

## Information Management Behaviour of Sugarcane Growers in Cuddalore District.

V. MANGAIYARKARASI<sup>1</sup>, V. BALAMURUGAN<sup>2</sup> AND K. SUSEENDRAN<sup>3</sup>

1. P.G Scholar, Department of Agricultural Extension, Faculty of Agriculture, Annamalai University, Annamalainagar,608002, Chidambaram, Tamilnadu.
2. Assistant Professor, Department of Agricultural Extension, Faculty of Agriculture, Annamalai University, Annamalainagar,608002, Chidambaram, Tamilnadu.
3. Assistant Professor, Department of Agronomy, Faculty of Agriculture, Annamalai University, Annamalainagar, 608002, Chidambaram.Tamilnadu

### Abstract

The present study was conducted in Keerapalayam block of Cuddalore district with 60 sugarcane growers, nine independent variables were selected for the study. Information management behaviour was the dependent variable of the study. Data were collected by using the well structured and pre-tested interview schedule. Majority of the respondents were middle to old aged with higher secondary level education. They had agriculture as their primary occupation, possessed marginal holdings with low area under sugarcane cultivation. They had low level of extension agency contact, mass media exposure and risk orientation. Regarding information management behaviour, 60.00 per cent of them had low information acquisition behaviour and dissemination behaviour. Three-fourth of them had low to medium information processing behaviour. The overall information management behaviour was found to be low among the sugarcane growers.

**Key words:** Information Management, Information acquisition, Information processing, Information dissemination, Sugarcane growers.

### Introduction

Information explosion in modern technologies had created a unique situation, making the recipients unable to understand and cope up with the vast amount of information .There is a gap between those who use ideas and those who produce them.Information management is an activity of primarily increase the knowledge level of sugarcane farmers, secondly it reduce or decreases uncertainty for decision-making process and thirdly, it can serve as representation of situation. Agricultural information management was defined as the process of identifying and collection of information on agricultural technologies of originating, storing, updating and retrieving it whenever necessary to process, manipulate and disseminate the processed information to various users. The information management behaviour has been conceptualized as a composite measure of information seeking, evaluation, preservation, utilization and dissemination behaviour of the individual growers.

### Material and method:

The study was conducted in Keerapalayam block of Cuddalore district of Tamilnadu. A sample size of 60 respondents was selected from three selected villages namely Valaikollai, Vayalur, and Kandakumaran by using the Proportionate random sampling technique. Nine independent variables were selected for studying the characteristics of the respondents. Information management behaviour was the dependent variable of the study. This referred to aggregate of information acquisition behaviour, information processing behaviour, information dissemination behaviour of the farmers on sugarcane technologies. Information management behaviour of the respondents was measured by using the scoring procedure adopted by kasidurai (2017). The data were collected by using the well structured and pre- tested interview schedule. The collected data were analyzed and interpreted by using the percentage analysis.

### Results and Discussion

#### 1. Age:

The data on distribution of respondents according to their age are presented in Table 1.

**Table 1. Distribution of respondents according to their age**

(n=60)

S. No	Category	Number of respondents	Per cent
1	Young	17	28.33
2	Middle	22	36.67
3	Old	21	35.00
	<b>Total</b>	<b>60</b>	<b>100.00</b>

The data in Table 1 reveals that majority of the respondents (36.67 per cent) were middle aged, followed by old age (35.00 per cent) and young aged (28.33 per cent) categories. This might be due to the nature of sample selected for the study.

#### 2. Educational Status

The results on distribution of respondents according to their educational status are presented in Table 2.

**Table 2. Distribution of respondents according to their educational status**

(n=60)

S. No	Category	Number of respondents	Per cent
1	Illiterate	-	-
2	Primary	-	-
3	Middle	13	21.67
4	Higher secondary	32	53.33
5	Collegiate	15	25.00
	<b>Total</b>	<b>60</b>	<b>100.00</b>

It could be observed from Table 2 that a little more than half the proportion of the respondent (53.33 per cent) had higher secondary education followed by one fourth of the respondents (25.00 per cent) who possessed collegiate education. One Fifth of the respondents (21.67 per cent) were found to possess middle school level education. None of the respondents was found under the categories of illiterate and primary level. This might be due to the presence of adequate number of higher secondary schools within easy reach.

### 3. Occupational Status

The results on distribution of respondents according to their occupational status are presented in Table 3.

