REFERENCES

Alexandratos, N., 2010, *World Agriculture Towards 2010: An FAO Study*, Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations and John Wiley and Sons Ltd, England.

Balasuriya, L. and Hughes, R., 2003, *Education and Employment: Sri Lanka at the crossroads*, 9th International conference on Sri Lanka Studies, Organization of Professional Associations, Colombo, Sri Lanka.

Bennell, P., 2007, *Promoting Livelihood Opportunities for Rural Youth*.

Central Bank of Sri Lanka, 2012, *Annual Report - 2012*, Colombo: Central Bank of Sri Lanka

Chandrasiri, C. and Karunagoda K., *Youth Perception on Farming as an Occupation: Case Study in Polonnaruwa District*, Annals of the Sri Lanka Department of Agriculture.

Department of Immigration and Emigration Sri Lanka, 2013, [online] Available at: http://www.immigration.gov.lk [Accessed: 10 September 2013].

Department of Labour Sri Lanka, 2013, [online] Available at: http://www.labourdept.gov.lk [Accessed: 10 September 2013].

Elder, S., 2009, *ILO School-to-work transition survey: A methodological guide*, Module 4: Key indicators of youth labour markets: Concepts, Definitions and Tabulations, International Labour Office, Geneva.

Future of Farming in Sri Lanka, 2013, [online] Available at: http://groundviews.org/2011/06/25/future-of-farming-in-sri-lanka/ [Accessed 30 August 2013].

Global Agriculture Industry, 2013, [online] Available at: http://www.businessvibes.com/blog/industry-insight-global-agriculture-industry [Accessed: 5 September 2013].

Hettige, S.T. and Mayer, M., 2002, *Sri Lankan Youth: Challenges and Responses*, Friedrich Ebert Stiftung, Colombo, Sri Lanka.

Ibargüen, C., 2005, *Youth Perceptions: Exploring Results from the Poverty and Youth Survey*, Working Paper Series No. 5 – 2005, Colombo: Centre for Poverty Analysis.

Labour Force Survey, 2011, Department of Census and Statistics, *Annual Report - 2011*, Colombo: Department of Census and Statistics.

"Let us Cultivate and uplift the Nation": National Campaign to Motivate Domestic Food Production 2007-2010, Colombo: Ministry of Agricultural Development and Agrarian Services.

Levy, A., 1996, *Youth in Ceylon*, Singapore.

Ministry of Education Sri Lanka, 2013, [online] Available at: http://www.moe.gov.lk [Accessed: 10 September 2013].

Ministry of Youth Affairs and Skills Development Sri Lanka, 2013, [online] Available at: http://www.youthskillsmin.gov.lk/web/ [Accessed: 10 September 2013].

Muhammad-Lawal, A., Omotesho, O.A., Falola, A., 2009, *Technical Efficiency of Youth Participation in Agriculture: A Case Study of the Youth-In-Agriculture Programme in Ondo State*, South Western Nigeria, Nigerian Journal of Agriculture, Food and Environment 5(1):20-26.

National Accounts of Sri Lanka, 2011, Department of Census and Statistics, Colombo: Department of Census and Statistics, [online] Available at: http://www.statistics.gov.lk/national_accounts/AB2011/quick_tables.pdf [Accessed 15 August 2013].

National Agriculture Policy Sri Lanka, 2010, Ministry of Agriculture Development and Agrarian Services, Sri Lanka.

Needs of youth in Sri Lanka, 1984, National Youth Services Council, Maharagama, Sri Lanka.

Nigeria Strategy Support Programme: "Encouraging Youth's Involvement in Agricultural Production and Processing", 2010, Policy Note No.29, International Food Policy Research Institute, Nigeria.

OECD-FAO Agricultural Outlook, 2012-2021, Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO), OECD (Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development).

Report of the Presidential Commission on Youth, 1990, Presidential Commission on Youth, Gramodaya Centre: Colombo, Sri Lanka.

Sharma, A., 2007, *The Changing Agricultural Demography of India: Evidence from a Rural Youth Perception Survey*, International Journal of Rural Management, 3(1), 27-41, Sage Publications, Los Angeles/London/New Delhi/Singapore.

The World Bank, Agriculture and Rural Development, 2013, [online] Available at: http://data.worldbank.org/topic/agriculture-and-rural-development [Accessed 27 August 2013].

United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, 2013 [online] Available at: http://www.unesco.org/new/en/social-and-human-sciences/themes/youth/youth-definition/ [Accessed: 12 September 2013].

