AD EDUXIAN JOURNAL,
VOL-1, ISSUE-1, JULY 2024

Farming and Its Implications on Small Farmers in India

Dr. Devindrappa Mallikarjun
Guest Faculty, Dept. of Social Work, Post Graduation Centre
Ramanagara, Bangalore University Jnan Bharati
Bengaluru-56, Karnataka State, India
Email: devindra.m.h@gmail.com

Abstract: Contract farming in India has emerged as a potentially transformative agricultural strategy, aiming to bridge the historical gap between smallholder farmers and agribusiness companies. This paper provides a comprehensive analysis of contract farming, exploring its multifaceted implications for small and marginal farmers in the Indian context. It examines the significant opportunities it presents, such as enhanced market access, access to modern inputs and technology, improved credit facilities, and the potential for increased income and productivity. Concurrently, the report critically evaluates the persistent challenges and disadvantages, including unequal bargaining power, lack of transparency in contractual arrangements, socio-economic disparities (such as gender inequality and child labor), and environmental degradation. The evolving policy and regulatory landscape, particularly the Model Agricultural Produce and Livestock Contract Farming and Services (Promotion & Facilitation) Act, 2018, is discussed in detail, along with its intended protections and observed limitations. Synthesizing empirical evidence, this paper argues that while contract farming holds considerable promise for modernizing Indian agriculture and boosting rural development, its actual impact is highly heterogeneous. Achieving inclusive and sustainable outcomes necessitates a robust regulatory framework that moves beyond mere facilitation to actively safeguard farmer interests, ensure equitable power dynamics, and address the inherent social and environmental externalities.

Keywords: Contract Farming, Small Farmers, Agricultural Policy, Farmer Welfare, Sustainability, Income Stability, Bargaining Power, Social Equity, Environmental Impact.

Introducation

Agriculture forms the foundational pillar of the Indian economy, providing livelihoods for a substantial segment of the nation's population.[1] Within this vital sector, smallholder farmers, defined as those with landholdings below two hectares (with marginal farmers holding less than one hectare), constitute the overwhelming majority, accounting for 86.1% of operational holdings. This demographic faces a myriad of systemic challenges that impede their progress and perpetuate agrarian distress. They struggle to adapt to the pervasive trends of commercialization and globalization, often experiencing limited access to profitable markets, reliable inputs such as quality seeds, fertilizers, and credit, and effective extension services. Furthermore, high production and marketing costs, inadequate infrastructure, and persistent market volatility contribute significantly to their precarious economic situation. The deeply concerning issues of farmer indebtedness and tragic instances of suicides underscore the urgent need for viable and equitable agricultural solutions across the country.

In response to these pervasive challenges, contract farming has emerged as a potentially transformative agricultural strategy, aiming to bridge the critical gap between these vulnerable smallholder farmers and larger agribusiness companies.[1] This arrangement is fundamentally an agreement between farmers and processing or marketing firms for the production and supply of agricultural products under forward agreements, frequently at predetermined prices. Proponents view this mechanism as vital for accelerating technology transfer, ensuring capital inflow into the agricultural sector, and providing assured markets for crop production.[1] Historically, contract farming is not a new phenomenon in India, with its presence dating back to the second half of the nineteenth century when the East India Company introduced the cultivation of crops like indigo, poppy, and plantation crops such as tea and coffee.[17] Its global importance has grown considerably, with the Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO) reporting that by the turn of the century (2000), 45% of cash crop and livestock farmers worldwide operated under contractual arrangements.

The enduring nature of Indian agriculture as the economic backbone, despite the widespread distress among its primary cultivators, highlights a profound systemic vulnerability at the very foundation of the national economy. This paradox, where the sector that sustains a significant portion of the population is simultaneously a source of deep socio-economic hardship, indicates that contract farming is not merely an economic intervention. Instead, it is presented as a potential solution to a deep-seated socio-economic crisis. The inherent fragility of the smallholder sector means that any implications of contract farming, whether positive or negative, will have widespread and significant ripple effects across the rural landscape, impacting national stability and the achievement of broader development goals.

The historical continuity of contract farming, from its colonial-era origins to its modern promotion and formalization through new legislative acts, suggests that its past implementations may have been problematic or insufficient in addressing farmer welfare. The shift in actors from colonial powers to contemporary agribusinesses, while seemingly a change, raises questions about whether the underlying power asymmetry between large buyers and small producers persists or is even reinforced under the new institutional guise. Understanding this historical context is crucial to avoid repeating past mistakes and to critically evaluate whether modern contract farming genuinely empowers small farmers or merely reconfigures existing power imbalances. The long history also implies that farmers may carry a degree of historical distrust, which must be acknowledged and addressed for any new contractual framework to achieve widespread acceptance and successful implementation.

This paper aims to provide a comprehensive, evidence-based analysis of contract farming in India, with a specific focus on its implications for small and marginal farmers. It will systematically explore the purported benefits, the inherent challenges, the evolving policy landscape, and synthesize empirical evidence to offer a nuanced understanding of contract farming's complex role in rural development and farmer welfare in the Indian context.

Conceptual Framework of Contract Farming

Contract farming is formally defined as an agreement between farmers and processing or marketing firms for the production and supply of agricultural products under forward agreements, typically at predetermined prices.[1] A crucial aspect of these arrangements is the support provided by the contracting company, which often includes supplying modern inputs, assisting with land preparation, offering production advice, and arranging for the transport of produce to its premises.[1] The core principles of contract farming involve pre-agreed terms regarding price, quality standards, quantity of produce, and delivery timeframes. The overarching objective of this system is to mitigate uncertainties for both parties: companies secure a consistent supply of quality raw materials for long-term planning and price stability, while farmers gain an assured market, access to company services, and often, easier access to credit.[1]

The landscape of contract farming in India is characterized by diverse operational models, frequently appearing as a hybrid of types depending on the specific buyer and commodity involved.

