and institutional dynamics. While many farmers in Nainital have adopted alternative livelihoods as a strategy to mitigate agricultural risks and enhance household income, others demonstrate reluctance to abandon traditional farming practices. This reluctance may stem from social norms, entrenched family traditions, or a lack of awareness concerning non-farm opportunities. The successful implementation of livelihood diversification strategies is also contingent upon several factors, including access to education, opportunities for skills development, infrastructural support, availability of credit facilities, and effective market linkages (Chakrabarti *et al.*, 2017).

A thorough understanding of farmers' attitudes towards livelihood diversification in Nainital is essential for the formulation of policies and interventions aimed at fostering sustainable development within the region. The integration of non-farm livelihoods into the rural economy has the potential to facilitate economic stability, alleviate poverty, and strengthen the resilience of rural households against climate change and other external

challenges. Achieving this requires a detailed comprehension of the motivational and obstructive elements surrounding diversification, such as the perceived risks and benefits, the function of local institutions, and the impact of external entities, including governmental and non-governmental organizations (Bandyopadhyay *et al.*, 2021).

In light of the significance of this issue, the present study is designed to investigate farmer attitudes in the Nainital district of Uttarakhand regarding livelihood diversification. The specific objectives of this study are twofold: firstly, to evaluate the attitudes of farmers towards livelihood diversification, and secondly, to identify the primary factors influencing the decision-making processes of farmers concerning diversification. By elucidating the underlying drivers of livelihood diversification, this research intends to contribute to the broader discourse on rural development and provide actionable recommendations aimed at enhancing the livelihoods of farmers in Nainital.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

The objective of the present study was to evaluate the perspectives of farmers regarding livelihood diversification in the Nainital district. A sample comprising 191 respondents was determined through the Probability Proportional to Size (PPS) method, facilitating the representation of farmers from all the villages. In order to ensure random selection, three villages within the Haldwani block were chosen utilizing simple random sampling, from which respondents were identified in accordance with the proportional size of the farming population. The first objective centered on the identification of farmers' attitudes towards livelihood diversification, for which a structured interview schedule was employed. This schedule was based on a scale developed by Reddy *et al.*, 2020 encompassing multiple dimensions of farmer attitudes and tailored to the specific local context. Regarding the second objective, which aimed to discern the principal factors affecting farmers' decisions to diversify their livelihoods, a structured schedule was meticulously devised. This schedule incorporated an array of inquiries designed to capture influences such as

economic circumstances, accessibility to resources, and social dynamics. Data were gathered employing a 5-point Likert scale, thereby enabling a nuanced analysis of the determinants influencing decisions related to livelihood diversification.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Attitudes of farmers towards livelihood diversification

The involvement of farmers in diversification practices is significantly influenced by their attitudes, which ultimately shape their perception of diversification as a viable strategy for enhancing their livelihoods. Consequently, a thorough examination of farmers' attitudes towards livelihood diversification is warranted.

As illustrated in Table 1, the attitudes of respondents concerning livelihood diversification reveal informative trends. A significant majority, accounting for 52.36%, exhibited a favourable attitude towards the concept of diversification. This was complemented by an almost equally substantial segment of respondents, amounting to 47.64%, who demonstrated a more favourable attitude. Notably, the data indicate that none of the respondents expressed a less favourable attitude towards livelihood diversification, suggesting a general acceptance and positive outlook regarding this approach.

From the above data it can be inferred that a vast majority of farmers had favourable to more favourable attitude towards livelihood diversification. The possible reason for this may be that most of the farmers embrace diversification as a strategy to cope with risks (e.g., climate variability, market fluctuations) and when cropping income is insufficient, farmers seek additional sources through

diversification. Similar results were obtained in research by [Bhanu (2006), Jha *et al.* (2021), Verma *et al.* (2016), and Sangamesh (2006)], in which majority of participants exhibited favourable attitudes.

Key factors influencing the decision of farmers

This section interprets the results of the factor influencing decision to diversify their livelihoods. The factors are categorized into five broad groups: Economic Conditions, Environmental Challenges, Social and Cultural Influences, Institutional and Policy Barriers, and Personal and Psychological Factors. Data has been presented in Table 2.