**Table 3. Distribution of respondents according to their occupational status**

(n=60)

S. No	Category	Number of respondents	Per cent
1	Agriculture as primary	46	76.67
2	Agriculture as secondary	14	23.30
	<b>Total</b>	<b>60</b>	<b>100.00</b>

It could be observed from Table 3 that most of the respondents (76.67 per cent) were found to have agriculture as their primary occupation. Respondents with agriculture as secondary occupation contributes only a limited portion (23.33 per cent) .It could be concluded that majority of the respondents depend only on agriculture for their family income. There are no industries in the study area and most of the villages are hamlets without any basic infrastructure facilities like roads, bus services etc. Hence, there was no option for them to get any other job, other than agriculture.

### 4. Farm Size

The results on distribution of respondents according to their farm size are presented in Table 4.

**Table 4. Distribution of respondents according to their farm size**

(n=60)

S. No	Category	Number of respondents	Per cent
1	Marginal	45	75.00
2	Small	14	23.33
3	Big	1	1.67
	<b>Total</b>	<b>60</b>	<b>100.00</b>

It could be observed from the Table 4 that three -fourth of the respondents (75.00 per cent) possessed marginal farms followed by small farms (23.33 per cent) .This might be due to the fragmentation of land holdings among the family members.

### 5. Area under sugarcane Cultivation

Results on distribution of the respondents according to their area sugarcane cultivation are presented in Table 5.

**Table 5. Distribution of respondents according to their area under sugarcane cultivation**  
(n=60)

S.No	Category	Number of respondents	Per cent
1	Low	37	61.67
2	Medium	12	20.00
3	High	11	18.33
	<b>Total</b>	<b>60</b>	<b>100.00</b>

The data in Table 5 reveals that majority of the respondents (61.67 per cent) had low level of area under sugarcane cultivation. Medium and high levels of area under sugarcane cultivation were observed with 20.00 per cent and 18.33 per cent of the respondents respectively. This might be due to the fact that majority of the farmers possessed only marginal farms.

### 6. Extension Agency Contact

The results on distribution of respondents according their level of extension agency contact are presented in Table 5.

**Table 6. Distribution of respondents according to their level of extension agency contact**  
(n=60)

S. No	Category	Number of respondents	Per cent
1	Low	24	40.00
2	Medium	14	23.33
3	High	22	36.67
	<b>Total</b>	<b>60</b>	<b>100.00</b>

The Table 6 shows that two-fifths of the respondents (40.00 per cent) had low level extension agency contact, followed by 36.67 per cent and 23.33 per cent of the respondents with high and medium level of extension agency contact respectively. Lack of interest of the respondents to know about improved sugarcane cultivation practices might be the reason for their poor extension agency contact.

### 7. Social Participation

The results on distribution of respondents according to their social participation are presented in Table 7.

**Table 7. Distribution of respondents according to their social participation**

(n=60)

S. No	Category	Number of respondents	Per cent
1	Low	19	31.67
2	Medium	26	43.33
3	High	15	25.00
	<b>Total</b>	<b>60</b>	<b>100.00</b>

Table 7 revealed that 43.33 per cent of the respondents had medium level of social participation, followed by 31.67 per cent of the respondents with low level of participation. Only 25.00 per cent of the respondents had to high level of social participation. Absence of social organizations in the study area and lack of awareness about the organizations might be the possible reasons for thier medium to low level of social participation.

### 8. Mass Media Exposure

The results on distribution of respondents according to their mass media exposure are presented in Table 8.

**Table 8. Distribution of respondents according to their mass media media exposure**

(n=60)

S. No	Category	Number of respondents	Per cent
1	Low	25	41.67
2	Medium	23	38.33
3	High	12	20.00
	<b>Total</b>	<b>60</b>	<b>100.00</b>

From the results of the table 8, it could be observed that 41.67 per cent of the respondents possessed low level of media exposure, followed by (38.33 per cent) and high (20.00 per cent) level of mass media exposure. High cost of mass media channels, poor resource base marginal farmers and low level of aptitude for innovativeness might have resulted in the above trend.

### 9. Risk orientation

The results on distribution of respondents according to their risk orientation are presented in Table 9.