- **Centralized Model:** This is a prevalent model where a single processor or buyer enters into contracts with a large number of small farmers. The entire process, from input provision to harvesting, is centrally monitored and managed by the buyer. The scope of services provided by the buyer can vary significantly, ranging from merely supplying quality seeds to offering comprehensive support including land preparation, provision of agro-chemicals, and even harvesting services. This model is commonly observed for crops like tobacco, cotton, sugarcane, bananas, tree crops, and in livestock sectors such as poultry, pork, and dairy.
- **Multipartite Model:** In contrast to the centralized model, the multipartite model involves multiple entities collaborating with farmers. Different organizations, based on their expertise, provide specialized services. For instance, financial institutions may offer credit, agri-input companies supply inputs, and technology firms provide specific farm-level technologies, creating a more distributed support system for the farmer.[16]
- **Informal Model:** This model typically involves individual entrepreneurs or smaller companies engaging in simple, often oral or informal, seasonal production contracts with farmers. It is particularly common for crops requiring minimal processing, such as fresh vegetables. Input provision and technical advice are usually limited in these less formalized arrangements.[6]
- **Nucleus Estate Model:** Under this model, the contracting company owns and manages a core farm (or leases land) and simultaneously contracts with surrounding farmers. This arrangement grants the buyer substantial control over the production process, enabling them to ensure specific quality standards. The nucleus estate often serves to guarantee supplies for efficient utilization of processing capacities and may also be used for research, breeding, or demonstration purposes.[15]

Contract farming is actively promoted in India as a strategic tool to address the multifaceted challenges faced by the agricultural sector and to drive its modernization.[1] A primary rationale is to overcome issues such as reliance on traditional technology, inadequate infrastructure, and a lack of market information, thereby enabling farmers to adopt more efficient practices.[1] It aims to promote market-oriented farming by aligning crop selection with market demand, which is expected to ensure better returns and reduce supply-demand mismatches.[1] Crucially, it is envisioned to enhance farmer income by providing assured markets and stable prices, while also facilitating value addition and accelerating technology transfer.[1] Beyond direct economic gains, contract farming is expected to generate a permanent source of income for farmers, ensure consistent quality standards, facilitate the adoption of modern agricultural technologies, and contribute to rural development by reducing rural-urban migration and generating employment.[13] From a broader economic perspective, it seeks to encourage private investment in agriculture and mitigate price risks and post-harvest losses, particularly for risk-oriented fruits, vegetables, and other high-value crops.[11]

The preference for informal relationships over formal contracts in Indian contract farming, where legal enforcement plays a peripheral role, creates a complex dynamic. This "moral economy," characterized by a reliance on mutual understanding and a "handshake ethic," is partly attributed to the high costs and perceived inefficiency of India's formal legal machinery, as well as a belief that the judiciary tends to favor farmers.[9] This often results in "notional contracts" that allow for a degree of flexibility and "excusable breach" within certain limits.[9] However, this informal approach, while seemingly fostering trust, can become a significant vulnerability for small farmers. Without robust, accessible, and enforceable formal legal mechanisms, the inherent unequal bargaining power of agribusinesses can be leveraged to manipulate quality standards, delay payments, or reject produce without adequate recourse for the weaker party. This highlights a critical tension: the cultural preference for informality, while appearing benign, can inadvertently perpetuate exploitation. This also explains why policy efforts, such as the Model Act 2018, are crucial, as they attempt to formalize and regulate a system that has historically resisted formalization, aiming to provide a safety net where informal mechanisms fail.

Furthermore, the objectives of contract farming extend beyond merely improving existing agricultural practices; they explicitly aim to facilitate farmers' transition from subsistence farming to the production of high-value or export-oriented products and promote crop diversification.[1] This indicates a deliberate shift in the agricultural production paradigm. Contract farming is not just a market linkage tool but a powerful mechanism for structural transformation within Indian agriculture. By linking farmers to agribusinesses, it drives a shift towards commercial, often export-oriented, and high-value agriculture. While this promises higher incomes, it also fundamentally alters the risk profile for farmers, making them more susceptible to global market fluctuations for specialized commodities rather than traditional food crops. This raises important questions about food security at both household and national levels, as well as the resilience of farming systems to external shocks, if staple crop cultivation is reduced in favor of contract-bound cash crops.

Opportunities and benefits for small farmers

Contract farming offers several significant opportunities and benefits for small and marginal farmers in India, addressing many of the systemic challenges they traditionally face.

Enhanced Market Access and Price Stability

A primary advantage of contract farming is the provision of assured markets and stable prices, which directly contributes to enhanced productivity and income while significantly reducing market risks for farmers.[1] A key benefit is the protection it offers farmers from volatile market price fluctuations through pre-agreed prices, insulating them from sudden drops in commodity values.[1] This assured market access is particularly beneficial for small farmers who traditionally face immense difficulties in reaching profitable markets due to fragmented supply chains, inadequate infrastructure, and a lack of market information.[1] Empirical studies corroborate this, with one indicating that 79% of respondents agreed that contract farming effectively reduces price risk for farmers.[5]

Access to Modern Inputs, Technology, and Technical Assistance

A significant opportunity for small farmers lies in gaining access to modern inputs, advanced technologies, and crucial technical guidance that might otherwise be out of their reach due to cost or unavailability.[1] Contracting companies frequently supply essential inputs such as quality seeds and fertilizers, and provide expert production advice, thereby helping farmers overcome common production constraints related to poor input access and lack of technical capacity.[1] This arrangement accelerates technology transfer, enabling small and marginal farmers to adopt new and more efficient agricultural practices and emerging technologies, which they might otherwise be hesitant to do due to high costs and risks involved.[1]

Improved Access to Credit and Financial Services

Contract farming plays a pivotal role in alleviating financial constraints for farmers and facilitating easier access to credit, which is often a primary motivation for their participation.[5] The contract itself can serve as collateral, making it easier for farmers to secure loans from banks and other financial institutions.[12] This financial linkage is not merely a service; it is a strategic mechanism for firms to exert influence over production practices, drive technological adoption, and integrate farmers more deeply into their value chains. This indicates a shift in the traditional agricultural credit landscape, with private players becoming significant financiers for specific high-value crops, potentially bypassing or complementing formal banking channels. NABARD, for instance, supports rural credit, with a notable share of agricultural loans reaching small and marginal farmers through Regional Rural Banks (RRBs) and cooperative banks, although the private sector's role in direct credit provision through contracts is distinct.[23]