Economic Conditions

The findings suggest a substantial influence of economic factors on the motivation of farmers to pursue livelihood diversification. The statement receiving the highest mean score, "Diversification helps reduce financial risks caused by unpredictable weather patterns and fluctuating market prices" (mean score: 4.03), indicates that farmers perceive diversification as a vital strategy for mitigating financial risks linked to agricultural volatility. Additionally, the statement with a mean score of 3.89, "My income from traditional farming is insufficient, prompting me to seek alternative sources of income," highlights the financial inadequacies inherent in traditional farming as a significant driver for farmers to explore diversified income opportunities.

These observations are consistent with prior research that underscores the role of income diversification in addressing economic stress and vulnerability within rural farming communities [Carter, 2011, Ellis, 2000]. The unpredictable characteristics of agricultural practices, exacerbated by climate change and market fluctuations, necessitate that farmers increasingly seek alternative livelihoods to secure their financial stability. Consequently, the recognition of diversification as an essential response to economic challenges has gained prominence among farmers, further reinforcing the connection between economic factors and livelihood strategies.

Table 1: Distribution of respondents on the basis of attitude towards livelihood diversification (n=191)

S.No.	Age	Frequency	Percentage
1	Less Favourable (less than 35)	0	0.00
2	Favourable (35 to 55)	100	52.36
3	More Favourable (more than 55)	91	47.64
	Total	191	100.00

Table 2: Factors influencing decision to diversify livelihoods

S. No.	Factors influencing the decision	Mean Score
A	Economic Conditions	
1	Diversification helps reduce financial risks caused by unpredictable weather patterns and fluctuating market prices	4.03
2	My income from traditional farming is insufficient, prompting me to seek alternative sources of income	3.89
B	Environmental Challenges	
3	Climate change and unpredictable weather patterns push me to diversify my livelihood to reduce agricultural risks.	3.25
4	Soil erosion and land degradation are significant barriers to sustaining traditional farming and lead me to seek non-farming opportunities.	2.39
C	Social and Cultural Influences	
5	Support from my family plays an important role in my decision to diversify my livelihood.	4.03
6	The success of my peers in diversifying their livelihoods encourages me to consider similar options.	3.01
7	Cultural norms and traditional gender roles sometimes limit my ability to diversify my livelihood.	4.594
D	Institutional and Policy Barriers	
8	Limited access to credit and financial support makes it difficult for me to invest in non-farm activities.	4
9	Government schemes and programs for livelihood diversification are not accessible or helpful.	4.57
10	Poor market linkages and inadequate infrastructure limit my ability to sell diversified products or start new businesses.	3.97
E	Personal and Psychological Factors	
11	My level of risk tolerance influences my decision to diversify; I am more willing to take risks in adopting new livelihood strategies.	3
12	Having an entrepreneurial mindset motivates me to explore new income sources beyond traditional farming.	4.36

Environmental Challenges

The analysis of environmental challenges reveals that the statement “Climate change and unpredictable weather patterns push me to diversify my livelihood to reduce agricultural risks” received the highest mean score of 3.25. This score indicates that, although climate change serves as a recognized motivator for the diversification of livelihoods, its impact, when compared to economic factors, is somewhat diminished. This finding suggests that while the influence of climate change is acknowledged, it may not be as acutely felt by farmers as the pressures stemming from economic considerations.

In contrast, the statement “Soil erosion and land degradation are significant barriers to sustaining traditional farming and lead me to seek non-farming opportunities” garnered a relatively low mean score of 2.39. This low rating implies that, despite the acknowledged negative effects of environmental factors such as land degradation on agricultural productivity, they may not act as primary drivers for diversification. It appears that farmers do not perceive these environmental issues as sufficiently

severe to independently motivate a transition towards alternative livelihoods, albeit, they may exacerbate existing economic constraints.

These observations support existing literature that elucidates the intricate interplay between environmental challenges and livelihood diversification. Research indicates that external shocks, such as extreme weather events, may incentivize farmers to explore alternative livelihoods; however, the predominant role of financial necessity in guiding these decisions is evident (Reardon *et al.*, 2007). Consequently, the complexities surrounding the interaction of environmental and economic factors warrant further investigation to better understand their respective influences on agricultural diversification.

Social and Cultural Influences

In the realm of social and cultural influences, it has been determined that familial support and the influence of peers significantly impact the decisions made by farmers regarding diversification of their livelihoods. High mean scores were assigned to two particular statements: “Support from my family plays

an important role in my decision to diversify my livelihood” (mean score: 4.03) and “The success of my peers in diversifying their livelihoods encourages me to consider similar options” (mean score: 3.01). This data suggests that the social milieu within agricultural communities fosters an environment that strongly supports diversification, with farmers frequently depending on their family and peers as key sources of motivation and encouragement.

