

International Journal of Agriculture Extension and Social Development

Volume 9; Issue 4; April 2026; Page No. 646-648

Received: 11-02-2026
Accepted: 15-03-2026

Indexed Journal
Peer Reviewed Journal

Satisfaction analysis of officials and farmers concerning the service provisions of MPCASS

¹Binaypartap Singh Sekhon and ²Kamalpreet Kaur

¹M.Sc. Scholar, Department of Extension Education, Punjab Agricultural University, Ludhiana, Punjab, India

²Extension Scientist, Department of Extension Education, Punjab Agricultural University, Ludhiana, Punjab, India

DOI: <https://www.doi.org/10.33545/26180723.2026.v9.i4h.3533>

Corresponding Author: Binaypartap Singh Sekhon

Abstract

The present study examines the satisfaction levels of officials and farmers regarding various services provided through Multipurpose Cooperative Agriculture Service Societies. The findings reveal that a majority of officials expressed a high level of satisfaction (67.5%) with the services delivered by the societies, while 22.5 per cent reported medium satisfaction and only 10 per cent indicated low satisfaction. Among different service domains, officials reported the highest satisfaction with timely recovery of rent from custom hiring services (82.5%), credit sanctioning procedures (82.5%), and cooperative bank policies (90.0%). However, comparatively lower satisfaction was observed in areas such as availability of machines (65%) and recovery procedures of credit (67.75%). Notably, the supply of seeds emerged as a major concern, with only 25 per cent officials satisfied and 47.5 per cent dissatisfied. Additionally, monthly income was identified as another area of concern, reflecting moderate satisfaction levels. From the farmers' perspective, nearly half (49.0%) reported high satisfaction, followed by 34.5 per cent with medium satisfaction and 16.5 per cent with low satisfaction. Farmers showed high satisfaction with staff assistance in financial inquiries (79.5%), quality of farm inputs (81.5%), and affordability of inputs (78.0%). In contrast, lower satisfaction levels were observed regarding the quantity of farm inputs in stock (25.5%), working condition of machines (43.5%), and availability of machinery. Overall, the study highlights that while MPCASS performs effectively in areas such as credit services, policy support, and input quality, significant gaps remain in seed supply, inventory management, machinery availability, and income enhancement. Addressing these issues can further strengthen the effectiveness and outreach of cooperative societies in supporting agricultural development.

Keywords: MPCASS, satisfaction, custom hiring, dissatisfaction

Introduction

The concept of co-operation is closely related to human society. Co-operation is not a new concept when it comes to two or more people working together for a common goal. It has existed for as long as human civilization. The idea of supporting one another during difficult times gave rise to the informal practice of cooperation (Nath and Aecawatia, 2022) [4]. Co-operation is a type of organization in which individuals freely collaborate with one another as fellow humans on the basis of equality in order to advance their own economic interests. Thus, co-operation is comparable to other forms of enterprise in that it too seeks to conduct business effectively. Additionally, it incorporates both the positive aspects of capitalism and communist organizational structures (Nakkiran 2006) [3]. Small and medium-sized farmers in Indian agriculture are often noted for having very poor income generations and little savings. India's population is growing quickly and in order to satisfy the demands of this expanding population, we must boost production and productivity. We require better seeds, fertilizers, irrigation and farm mechanizations to increase food production. However, the financial situation of farmers makes it difficult for them to adopt modern production methods and technologies. We need to give farmers easy

access to loans in order to get over these limitations (Verma 2016) [1]. Farmers who work together to pool their resources in particular fields of endeavour form cooperatives, sometimes known as farmer's co-operatives. Numerous such co-operatives have enabled integrated agricultural development in Punjab's agriculture, which is a blessing. In the context of the rural social system, cooperatives can be producer's cooperatives, supplier co-operatives, marketing cooperatives, or cooperatives for research and extension. Farmers that produce related agricultural products get together to form cooperative societies. They plan cooperative production and carry out collaborative marketing of the good at retail or wholesale level (Shree and Vaishnavi 2022) [2]. Despite the fact that the service was launched through multipurpose cooperative agriculture service societies (MPCASS), it highlighted various issues regarding the effectiveness of these services, farmer's satisfaction with the service, challenges encountered in using the service, constraints faced by the officials of (MPCASS) etc noted by Kunderagi and Kadakol (2016) [5].