Risk Mitigation and Income Enhancement

Beyond market risks, contract farming helps mitigate production and marketing costs.[15] Empirical studies, particularly from Indian Punjab, demonstrate significant increases in both gross and net income for contract farmers compared to non-contract farmers across various crops, including Basmati, Potatoes, Maize, and Tomatoes.[22] For example, net income for potatoes increased by a substantial 40.44% and for maize by 34.82% under contract farming.[22] Many studies consistently confirm that contract farming improves agricultural productivity and farmer welfare, leading to higher incomes, with reported increases ranging from a modest 10-20% to an impressive 185% in some cases.[24]

Skill Development and Productivity Gains

Contract farming introduces new production techniques and enables farmers to acquire valuable new skills, such as improved record-keeping, efficient utilization of farm resources, better application of chemicals and fertilizers, understanding the importance of quality standards, and knowledge of export market demands.[5]These acquired skills can also have positive spillover effects, enhancing productivity in other non-contracted farm activities.[6]

When effectively implemented, contract farming has the potential to contribute to a more resilient and prosperous rural landscape, stemming rural-urban migration by creating viable livelihoods in situ. This suggests that the benefits extend beyond direct income, contributing to a more holistic rural transformation. However, the wide range of reported income increases (from 10% to 185%) indicates that these benefits are highly heterogeneous and contingent upon specific contractual designs, crop types, and firm practices. This heterogeneity necessitates a nuanced understanding, moving beyond simplistic "win-win" narratives to identify the conditions under which these broader welfare benefits are genuinely realized.

Table 1: Key Benefits of Contract Farming for Small Farmers

Benefit Category	Specific Advantages
Market Access	Assured market and stable prices, reduced market risks, protection from price fluctuations, access to new markets otherwise unavailable.
Financial Support	Easier access to credit (contract as collateral), alleviation of financial constraints, provision of inputs on credit.
Technology Transfer & Skill Development	Access to modern inputs and advanced technologies, technical guidance, learning new skills (e.g., record-keeping, efficient resource use, quality importance), improved production efficiency.
Income Enhancement & Risk Mitigation	Higher productivity and income, reduction of production and marketing costs, mitigation of post-harvest losses, protection from distress sales, increased profits.
Rural Development	Potential to reduce rural-urban migration, generate employment, facilitate value addition, integrate farmers with the national economy.

Challenges and Disadvantages Faced by Small Farmers

Despite the purported benefits, contract farming in India is plagued by persistent challenges and disadvantages, particularly for small and marginal farmers. These issues often arise from inherent power imbalances, lack of robust regulatory oversight, and the unintended consequences of market-driven agricultural transformation.

Unequal Bargaining Power and Potential for Exploitation

One of the most significant and frequently cited challenges is the limited bargaining power of small farmers, which creates a substantial potential for exploitation.[1] Firms frequently exert a dominant role in price fixation, often to the disadvantage of farmers.[12] This inherent power imbalance can lead to exploitative practices and unfair contracts.[5] Small farmers, lacking sufficient resources and alternative market access, often find themselves unable to negotiate equitable terms or seek better deals for their produce.[5] A recent study from Punjab on broiler contract farming starkly illustrates this, finding it to be "unfair and less profitable" for smallholders, with contracting agencies appropriating a disproportionately large share of the profits. Non-contract farmers in this sector reportedly achieved significantly higher net incomes (40-88% higher).[29] Similarly, in the case of potato farming, PepsiCo was found to heavily influence contract negotiations related to pricing and quality, effectively leaving farmers without a meaningful say.[4] The preference for informal "relationships over formal contracts" [9], while culturally embedded, can, in practice, become a subtle but potent tool for exploitation. In the absence of robust, accessible, and enforceable legal frameworks, this informality allows firms to easily manipulate quality standards, delay payments, or reject produce without strong legal repercussions for vulnerable farmers.[6] This situation, where contract farmers earn less despite formal agreements, highlights that reliance on informal norms alone is insufficient for protecting small farmers and necessitates a critical re-evaluation of the "promotional" nature of current policies, arguing for stronger regulatory mechanisms to ensure genuine fairness and accountability.

Lack of Transparency and Contractual Issues

A pervasive lack of transparency in contractual arrangements between farmers and buyers frequently leads to disputes and mistrust.[5] Contracts are often informal or verbal, and even written agreements may not provide the robust legal protection observed in other countries.[15] Common issues include the non-purchase of contracted produce, often on subjective quality grounds, manipulation of grading standards by firms, and chronic delays in payments to farmers.[6] This can result in farmers reneging on contracts if open market prices are higher, or companies defaulting if market prices fall, highlighting the fragility of these agreements.[30] A detailed study on potato farming specifically highlighted a lack of fairness in contract farming arrangements, failing to meet most fairness measures. It also noted that fixed prices, intended as a benefit, sometimes failed to provide better returns to contract farmers compared to non-contract farmers who sold in the open market.[4]

Inadequate Extension Services and Support

Despite the promise of technical assistance and knowledge transfer, the extension services provided to contract farmers are frequently inadequate, thereby hindering their ability to effectively adopt newer technologies and improve farming practices.[5] This deficiency can also be a significant source of farmer disgruntlement and withdrawal from projects, as farmers may not receive the necessary guidance to meet stringent quality standards or manage unforeseen production challenges.[6]

Socio-Economic Implications

Contract farming can exacerbate existing social inequalities and introduce new challenges.