World Wildlife, Sustainable Agriculture, 2013, [online] Available at: http://worldwildlife.org/industries/sustainable-agriculture [Accessed 15 August 2013].

Wuensch, K.L., 2011, *Binary Logistic Regression with PASW/SPSS*.

APPENDIX 1

Results of Chi-Square Tests between Youth Satisfaction and Predictor Variables obtained from SPSS

1) Age * Satisfaction on Agriculture Cross tabulation

		Youth Satisfaction on Agriculture					
		Satisfy		**Dissatisfy**		**Total**	
		Count	Column N %	Count	Column N %	Count	Column N %
Age	**15-19**	19	33.9%	49	30.1%	68	31.1%
	20-24	13	23.2%	39	23.9%	52	23.7%
	25-29	24	42.9%	75	46.0%	99	45.2%
	Total	56	100.0%	163	100.0%	219	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests			
	Value	**df**	**Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)**
Pearson Chi-Square	.301ᵃ	2	.860
Likelihood Ratio	.299	2	.861
Linear-by-Linear Association	.276	1	.600
N of Valid Cases	219		
a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 13.30.			

2) Gender * Satisfaction on Agriculture Cross tabulation

		Youth Satisfaction on Agriculture					
		Satisfy		**Dissatisfy**		**Total**	
		Count	Column N %	Count	Column N %	Count	Column N %
Gender	**Female**	14	25.0%	44	27.0%	58	26.5%
	Male	42	75.0%	119	73.0%	161	73.5%
	Total	56	100.0%	163	100.0%	219	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests					
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	.085[a]	1	.770		
Continuity Correction[b]	.014	1	.907		
Likelihood Ratio	.086	1	.770		
Fisher's Exact Test				.861	.459
Linear-by-Linear Association	.085	1	.771		
N of Valid Cases	219				
a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 14.83.					
b. Computed only for a 2x2 table					

3) Marital Status * Satisfaction on Agriculture Cross tabulation

		Youth Satisfaction on Agriculture					
		Satisfy		Dissatisfy		Total	
		Count	Column N %	Count	Column N %	Count	Column N %
Marital Status	Married	21	37.5%	93	57.1%	114	52.1%
	Unmarried	35	62.5%	70	42.9%	105	47.9%
	Total	56	100.0%	163	100.0%	219	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests					
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	6.386[a]	1	.012		
Continuity Correction[b]	5.627	1	.018		
Likelihood Ratio	6.424	1	.011		
Fisher's Exact Test				.013	.009
Linear-by-Linear Association	6.357	1	.012		
N of Valid Cases	219				
a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 26.85.					
b. Computed only for a 2x2 table					

4) Education Level * Satisfaction on Agriculture Cross tabulation

		Youth Satisfaction on Agriculture					
		Satisfy		Dissatisfy		Total	
		Count	Column N %	Count	Column N %	Count	Column N %
Education Level	Less Educated	36	64.3%	47	28.8%	83	37.9%
	Educated	20	35.7%	116	71.2%	136	62.1%
	Total	56	100.0%	163	100.0%	219	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests					
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	22.257[a]	1	.000		
Continuity Correction[b]	20.776	1	.000		
Likelihood Ratio	21.831	1	.000		
Fisher's Exact Test				.000	.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	22.155	1	.000		
N of Valid Cases	219				
a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 21.22.					
b. Computed only for a 2x2 table					

5) Monthly Income * Satisfaction on Agriculture Cross tabulation

		Youth Satisfaction on Agriculture					
		Satisfy		Dissatisfy		Total	
		Count	Column N %	Count	Column N %	Count	Column N %
Monthly Income	Income<30000	39	69.6%	119	73.0%	158	72.1%
	Income>30000	17	30.4%	44	27.0%	61	27.9%
	Total	56	100.0%	163	100.0%	219	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests					
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	.235[a]	1	.628		
Continuity Correction[b]	.097	1	.755		
Likelihood Ratio	.232	1	.630		
Fisher's Exact Test				.610	.373
Linear-by-Linear Association	.234	1	.629		
N of Valid Cases	219				
a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 15.60.					
b. Computed only for a 2x2 table					