Results & Discussion

Satisfaction of officials regarding various aspects of services that they provide through MPCASS: The Table

1 represents the levels of satisfaction related to various services provided by the society, including custom hiring, farm inputs, credit facilities and other aspects like government and cooperative bank policies. In the category of custom hiring, the highest level of satisfaction (82.5%) is observed in the timely recovery of rent generated from machinery, indicating that most farmers are satisfied with how rents are collected. The lowest level of satisfaction within this category, though still high, is with the number of machines available to fulfil farmer demand (65%). For farm inputs, the purchasing procedure and supply of agro-chemicals from the source received the highest satisfaction (77.5%), along with purchasing procedure and supply of DAP (77.5%), showing a strong positive response to the availability and process of obtaining agro-chemicals. However, the supply of seeds from the source has the lowest satisfaction level (25%) and the highest dissatisfaction (47.5%), indicating significant issues in seed supply. Credit facilities show high satisfaction in the sanctioning procedure of credit (82.5%), reflecting effective and efficient credit approval processes. Conversely, the recovery procedure of credit has a lower satisfaction level (67.75%) and some dissatisfaction (10%), suggesting room for improvement in credit recovery practices. Among other services, the area of operation received the highest satisfaction (92.5%), indicating that the geographical coverage of services meets the needs of the majority. On the contrary, the lowest satisfaction in this category pertains to monthly income, with only 47.5 per cent satisfaction and a significant dissatisfaction level (32.5%), highlighting income concerns among the service users. In summary, while the society excels in certain areas like rent recovery, credit sanctioning and operational coverage, it faces challenges in seed supply and monthly income satisfaction.

Table 2 presents the distribution of officials based on their satisfaction levels regarding various aspects of services that

they provide through Multipurpose Cooperative Agriculture Service societies to the beneficiaries. According to the Table 4.17, 10 per cent of officials fell within the low satisfaction range. In the medium satisfaction range, representing a broader segment, 22.5 per cent of officials scored. The majority of officials, constituting 67.5 per cent, reported high satisfaction levels.

Satisfaction of farmers regarding various aspects of services provided by MPCASS

Table 3 illustrates satisfaction levels related to various services provided by the society, revealing both high and low points. Custom hiring shows the highest satisfaction with the dealing of officials (66.0%), while the working condition of the machines has the lowest satisfaction (43.5%). Moreover, number of machines available, has the highest level of dissatisfaction (17.0%). Regarding credit facilities, staff assistance for financial inquiries is highly appreciated (79.5%), whereas interest rates, although satisfactory, have the lowest satisfaction in this category (58.5%). These insights highlight strengths in the quality of inputs and financial support, while also identifying areas such as inventory and machine availability that require improvement. In context to input facilities, highest satisfaction (81.5%) is with the quality of farm inputs, indicating that the offered seeds, fertilizers and pesticides meet farmer's expectations. Conversely, the lowest satisfaction (25.5%) is with the quantity of farm inputs in stock, reflecting a need for better inventory management.

Table 4 presents the distribution of farmers based on their overall satisfaction levels regarding services provided by cooperative societies. Among the respondents, 16.5 per cent reported Low satisfaction followed by medium satisfaction level with 34.5 per cent and 49 per cent of respondents, expressed High satisfaction level.

Table 1: Distribution of officials on the basis of satisfaction regarding various aspects of services provided by Multipurpose Cooperative Agriculture Service societies, (n=40)

Sr No.	Statements	Satisfied f (%)	Somewhat satisfied f (%)	Dissatisfied f (%)
i.	Custom hiring			
1.	No. of machines are sufficient to fulfil farmer's demand	26 (65)	14 (35.0)	-
2.	Procedure for buying a new machine	29 (72.5)	11 (27.5)	-
3.	Repair/Maintenance procedure of machines	32 (80.0)	8 (20.0)	-
4.	Timely recovery of rent generated from machinery	33 (82.5)	7 (17.5)	-
ii.	Farm inputs			
1.	Purchasing procedure and supply of urea from the source	26 (65.0)	14 (35.0)	-
2.	Purchasing procedure and supply of agro-chemicals from the source	31 (77.5)	9 (22.5)	-
3.	Purchasing procedure and supply of DAP from the source	31 (77.5)	6 (15.0)	3 (7.5)
4.	Supply of seed from the source	10 (25.0)	11 (27.5)	19 (47.5)
5.	Storage capacity of society for the stock	31 (77.5)	9 (22.5)	-
iii.	Credit facilities			
1.	Sanctioning procedure of credit	33 (82.5)	7 (17.5)	-
2.	Recovery procedure of credit	27 (67.75)	9 (22.5)	4 (10.0)
iv.	Other			
1.	Govt. policies	31 (77.5)	9 (22.5)	-
2.	Coop. Bank policies	36 (90.0)	4 (10.0)	-
3.	Working hours in season	28 (70.0)	8 (20.0)	4 (10.0)
4.	Area of operation	37 (92.5)	3 (7.5)	-
5.	Monthly income	19 (47.5)	8 (20.0)	13 (32.5)