- **Gender Disparities and Child Labor:** It has been observed to lead to gender inequalities in the quantity and quality of work, as well as wages for women and children.[21] Women often work longer hours for lower wages and possess limited bargaining power within these arrangements.[32] There is a concerning increasing incidence of child labor, particularly involving girls, who are often preferred by employers for their perceived "docility, obedience, and 'nimble fingers'".[32] These children frequently work extended hours for piece rates, missing out on crucial schooling, a practice sometimes facilitated by interlinking credit with child labor.[32]
- **Food Insufficiency:** A potential drawback is the shift towards cash crops, which can lead to farmers neglecting the cultivation of staple food crops, thereby raising concerns about household food insufficiency and national food security.[5]

- **Exclusion and Inequality:** Firms may selectively neglect or exclude small and marginal farmers from contracts, often preferring larger farmers for economies of scale.[12] While some studies suggest contract farming arrangements can be inclusive [33]
- **Indebtedness:** Farmers face a significant risk of becoming indebted, particularly due to production problems, unforeseen circumstances, or high input costs that impact their ability to meet contractual obligations and repay advances.[5]

Environmental Concerns

The pursuit of economic efficiency and higher value crops through contract farming can generate substantial negative externalities on social equity and environmental sustainability. Contract farming practices, especially those promoting intensive cultivation, can lead to the degradation of traditional knowledge, soil quality, and the unsustainable overuse of groundwater, resulting in salination and chemical contamination of soil and water.[11] Case studies highlight the emergence of new pests and diseases, which can be attributed to the monoculture or intensive cultivation practices encouraged by contract farming.[35] The heavy reliance on inorganic fertilizers and pesticides, driven by strict quality and quantity requirements, can result in significant environmental pollution.[27] Examples like eucalyptus planting illustrate the erosion of "ecological capital," including reduced water recharge, altered water flows, and diminished soil fertility.[36] These hidden costs are disproportionately borne by the most vulnerable segments of the rural population (women, children) and the natural resource base, and are often not internalized by the contracting firms. This suggests that a purely economic evaluation of contract farming is insufficient. Consequently, some research suggests that, due to these environmental consequences, contract farming may only be sustainable for the short term.

Table 2: Major Challenges of Contract Farming for Small Farmers

Challenge Category	Specific Disadvantages
Power Imbalance & Exploitation	Limited farmer bargaining power, dominant role of firms in price fixation, exploitative practices, unfair contracts, firms neglecting small/marginal farmers, manipulation of grading standards.
Contractual Issues & Lack of Transparency	Lack of transparency in agreements, informal/verbal contracts, non-purchase of contracted produce, delayed payments, difficulty of legal enforcement, inflexibility.
Socio-Economic Impacts	Decreased employment opportunities due to mechanization, food insufficiency (shift to cash crops), increased rural income inequalities, risk of indebtedness, gender inequalities in wages/work, increased child labor.
Environmental Impacts	Degradation of traditional knowledge, soil quality deterioration, overuse of groundwater (salination, chemical

	contamination), emergence of new pests/diseases, heavy reliance on inorganic fertilizers/pesticides, short-term sustainability concerns.
Institutional & Support Gaps	Inadequate extension services, higher transaction costs for farmers, limited institutional support, corruption in quota allocation.

Policy and Regulatory Landscape of Contract farming in India

The policy and regulatory landscape governing contract farming in India has undergone significant evolution, reflecting a continuous effort to integrate farmers into modern value chains while attempting to address inherent challenges.

Evolution of Contract Farming Policies

The liberalization of economic policies in India, initiated in the 1980s and intensified in the 1990s, brought a renewed focus on contract farming as a mechanism for agricultural development.[9] Since 2000, successive central governments have actively encouraged states to reform their Agricultural Produce Market Committee (APMC) Acts to incorporate provisions for contract farming and facilitate direct purchases from farmers, thereby bypassing traditional mandis.[18] The Model APMC Act 2003 was a significant step, including specific provisions for contract farming and allowing direct purchase outside the APMC framework.[37]

Recognizing the need for a more comprehensive framework, contract farming was subsequently delinked from the Model APLM Act 2017. Instead, a dedicated "Model Agricultural Produce & Livestock Contract Farming and Services (Promotion & Facilitation) Act 2018" was prepared and circulated by the Ministry of Agriculture and Farmers' Welfare (MoAFW) after extensive consultations.[18] More recently, the Farmers (Empowerment and Protection) Agreement on Price Assurance and Farm Services Bill, 2020 (commonly known as the Contract Farming Act, 2020), was enacted. This controversial legislation aimed to provide a legal architecture for written agreements, assuring predetermined prices and acting as a form of price risk insurance.[18] However, it faced widespread farmer protests and was subsequently repealed.[18]

Key Provisions of the Model Agricultural Produce and Livestock Contract Farming and Services (Promotion & Facilitation) Act, 2018

The Model Act of 2018 represents a significant policy attempt to formalize and streamline contract farming.

- **Farmer Protection:** The Act places a strong emphasis on protecting the interests of farmers, explicitly recognizing them as the weaker party in a contractual agreement.[39]
- **Broad Scope:** It encompasses not only contract farming but also services contracts across the entire agricultural value chain, including pre-production, production, and post-production activities.[39]
- **Registration and Recording:** The Act mandates the establishment of a "Registering and Agreement

Recording Committee" or an "Officer" at the district/block/taluka level for the online registration of sponsors and formal recording of contract agreements.[39]

- **Insurance Coverage:** A crucial provision ensures that contracted produce is covered under existing crop or livestock insurance schemes, mitigating production risks for farmers.[39]
- **APMC Exemption:** Contract farming arrangements are explicitly placed outside the purview of the APMC Act, aiming to provide farmers with alternative marketing channels.[39]
- **Land Ownership Protection:** A key safeguard is the stipulation that no rights, title, ownership, or possession of agricultural land shall be transferred or vested in the contract farming sponsor. Furthermore, no permanent structure can be developed on farmers' land/premises under these contracts.[39]
- **Promotion of FPOs:** The Act actively promotes Farmer Producer Organizations (FPOs) and Farmer Producer Companies (FPCs) as a means to mobilize small and marginal farmers, enabling them to collectively enter into contracts and enhance their bargaining power.[39]
- **Assured Purchase:** Sponsors are obligated to purchase the entire pre-agreed quantity of agricultural produce or livestock products as per the contract.[39]
- **Facilitation Groups:** The Act provides for the establishment of Contract Farming Facilitation Groups (CFFG) at the village/panchayat level to promote and support contract farming services.[39]
- **Nature of Act:** Importantly, the Act is characterized as "promotional and facilitative," rather than regulatory in its primary structure.[39]