6) Agricultural Experience * Satisfaction on Agriculture Cross tabulation

		Youth Satisfaction on Agriculture					
		Satisfy		Dissatisfy		Total	
		Count	Column N %	Count	Column N %	Count	Column N %
Experience in Agricultural Activities	Exp<10	46	82.1%	143	87.7%	189	86.3%
	Exp>10	10	17.9%	20	12.3%	30	13.7%
	Total	56	100.0%	163	100.0%	219	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests					
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	1.101[a]	1	.294		
Continuity Correction[b]	.679	1	.410		
Likelihood Ratio	1.049	1	.306		
Fisher's Exact Test				.367	.203
Linear-by-Linear Association	1.096	1	.295		
N of Valid Cases	219				
a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 7.67.					
b. Computed only for a 2x2 table					

7) High Land Availability * Satisfaction on Agriculture Cross tabulation

		Youth Satisfaction on Agriculture					
		Satisfy		Dissatisfy		Total	
		Count	Column N %	Count	Column N %	Count	Column N %
High Land Availability	Not at all sufficient	3	5.4%	48	29.4%	51	23.3%
	Slightly sufficient	19	33.9%	82	50.3%	101	46.1%
	Very sufficient	33	58.9%	31	19.0%	64	29.2%
	Not needed	1	1.8%	2	1.2%	3	1.4%
	Total	56	100.0%	163	100.0%	219	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests			
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	35.624[a]	3	.000
Likelihood Ratio	36.049	3	.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	30.737	1	.000
N of Valid Cases	219		
a. 2 cells (25.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .77.			

8) Paddy Land Availability * Satisfaction on Agriculture Cross tabulation

		Youth Satisfaction on Agriculture					
		Satisfy		Dissatisfy		Total	
		Count	Column N %	Count	Column N %	Count	Column N %
Paddy Land Availability	Not at all sufficient	5	8.9%	38	23.3%	43	19.6%
	Slightly sufficient	26	46.4%	90	55.2%	116	53.0%
	Very sufficient	23	41.1%	32	19.6%	55	25.1%
	Not needed	2	3.6%	3	1.8%	5	2.3%
	Total	56	100.0%	163	100.0%	219	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests			
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	13.175[a]	3	.004
Likelihood Ratio	13.156	3	.004
Linear-by-Linear Association	12.111	1	.001
N of Valid Cases	219		
a. 2 cells (25.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 1.28.			

9) Agricultural Machineries * Satisfaction on Agriculture Cross tabulation

		Youth Satisfaction on Agriculture					
		Satisfy		Dissatisfy		Total	
		Count	Column N %	Count	Column N %	Count	Column N %
Agricultural Machineries	Not at all sufficient	8	14.3%	13	8.0%	21	9.6%
	Slightly sufficient	33	58.9%	104	63.8%	137	62.6%
	Very sufficient	11	19.6%	30	18.4%	41	18.7%
	Not needed	4	7.1%	16	9.8%	20	9.1%
	Total	56	100.0%	163	100.0%	219	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests			
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	2.249[a]	3	.522
Likelihood Ratio	2.126	3	.547
Linear-by-Linear Association	.785	1	.375
N of Valid Cases	219		
a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 5.11.			

10) Agricultural Inputs * Satisfaction on Agriculture Cross tabulation

| | | Youth Satisfaction on Agriculture | | | | | |
| | | Satisfy | | Dissatisfy | | Total | |
		Count	Column N %	Count	Column N %	Count	Column N %
Agricultural Inputs	**Not at all sufficient**	3	5.4%	3	1.8%	6	2.7%
	Slightly sufficient	26	46.4%	130	79.8%	156	71.2%
	Very sufficient	27	48.2%	23	14.1%	50	22.8%
	Not needed	0	0.0%	7	4.3%	7	3.2%
	Total	56	100.0%	163	100.0%	219	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests			
	Value	**df**	**Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)**
Pearson Chi-Square	32.018[a]	3	.000
Likelihood Ratio	31.124	3	.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	6.406	1	.011
N of Valid Cases	219		

a. 3 cells (37.5%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 1.53.

11) Financial Facilities * Satisfaction on Agriculture Cross tabulation

| | | Youth Satisfaction on Agriculture | | | | | |
| | | Satisfy | | Dissatisfy | | Total | |
		Count	Column N %	Count	Column N %	Count	Column N %
Financial Facilities	**Not at all sufficient**	3	5.4%	12	7.4%	15	6.8%
	Slightly sufficient	42	75.0%	123	75.5%	165	75.3%
	Very sufficient	11	19.6%	26	16.0%	37	16.9%
	Not needed	0	0.0%	2	1.2%	2	0.9%
	Total	56	100.0%	163	100.0%	219	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests			
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	1.269[a]	3	.736
Likelihood Ratio	1.766	3	.622
Linear-by-Linear Association	.168	1	.682
N of Valid Cases	219		
a. 3 cells (37.5%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .51.			