Conversely, the cultural dimension presents a compelling contrast; the statement, “Cultural norms and traditional gender roles sometimes limit my ability to diversify my livelihood,” received the highest mean score in this analysis (4.59). This observation underscores the profound impact of cultural norms and gender roles, which frequently impede diversification efforts. Traditional expectations, especially prevalent in rural contexts, may hinder women’s participation in alternative livelihood strategies, despite economic or environmental imperatives advocating for diversification. Such cultural barriers are often deeply entrenched and necessitate substantial transformations in societal perceptions and policy frameworks to be effectively addressed.

The findings align with existing literature that elucidates how cultural norms, particularly those associated with gender, shape the economic choices and opportunities accessible to rural populations (Agarwal, 2010; Moser, 1995)

Institutional and Policy Barriers

The examination of institutional and policy barriers has identified significant challenges faced by farmers in their efforts to diversify. Primary among these challenges is the restricted access to financial resources, coupled with the ineffectiveness of governmental schemes, which have been recognized as fundamental impediments. The statement receiving the highest mean score of 4.57, “Government schemes and programs for livelihood diversification are not accessible or helpful,” illustrates widespread dissatisfaction regarding governmental interventions. Such interventions are perceived as either inaccessible, insufficient, or misaligned with the specific needs of farmers striving for diversification. Furthermore, the

statement reflecting a mean score of 4.00, “Limited access to credit and financial support makes it difficult for me to invest in non-farm activities,” emphasizes the critical role of financial capital in facilitating the diversification of livelihoods. The challenges associated with accessing credit serve to obstruct farmers from pursuing additional income-generating endeavors beyond traditional agricultural practices. These observations align with the findings of previous research that highlights the impact of institutional constraints, including inadequate access to credit and insufficient policy support, on the ability of farmers to diversify their income sources (Ghosh and Ghoshal, 2022). The establishment of effective and accessible governmental programs is essential for supporting diversification strategies, particularly when addressing the financial barriers that impede farmers’ progress.

Personal and Psychological Factors

The analysis of personal and psychological factors that influence diversification within agricultural contexts reveals that an entrepreneurial mindset serves as a significant motivating force. A high mean score of 4.36 is associated with the statement: “Having an entrepreneurial mindset motivates me to explore new income sources beyond traditional farming.” This indicates that individuals possessing a proactive and business-oriented approach are more inclined to pursue alternative livelihood opportunities.

In contrast, the assessment of the influence of risk tolerance on diversification decisions is illustrated by the statement: “My level of risk tolerance influences my decision to diversify; I am more willing to take risks in adopting new livelihood strategies,” which recorded a mean score of 3.00. This lower score suggests that the role of risk tolerance in influencing diversification choices is comparatively limited. It is evident that while some individuals may embrace risk as a means to diversify, others may opt to adhere to conventional farming practices, particularly in contexts characterized by financial instability.

These findings illuminate the multifaceted nature of decision-making processes in rural agricultural communities, where psychological elements such as

entrepreneurial motivation and risk tolerance play integral roles that can both promote and impede diversification efforts (McElwee, 2012).

CONCLUSION

The investigation into the attitudes and determinants influencing livelihood diversification in the Nainital district reveals a range of significant considerations. A predominant majority of farmers exhibit positive attitudes towards diversification, perceiving it as a viable approach to mitigate the economic uncertainties inherent in traditional agricultural practices. The primary drivers identified for this diversification include unfavorable economic conditions, specifically the limited income derived from agriculture compounded by the unpredictable fluctuations of climate and market forces. In addition to economic factors, social and cultural influences also play a critical role in promoting diversification. Family support and the achievements of peers serve as motivating factors that encourage farmers to adopt diversified strategies. However, cultural norms and established gender roles emerge as substantial obstacles, particularly impacting women in rural communities. Furthermore, institutional barriers, characterized by inadequate access to credit, ineffective government initiatives, and insufficient infrastructure, critically hinder farmers' abilities to engage in livelihood diversification. While an entrepreneurial mindset is acknowledged as a significant motivating factor, it is noteworthy that the farmers' risk tolerance does not emerge as a major influence in the decision-making processes pertaining to the shift away from traditional farming methodologies. Consequently, the implications for policymakers are clear. It is essential for policymakers to cultivate enabling environments that address financial limitations, enhance infrastructural development, and implement accessible and targeted support programs aimed at facilitating livelihood diversification. Moreover, it is imperative to confront the social and cultural impediments, particularly those associated with gender dynamics, to ensure that all farmers, irrespective of gender, can avail themselves of the benefits associated with livelihood diversification strategies.