Dispute Resolution Mechanisms

The Model Act outlines an "accessible and simple dispute settlement mechanism at the lowest level possible for quick disposal of disputes".[39] Where state-specific APMC Acts have enabling provisions, disputes are to be resolved as per their arbitration and dispute resolution mechanisms.[48] A multi-layer mechanism is proposed, starting with direct negotiation between parties, followed by alternative dispute resolution methods, and finally, a Dispute Settlement Authority with the powers of a civil court, with provisions for challenging its verdict.[43] A party breaching a contract is liable to pay compensation, which can be recovered as arrears of land revenue.[43] The existing Contract Act is deemed inadequate for the specific, time-sensitive requirements of contract farming due to the protracted nature of civil court processes.[30]

Recent Government Initiatives and Policy Changes

As of recent updates, 15 States and Union Territories have made enabling provisions for contract farming within their APMC Acts.[48] The NITI Aayog, in its report "From Green Revolution to Amrit Kaal," emphasizes the strategic importance of strengthening market linkages and promoting contract farming to enhance farmer income and foster overall agricultural development.[7] The controversial Farmers (Empowerment and Protection) Agreement on Price Assurance and Farm Services Act, 2020, aimed to liberalize agriculture and provide price assurance, acting as a form of insurance against price risks.[18] However, this Act faced significant farmer protests and was ultimately repealed.[18] States are also formulating their own policies; for instance, Goa's new agricultural policy is set to boost horticulture through contract farming by introducing legal structures that permit leasing land for farming without transferring ownership rights, thereby alleviating farmers' fears of losing land control.[50]

The Model Act 2018 is explicitly designed to be "promotional and facilitative," rather than regulatory in its primary structure.[41] This aligns with the historical preference for informal "moral economy" relationships.[9] However, the documented challenges – particularly unequal bargaining power, exploitation, and lack of transparency [5] – strongly suggest that a purely facilitative approach is insufficient to genuinely protect vulnerable small farmers. The widespread protests and subsequent repeal of the 2020 Farm Laws (including a contract farming act) [18] indicate a deep-seated distrust among farmers regarding corporate dominance without strong regulatory safeguards. For contract farming to be truly inclusive and sustainable, the policy framework must evolve beyond mere "promotion and facilitation" to incorporate robust regulatory oversight. This means developing mechanisms that actively ensure fair pricing, transparent quality assessment, timely payments, and genuinely accessible and effective dispute resolution, rather than solely relying on market incentives and informal trust. The fear of "corporatisation" [18] underscores the critical need for regulatory frameworks that explicitly prevent exploitation and ensure equitable power dynamics, thereby building farmer trust and acceptance.

The state's role is transitioning from a direct market regulator to a facilitator aiming to attract private investment. The policy evolution shows a clear shift: from the state's direct control over agricultural markets through APMCs [37] to actively promoting private sector involvement and contract farming via model acts.[11] The attempt with the 2020 laws was an even more centralized push.[18] This indicates a continuous effort to reform agricultural marketing and integrate farmers into modern value chains. However, the resistance to the 2020 laws suggests that the

manner of state intervention and its perceived neutrality are crucial. The effectiveness of future policies will depend on their ability to strike a delicate balance: fostering private investment while simultaneously safeguarding the interests of small farmers. This implies a need for policies that are not just "promotional" but also "protective" and "empowering," ensuring that the benefits of market integration reach the grassroots equitably and sustainably.

Table 3: Salient Features of the Model Agricultural Produce and Livestock Contract Farming and Services (Promotion & Facilitation) Act, 2018

Feature Category	Specific Provisions
Farmer Protection	Explicit emphasis on protecting farmers' interests as the weaker party; no transfer of land rights/ownership/possession to sponsor; no permanent structures on farmer's land; contracted produce covered under crop/livestock insurance.
Operational Framework	Covers contracts across entire value chain (pre-production, production, post-production); online registration of sponsors and recording of agreements by designated officer/committee; promotion of FPOs/FPCs to mobilize small/marginal farmers; FPOs/FPCs can be contracting parties; sponsors obligated to purchase entire pre-agreed quantity.
Dispute Resolution	Accessible and simple dispute settlement

	mechanism at lowest level; multi-layer mechanism (negotiation, ADR, Dispute Settlement Authority with civil court powers, appeal); breaching party liable for compensation (recoverable as land revenue arrears).
Market Integration	Contract farming outside APMC Act ambit; Contract Farming Facilitation Groups (CFFG) at village/panchayat level for promotion.
Nature of Act	Promotional and facilitative, not regulatory in structure.

Empirical Evidence and Case Studies: A Synthesis of Impacts

The empirical evidence regarding the impact of contract farming on small farmers in India presents a complex and often contradictory picture, challenging simplistic narratives of universal benefit.