**Table 9: Distribution of respondents according to their risk orientation**

(n=60)

S. No	Category	Number of respondents	Per cent
1	Low	35	58.33
2	Medium	14	23.33
3	High	11	18.34
	<b>Total</b>	<b>60</b>	<b>100.00</b>

It could be observed from the Table 9 that above around sixty per cent of the respondents (58.33 per cent) had low level of risk orientation followed by medium (23.33 per cent) and high (18.34 per cent) levels of risk orientation. This might be due to the fact that majority of the sugarcane growers possessed only marginal holdings, and hence they were reluctant to take risk.

### **Information Management Behaviour (IMB) of Sugarcane Growers**

Information management behaviour of the farmers was studied under three dimensions viz., information acquisition, information processing and information dissemination. The overall Information management behaviour was also studied. The findings are discussed as follows.

#### **1. Information Acquisition Behaviour (IAB) of Sugarcane Growers**

The results on distribution of respondents according to their level of information acquisition behaviours are presented in Table 10

**Table 10. Distribution of respondents based on their information acquisition behaviour (n=60)**

S. No	Category	Number of respondents	Per cent
1	Low	37	61.67
2	Medium	11	18.33
3	High	12	20.00
	<b>Total</b>	<b>60</b>	<b>100.00</b>

It could be observed from Table 10 that majority 61.67 per cent of the respondents had low information acquisition behaviour followed by high (20.00 per cent) and medium (18.33 per cent) levels of information acquisition behaviour. This might be due to the poor extension agency contact, mass media exposure, risk orientation and low to medium level of social participation.

#### **2. Information Processing Behaviour (IPB) of Sugarcane Growers**

The results on distribution of respondents according to their information processing behaviour are presented in Table 11

**Table 11. Distribution of respondents According to their Information processing behaviour (n=60)**

S. No	Category	Number of respondents	Per cent
1	low	25	41.66
2	Medium	18	30.00
3	High	17	28.34
	<b>Total</b>	<b>60</b>	<b>100.00</b>

From the results of the Table 11, it could be observed that two-fifths (41.66 per cent) of the respondents belonged to low category followed by medium (30.00 per cent) and high (28.34 per cent) categories of information processing behaviour. This might be due to their low information acquisition behaviour.

### 3. Information Dissemination behaviour (IDB) of Sugarcane Growers

The results on distribution of respondents according to their information dissemination behaviour are presented in Table 12.

**Table 12. Distribution of respondents according to their level on information dissemination behaviour**

(n=60)

S. No	Category	Number of respondents	Per cent
1	Low	36	60.00
2	Medium	12	20.00
3	High	12	20.00
	<b>Total</b>	<b>60</b>	<b>100.00</b>

Table 12 revealed that 60.00 per cent of the respondents were found under low category followed by medium (20.00 per cent) and high (20.00 per cent) categories of information dissemination behaviour. The low levels of information acquisition and processing behaviour of the respondents might have resulted in low level of information dissemination behaviour.

### Information Management Behaviour (IMB) of sugarcane growers

The results on distribution of respondents according to their level of information management behaviour are presented in table 13.

**Table 13. Distribution respondents according to their information management behaviour**

(n=60)

S. No	Category	Number of respondents	Per cent
1	Low	26	43.33
2	Medium	18	30.00
3	High	16	26.67
	<b>Total</b>	<b>60</b>	<b>100.00</b>

A perusal of over all information management behavior revealed the majority (73.33 per cent) of the respondents were found to have low to medium level of information management behaviour followed by 26.67 per cent with high level of information management behaviour. As the respondents had low level of three components of Information management Behaviour viz., information acquisition, information processing, information dissemination, it might have naturally resulted in low level of over all information management behaviour.

## Conclusion

The overall information behaviour was found to be low among the sugarcane growers. The components of information management behaviour namely, information acquisition, information processing, information dissemination, were also found to be low. The extension agency contact and mass media exposure were found to be low among the growers. Hence it

is suggested that the State Department of Agriculture may arrange to make frequent visits to the sugarcane farms and disseminate suitable technological information needed by the sugarcane growers. It is also suggested that the training programs may be organized based on the needs of growers so as to make them in access to authenticated information sources. The growers may be educated on information collection, processing of information and dissemination of information to others and its importance.

### *References*

1. Kasidurai, S. 2017. *Information Management Behaviour of Maize Growers of Perambalur District. Unpublished M.Sc. (Ag.) Thesis, Annamalai University, Annamalainagar.*