Table 2: Distribution of officials on the basis of overall satisfaction regarding various aspects of services provided by MPCASS, (n=40)

Satisfaction level	Range	Frequency	Percentage
Low	20-28	4	10.0
Medium	29-37	9	22.5
High	38-46	27	67.5

Table 3: Distribution of farmers on the basis of satisfaction regarding various aspects of services provided by cooperative societies, (n=200)

Statements		Satisfied		Somewhat Satisfied		Dissatisfied	
(a)	Custom hiring	f	%	f	%	f	%
1.	Number of machines available in the society	97	48.5	69	34.5	34	17.0
2.	Timely availability of machines	119	59.5	54	27.0	27	13.5
3.	Working Condition of machines	87	43.5	82	41.0	31	15.5
4.	Rent of the machines	117	58.5	59	29.5	24	12.0
5.	Procedure followed by the society while giving the machines on rent	96	48.0	75	37.5	29	14.5
6.	Dealing of officials	132	66.0	68	34.0	-	-
7.	Working skill of the machinery operator	98	49.0	83	41.5	19	9.5
b) Credit facilities							
1.	Financial services provided by cooperative society	145	72.5	55	27.5	-	-
2.	Interest rates offered by the society	117	58.5	83	41.5	-	-
3.	Re-payment terms and schedules offered	134	67.0	66	33.0	-	-
4.	Staff assistance for financial enquires	159	79.5	41	20.5	-	-
5.	Transparency in financial transactions	147	73.5	53	26.5	-	-
c) Farm Input facilities							
1.	Quantity of farm inputs (seeds, fertilizers, pesticides, etc.) in stock	51	25.5	143	71.5	6	3.0
2.	Quality of farm inputs offered by the society	163	81.5	37	18.5	-	-
3.	Even distribution of farm inputs by the society	64	32.0	89	44.5	47	23.5
4.	Timely availability of farm inputs (seeds, fertilizers, pesticides, etc.)	96	48.0	72	36.0	32	16.0
5.	Relevant advice for optimal utilization of farm inputs	122	61.0	78	39.0	-	-
6.	Affordable price of farm inputs offered by cooperative society	156	78.0	44	22.0	-	-

Table 4: Distribution of farmers on the basis of overall satisfaction regarding various aspects of services provided by cooperative societies

S. No.	Level of Satisfaction	Frequency	Percentage
1	Low (19-30)	33	16.5
2	Medium (31-42)	69	34.5
3	High (43-54)	98	49.0

Conclusion

The present study highlights the pivotal role of cooperative institutions, particularly MPCASS, in strengthening the agricultural support system and enhancing farmers' access to essential services. From the farmers' perspective, nearly half (49%) reported high satisfaction, reflecting a generally positive perception of the services. Overall, while MPCASS has made significant contributions toward agricultural development and service delivery, the study underscores the need for targeted improvements. Strengthening seed supply chains, enhancing inventory management, increasing the availability of machinery, and addressing income-related concerns of officials can further improve efficiency and satisfaction levels. By addressing these challenges, MPCASS can play a more transformative role in achieving sustainable agricultural development and improving the socio-economic conditions of farmers.

References

1. Singh N, Kumar A, Verma KL, Jeengar CB, Goyal MC. Extent of satisfaction of trainees about Krishi Vigyan Kendra's trainings. *International Journal of Science*. 2016;5(11):1393-1401.
2. Shree DN, Vaishnavi P. Challenges faced by farmer

producer organisations (FPOs)-A review. *Journal of Agricultural Extension Management*. 2022;23(1):131-138.

3. Nakkiran S. Co-operative management: principles and techniques. New Delhi: Deep and Deep Publications; 2006. 274-279 p.
4. Nath S, Aecawatia R. Trade-offs or synergies? Hybridity and sustainable performance of dairy cooperatives in India. *World Development*. 2022;154:1-14.
5. Kundaragi PB, Kadakol AM. Level of job satisfaction of working employees: a study on cooperative societies in Belagavi district. *International Multidisciplinary Research Journal*. 2016;5(2):1-6.