Analysis of Income and Welfare Impacts

Numerous empirical studies suggest that contract farming generally leads to higher production, increased income, and enhanced employment opportunities for participating households.[25] For example, a study conducted in Indian Punjab demonstrated significantly higher gross and net incomes for contract farmers across various crops, including Basmati, Potatoes, Maize, and Tomatoes, when compared to their non-contract counterparts.[22] Specifically, net income for potato farmers under contract increased by a substantial 40.44%, and for maize farmers, it rose by 34.82%.[22] Contract farming can enhance crop yields, establish crucial market linkages, mitigate post-harvest losses, protect farmers from distress sales, and secure a more reliable income stream.[25] Beyond direct income, it has been shown to play a significant role in reducing absolute poverty while concurrently raising the overall income and welfare for participating farmers.[25] However, the empirical evidence is not uniformly positive, with some studies reporting ambiguous or even negative outcomes, challenging the simplistic "win-win" narrative.[12] A study on potato farming in Maharashtra, for instance, found that non-contract farmers actually obtained significantly higher farm investment income per acre than contract farmers, despite the fixed prices offered by contracts. This was primarily due to higher open market prices for traditional potato varieties.[31] More recently, a study in Punjab focusing on broiler contract farming revealed it to be "unfair and less profitable" for smallholders, with non-contract farmers earning 40-88% higher annual net income. This disparity was attributed to contracting agencies retaining a larger share of profits and providing inputs like feed at inflated costs.[29] The frequent promotion of contract farming as an unambiguous "win-win" scenario [1] is an oversimplification that masks the complex and highly heterogeneous impacts. The actual outcomes are deeply context-dependent, influenced by crop type, market dynamics, and the specific terms and enforcement of contracts. This indicates that policy interventions must move beyond a blanket promotion of contract farming and instead focus on *how* contracts are designed, implemented, and monitored to ensure fairness, transparency, and equitable distribution of benefits and risks. The goal should be to promote "responsible contract farming" [4] that accounts for these variations and actively mitigates negative outcomes.

Social and Environmental Impacts from Case Studies

Beyond economic considerations, contract farming has notable social and environmental ramifications.

- **Social Impacts:** Contract farming, especially for labor-intensive, high-value crops, can generate farm labor employment, particularly for women.[21] However, it frequently leads to a "gender gap in wages and gendering of tasks," where women receive lower wages, work longer hours, and possess limited bargaining power.[21] There is a documented increase in child labor, especially involving girls, in certain contract-farmed crops like hybrid cottonseed. These children often work long hours for piece rates, missing schooling, a practice sometimes facilitated by interlinking credit with child labor.[32] Firms may selectively neglect small and marginal farmers, and contractual terms might not be flexible or adaptable to local conditions or the specific needs of individual farmers.[5]
- **Environmental Impacts:** Contract farming can contribute to the degradation of traditional knowledge, soil quality, and the unsustainable overuse of groundwater, leading to salination and chemical contamination of soil and water.[11] Case studies highlight the emergence of new pests and diseases, which can be linked to the intensive cultivation practices and monoculture often encouraged by contract farming.[35] The heavy reliance on inorganic fertilizers and pesticides, driven by strict quality and quantity requirements, can result in significant environmental pollution.[27] Examples like eucalyptus planting illustrate the erosion of "ecological capital," including reduced water recharge, altered water flows, and diminished soil fertility.[36]Consequently, some research suggests that, due to these environmental consequences, contract farming may only be sustainable in the short term.[35]

There is a critical trade-off between short-term economic gains and long-term social and environmental sustainability. The current economic models of contract farming often externalize these social and ecological costs, meaning they are borne by vulnerable populations and the environment rather than being internalized by the contracting firms. This highlights that a purely economic evaluation of contract farming is insufficient. Policies need to explicitly address these negative externalities through stricter environmental regulations, social audits, and incentives for sustainable practices, ensuring that the "sustainability" of contract farming is holistically defined to include social and environmental dimensions, not just economic viability.

Variations in Impact Across Regions and Crops

The impact of contract farming is far from uniform; it varies significantly based on the specific commodity, the nature of the buyer, the prevailing socioeconomic environment, and the precise design of the contractual arrangements.[14] Different types of contracts, such as simple marketing agreements versus more comprehensive resource-providing contracts, have distinct effects on income sources and overall livelihood strategies.[52] Resource-providing contracts, for instance, have been shown to yield substantially larger income differences for participating farmers.[52] The degree of farmer participation in contract farming schemes also differs considerably depending on the type of produce being cultivated.[5]

Table 4: Comparative Income Analysis: Contract vs. Non-Contract Farmers (Illustrative Data from Punjab)

Crop Type	Gross Income (Contract Farming) (₹/acre)	Gross Income (Non-Contract Farming) (₹/acre)	% Change in Gross Income	Net Income (Contract Farming) (₹/acre)	Net Income (Non-Contract Farming) (₹/acre)	% Change in Net Income
Basmati	54,175.05	49,391.39	9.69%	30,706.42	26,891.98	14.18%
Potatoes	103,476.86	80,803.42	28.06%	72,110.99	51,345.73	40.44%
Maize	47,431.90	33,118.56	43.21%	32,761.88	24,298.84	34.82%
Tomatoes	145,718.31	115,360.56	26.31%	97,335.97	74,603.85	30.47%

Conclusion

Contract farming in India presents a complex and dualistic reality for small and marginal farmers. While it offers significant opportunities for agricultural modernization, enhanced market access, technology adoption, and income stability, its implementation is fraught with challenges that often disproportionately affect the most vulnerable cultivators. The analysis indicates that contract farming can bridge the gap between farmers and agribusinesses, providing assured markets, stable prices, and crucial access to inputs, credit, and technical know-how. Empirical evidence from various regions, such as Punjab, demonstrates tangible increases in farmer income and productivity under contractual arrangements.

However, the inherent power imbalance between large firms and small farmers frequently leads to exploitative practices, lack of transparency in contracts, and issues such as delayed payments and arbitrary quality rejections. The reliance on a "moral economy" over formal legal enforcement, while culturally embedded, can inadvertently enable firms to leverage their dominant position. Furthermore, the pursuit of economic efficiency through contract farming often generates significant negative social and environmental externalities, including gender inequalities, child labor, potential food insecurity due to a shift to cash crops, and degradation of natural resources.

The evolving policy landscape, notably the Model Agricultural Produce and Livestock Contract Farming and Services (Promotion & Facilitation) Act, 2018, represents a crucial step towards formalizing and safeguarding farmer interests. Its provisions for land ownership protection, FPO promotion, and accessible dispute resolution mechanisms are commendable. However, the Act's "promotional and facilitative" nature, rather than a strictly regulatory one, coupled with the resistance observed during the 2020 Farm Laws, underscores a fundamental tension. For contract farming to be truly inclusive and sustainable in India, a more robust regulatory framework is imperative. This framework must actively ensure fair pricing, transparent quality assessment, and timely payments, while also addressing the social and environmental costs that are currently externalized. The state's role must evolve from merely promoting private investment to actively protecting and empowering small farmers, ensuring that the benefits of market integration are equitably distributed and contribute to a genuinely sustainable agricultural future.