REFERENCES

- Agarwal, B. (2010). Rethinking agricultural production collectivities. *Economic and Political Weekly*, 64-78.
- Bandyopadhyay, A., Haile, B., Azzarri, C. and Somé, J. (2021). Analyzing the drivers of household dietary diversity: evidence from Burkina Faso. *Food and Nutrition Bulletin*, 42(4): 530-550.
- Bhanu, V. L. (2006). *Study on aspirations of rural youth and their attitude towards rural development activities in Dharwad district of Karnataka state* (Master's thesis). University of Agricultural Sciences, Dharwad.
- Barrett, C. B., Reardon, T. and Webb, P. (2001). Nonfarm income diversification and household livelihood strategies in rural Africa: concepts, dynamics, and policy implications. *Food Policy*, 26(4): 315-331.
- Carter, S. (2011). The rewards of entrepreneurship: Exploring the incomes, wealth, and economic well-being of entrepreneurial households. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 35(1): 39-55.
- Chakrabarti, R., Subramanian, K. and Meka, S. (2017). Localization of FDI flows: evidence on infrastructure as a critical determinant. *Journal of Law, Finance, and Accounting*, 2(1):205-246.
- Ellis, F. (2000). *Rural livelihoods and diversity in developing countries*. Oxford university press.
- Ghosh, M. and Ghosal, S. (2022). Households' choices and their drivers to rural non-farm livelihood diversification in West Bengal, India. *Journal of Asian and African Studies*, 57(6), 1158-1178.
- Jha, R. K., Sharma, G. R., & Pandey, R. K. (2002). Appropriateness of training for rural youth. *Indian Journal of Extension Education*, 38(3-4), 214-216.
- Lakshmana Reddy, B.S., M.S. Nataraju and Lakshminarayan, M.T. 2020. A Scale to Measure the Attitude of Farmers towards Livelihood Diversification. *Int. J. Curr.*

- Microbiol. App. Sci.*, 9(05): 2215-2222. doi: <https://doi.org/10.20546/ijemas.2020.905.252>
- McElwee, G. and Smith, R. (2012). Classifying the strategic capability of farmers: a segmentation framework. *International Journal of Entrepreneurial Venturing*, 4(2): 111-131.
- Moser, C. O. (1995). Women, gender and urban development policy: challenges for current and future research. *Third World Planning Review*, 17(2): 223.
- Reardon, T., Berdegúé, J., Barrett, C. B. and Stamoulis, K. (2007). Household income diversification into rural nonfarm activities. *Transforming the rural nonfarm economy: opportunities and threats in the developing world*, 2(4): 115-140.
- Scoones, I. (2009). Livelihoods perspectives and rural development. *The Journal of Peasant Studies*, 36(1): 171–196. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03066150902820503>
- Sangamesh, P. S. (2006). *A comparative profile analysis of rural youth in rainfed and irrigated tracts of Bagalkot district* (Master's thesis). University of Agricultural Sciences, Dharwad.
- Sharma, U. C., Datta, M., & Sharma, V. (2023). Land use and management. In *Soils in the Hindu Kush Himalayas: Management for Agricultural Land Use*. Cham: Springer International Publishing, Pp. 295-462.
- Jha, Shivani, Kashyap, S.K., Ansari, M. A., Kameswari, VLV, Singh, Smriti, and Goswamy, Pragya. (2021). Attitude of Farm Women Towards ICT Tools based Extension Services. *Indian Research Journal of Extension Education*, 21(1): 96-98
- Singh, P., Singh, S. and Dubey, R. S. (2023). Climate Change Impacts on Agriculture: Crop Productivity and Food Security. In *Climate Change and Sustainable Development*, CRC Press, Pp. 61-86.
- Verma, A. P., Ansari, M. A., Ranjan, R., Raghuvanshi, Rupan, Patel, Diksha, and Bhatt, Archana (2016). Farmers' Attitude towards e-Choupal: A Critical Investigation in Gonda District of Uttar Pradesh. *International Journal of Agriculture Sciences*, 8 (49): 2076-78.

Received: December 31, 2024

Accepted: April 08, 2024