12) Labour * Satisfaction on Agriculture Cross tabulation

		Youth Satisfaction on Agriculture					
		Satisfy		Dissatisfy		Total	
		Count	Column N %	Count	Column N %	Count	Column N %
Labour	**Not at all sufficient**	0	0.0%	5	3.1%	5	2.3%
	Slightly sufficient	13	23.2%	97	59.5%	110	50.2%
	Very sufficient	43	76.8%	57	35.0%	100	45.7%
	Not needed	0	0.0%	4	2.5%	4	1.8%
	Total	56	100.0%	163	100.0%	219	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests			
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	29.985[a]	3	.000
Likelihood Ratio	32.425	3	.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	20.013	1	.000
N of Valid Cases	219		
a. 4 cells (50.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 1.02.			

13) Water/Irrigation Facilities * Satisfaction on Agriculture Cross tabulation

| | | Youth Satisfaction on Agriculture | | | | | |
| | | Satisfy | | Dissatisfy | | Total | |
		Count	Column N %	Count	Column N %	Count	Column N %
Water/ Irrigation Facilities	Not at all sufficient	4	7.1%	12	7.4%	16	7.3%
	Slightly sufficient	20	35.7%	94	57.7%	114	52.1%
	Very sufficient	32	57.1%	53	32.5%	85	38.8%
	Not needed	0	0.0%	4	2.5%	4	1.8%
	Total	56	100.0%	163	100.0%	219	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests			
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	11.750[a]	3	.008
Likelihood Ratio	12.540	3	.006
Linear-by-Linear Association	4.017	1	.045
N of Valid Cases	219		
a. 3 cells (37.5%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 1.02.			

14) Agriculture Extension * Satisfaction on Agriculture Cross tabulation

| | | Youth Satisfaction on Agriculture | | | | | |
| | | Satisfy | | Dissatisfy | | Total | |
		Count	Column N %	Count	Column N %	Count	Column N %
Agricultural Extension Services	Not at all sufficient	17	30.4%	33	20.2%	50	22.8%
	Slightly sufficient	30	53.6%	86	52.8%	116	53.0%
	Very sufficient	9	16.1%	38	23.3%	47	21.5%
	Not needed	0	0.0%	6	3.7%	6	2.7%
	Total	56	100.0%	163	100.0%	219	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests			
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	4.952[a]	3	.175
Likelihood Ratio	6.387	3	.094
Linear-by-Linear Association	4.601	1	.032
N of Valid Cases	219		
a. 2 cells (25.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 1.53.			

15) Training * Satisfaction on Agriculture Cross tabulation

		Youth Satisfaction on Agriculture					
		Satisfy		Dissatisfy		Total	
		Count	Column N %	Count	Column N %	Count	Column N %
Training	Not at all sufficient	33	58.9%	107	65.6%	140	63.9%
	Slightly sufficient	17	30.4%	47	28.8%	64	29.2%
	Very sufficient	6	10.7%	7	4.3%	13	5.9%
	Not needed	0	0.0%	2	1.2%	2	0.9%
	Total	56	100.0%	163	100.0%	219	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests			
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	3.908[a]	3	.272
Likelihood Ratio	4.068	3	.254
Linear-by-Linear Association	1.128	1	.288
N of Valid Cases	219		
a. 3 cells (37.5%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .51.			

16) Market Facilities * Satisfaction on Agriculture Cross tabulation

| | | Youth Satisfaction on Agriculture | | | | | |
| | | Satisfy | | Dissatisfy | | Total | |
		Count	Column N %	Count	Column N %	Count	Column N %
Market Facilities	**Not at all sufficient**	4	7.1%	16	9.8%	20	9.1%
	Slightly sufficient	34	60.7%	116	71.2%	150	68.5%
	Very sufficient	17	30.4%	20	12.3%	37	16.9%
	Not needed	1	1.8%	11	6.7%	12	5.5%
	Total	56	100.0%	163	100.0%	219	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests			
	Value	**df**	**Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)**
Pearson Chi-Square	10.935[a]	3	.012
Likelihood Ratio	10.497	3	.015
Linear-by-Linear Association	1.096	1	.295
N of Valid Cases	219		
a. 1 cells (12.5%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 3.07.			