References

1. Patra, S. K., & Mondal, T. (2024). *Contract farming in India – A brief review*. *Agriculture & Food e-Newsletter*, 7(4).
2. Chand, R. (2019). *Transforming agriculture for challenges of the 21st century*. *Presidential Address at the 102nd Annual Conference of the Indian Economic Association*, Surat, Gujarat, India. NITI Aayog. https://www.niti.gov.in/sites/default/files/2020-01/Presidential_Address.pdf
3. Department of Agriculture & Farmers Welfare. (2024). *Annual report 2023–24*. Ministry of Agriculture & Farmers Welfare, Government of India.
4. Barik, P., & Bedamatta, R. (2024). *Is contract farming fair for smallholder farmers? A case study from India*. *Journal of Contemporary Asia*. Advance online publication.
5. Srivastav, S. (2024). *Opportunities and challenges of contract farming in India: A quantitative investigation*. *International Journal of Psychosocial Rehabilitation, 23*(1)
6. Kumar, Y. V., Sharma, S., & Chaudhari, B. D. (2019). *Contract farming—Prospects and challenges in India*. *Bulletin of Environment, Pharmacology and Life Sciences, 8*(3), 8–16. https://bepls.com/feb_2019/2.pdf
7. Patel, N., Sethi, T., & Athira, S. (2023, July 10). *NITI Aayog on agriculture sector*. Ensure IAS. https://www.ensureias.com/blog/current-affairs/niti-aayog-on-agriculture-sector
8. Rambhau Mhalgi Prabodhini. (2023). *Assessing the state of affairs in Indian agriculture with a focus on credit & insurance and storage & marketing* (NABARD Research Study No. 41). National Bank for Agriculture and Rural Development. https://www.nabard.org/auth/writereaddata/tender/1201243818assessing-the-state-of-affairs-in-indian-agriculture-with-a-focus-on-credit-insurance-and-storage-marketing.pdf
9. Narayanan, S. (2013). *Notional contracts: The moral economy of contract farming* [Working paper]. UNIDROIT. https://www.unidroit.org/english/documents/2013/study80a/wg-shared/s-80a-narayanan-notional.pdf
10. Sarkar, B. (2022). *Changing profile of Indian agricultural market*. *ILI Law Review, Winter Issue 2022*. https://ili.ac.in/pdf/17._Babu_Sarkar__F_.pdf
11. Swain, B. B. (2016). *Contract farming and Indian agriculture: Can agribusiness help the small farmer? Indian Journal of Agricultural Economics, 71*(3), 285–297. https://doi.org/10.22004/ag.econ.302214
12. Yadav, R. K. (2024). *Emergence of contract farming in India: An overview*. *International Journal for Multidisciplinary Research (IJFMR)*, 6(3).
13. Kumar, R., & Lal, P. (2024). *Contract farming application review paper*. *International Journal of Advanced Research in Science, Communication and Technology (IJARSCT)*, 24(8), 1–10. https://ijarsct.co.in/Paper7555.pdf
14. Gupta, A., & Choudhary, P. (2020). *Contract farming: A critical aspect in agriculture* https://www.researchgate.net/publication/376853281_CONTRACT_FARMING_A_CRITICAL_ASPECT_IN_AGRICULTURE
15. Krishnpriya (2020). *Contract farming: A mechanism of alternative marketing*. Vikaspedia.https://agriculture.vikaspedia.in/viewcontent/agriculture/market-information/contract-farming-a-mechanism-of-alternative-marketing?lgn=en
16. KhetiBuddy. (2023). *Contract farming: A new model for agriculture in India.*
17. Verma, M. V. (2021). *Chapter 1: Introduction*. In *Contract farming and stakeholder roles* (GIPE Thesis, pp. 1–19). Gokhale Institute of Politics and Economics.
18. Singh, S. (2020). *Contract farming for agrarian transformation? Experiences from Punjab in the context of the Union Contract Farming Act, 2020* [Working paper]. Global Institute for Sustainable Solutions. https://www.giss.org/jsps_vol_29/09-sukhpal_singh.pdf

19. Sarkar, C. (2023). *Contract farming: A remedy of poor farmers in India. International Journal of Advanced Research, 11*(6), 689–696. http://dx.doi.org/10.21474/IJAR01/17116

20. Birthal, P. S., Jha, A. K., & Singh, H. (2007). *Contract farming and Indian agriculture: Can agribusiness help the small farmer?* Agricultural Economics Research Review, Agricultural Economics Research Association (India). Retrieved from https://cgspace.cgiar.org/items/9891d3e7-a275-47f5-a128-bca8411a7ed8

21. Kaur, P., Singla, N., & Singh, S. (2021). *Role of contract farming in crop diversification and employment generation: Empirical evidence from Indian Punjab. Indian Journal of Agricultural Economics* (SAGE). https://doi.org/10.1177/09763996211051300

22. Singh, S., & Raj, M. (2019). *Impact of contract farming on the income of farmers: An empirical study of Indian Punjab. Envision – Apeejay Journal of Arts & Commerce*, 2019, 1–12. https://www.acfa.apeejay.edu/docs/volumes/envision-2019/paper1.pdf

23. Nabard. (2021). *NABARD annual report FY2021*. National Bank for Agriculture and Rural Development. https://www.nabard.org/pdf/credit-to-all-reaching-the-last-mile-eng.pdf

24. Li, Q., & Wang, Z. (2024). *Impact of contract farming on green technological efficiency of farmers: A comparative study of two contract organizational models. Frontiers in Sustainable Food Systems, Agricultural and Food Economics*, Article 1368997. https://doi.org/10.3389/fsufs.2024.1368997

25. Ray, N., Clarke, G., & Waley, P. (2021). *The impact of contract farming on the welfare and livelihoods of farmers: A village case study from West Bengal. Journal of Rural Studies, 86*, 127–135. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jrurstud.2021.06.003

26. Yang, Q., Zhang, X., Peng, H., & Sun, D. (2024). *Contract farming for improving farmers' incomes: From Resource-Based View. Frontiers in Sustainable Food Systems.*

27. Eaton, C., & Shepherd, A. W. (2001). *Contract farming for agricultural development: Review of theory and practice with special reference to India.* Integrated Food Security Phase Classification, Food and Agriculture Organization.

28. Yang, Q., Zhang, X., Peng, H., & Sun, D. (2024). *Contract farming for improving farmers' incomes: From Resource-Based View. Frontiers in Sustainable Food Systems.*

29. Shagun. (2024). *Contract farming unfair trade, less profitable for smallholders in Punjab: New study. Down to Earth.*

30. National Institute of Agricultural Extension Management. (2024). *Contract farming in India.* MANAGE. Retrieved July 1, 2024, from https://www.manage.gov.in/publications/resArticles/kcg/Contract%20Farming%20In%20India.pdf

31. Vicol, M. (2018). *Potatoes, petty commodity producers and livelihoods: Contract farming and agrarian change in Maharashtra, India. Journal of Agrarian Change, 19*(1), 135–161. https://doi.org/10.1111/joac.12273

32. Singh, S. (2003). *Contract farming in India: Impacts on women and child workers* (Gatekeeper Series No. 111). International Institute for Environment and Development. https://www.iied.org/sites/default/files/pdfs/migrate/9281IIED.pdf

33. Vicol, M. (2017). *Potatoes, petty commodity producers and livelihoods: Contract farming and agrarian change in Maharashtra, India. Geoforum, 85*, 157–166. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.geoforum.2017.07.012

34. Ray, N., Clarke, G., & Waley, P. (2021). *The impact of contract farming on the welfare and livelihoods of farmers: A village case study from West Bengal*. *Journal of Rural Studies, 86*, 127–135. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jrurstud.2021.06.003

35. Sethi, N., Sucharita, S., & Pradhan, H. (2016). *Environmental implications of contract farming: The case of cotton cultivation in Odisha*.

36. Mitra, A., & Rao, N. (2021). *Contract farming, ecological change and the transformations of reciprocal gendered social relations in Eastern India*. *The Journal of Peasant Studies, 48*(2), 436–457. https://doi.org/10.1080/03066150.2019.1683000

37. Chand, R. (2020). *New Farm Acts 2020 (English)* [Working paper no. 06]. NITI Aayog. https://www.niti.gov.in/sites/default/files/2020-11/NewFarmActs2020.pdf

38. *Model Contract Farming Act, 2018* (2018). Press Information Bureau. https://www.pib.gov.in/PressReleseDetail.aspx?PRID=1533077

39. Press Information Bureau. (2023). *New Farm Acts—Understanding the Implications*. NITI Aayog. https://www.niti.gov.in/sites/default/files/2023-02/NewFarmActs2020.pdf

40. Press Information Bureau. (2018). *Salient features of Model Contract Farming Act, 2018*. https://www.pib.gov.in/newsite/PrintRelease.aspx?relid=179462

41. Krishnpriya. (2020). *Contract farming: A mechanism of alternative marketing*. Vikaspedia. Retrieved July 1, 2024, from https://agriculture.vikaspedia.in/viewcontent/agriculture/market-information/contract-farming-a-mechanism-of-alternative-marketing?lgn=en

42. Rede, G. D., & Ingle, S. G. (2022). *Model Contract Farming Act, 2018*. *Journal of Agricultural Economics and Policy*, 4(3), 50–60. Symbiosis International University.

43. Ghose, A. (2020, January 25). *Legalising contract farming*. *The New Indian Express*. https://www.newindianexpress.com/opinions/2020/Jan/25/legalising-contract-farming-2094234.html

44. Rede, G. D., & Ingle, S. G. (2022). *Model Contract Farming Act, 2018*. *Journal of Agricultural Economics and Policy, 4*(3), 50–60. Symbiosis International University. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/358939655_Model_Contract_Farming_Act_2018

45 Rede, G. D., & Ingle, S. G. (2022). *Model Contract Farming Act, 2018*. *Journal of Agricultural Economics and Policy, 4*(3), 50–60. Symbiosis International University. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/358939655_Model_Contract_Farming_Act_2018

46. Srivastava, A. (2020). *The Three Farm Bills*. *Swaniti Initiative*. https://www.swaniti.com/the-three-farm-bills/

47. Press Information Bureau. (2021, September 14). *Fifteen states and union territories greenlight contract farming: Agriculture ministry update*. NDTV Profit. https://www.ndtvprofit.com/business/fifteen-states-and-union-territories-greenlight-contract-farming-agriculture-ministry-update

48. NDTV Profit. (2021, September 14). *Fifteen states and union territories greenlight contract farming: Agriculture ministry update*. https://www.ndtvprofit.com/business/fifteen-states-and-union-territories-greenlight-contract-farming-agriculture-ministry-update

49. *New agriculture policy likely to boost horticulture through contract farming*. (2023, April 10). *The Times of India* (Goa). https://timesofindia.indiatimes.com/city/goa/new-agriculture-policy-likely-to-boost-horticulture-through-contract-farming/articleshow/118188068.cms

50. Bellemare, M. F. (2012). *As you sow, so shall you reap: The welfare impacts of contract farming*. *World Development, 40*(7), 1418–1434. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.worlddev.2011.12.008

51. Gouel, C., Martin, W., & Vos, R. (2020). *Smallholder farmers and contract farming in developing countries: A review of evidence*. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, 117*(17), 9150–9159. https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1909501116

52. Key, N., & Runsten, D. (1999). *Contract farming, contract design and smallholder livelihoods*.https://ageconsearch.umn.edu/record/342982/files/Contract%20farming%2C%20contract.pdf

53.Reddy, R. R., & Rao, R. (2023). *Role of contract farming in increasing agricultural sustainability in India*. *International Journal of Psychosocial Rehabilitation, 27*(3), 1505–1518. https://www.psychosocial.com/index.php/ijpr/article/view/1736