CropMatrix
International Journal of
Conscious Business Management Studies
International Publication
ISSN: 3139-874X

Contract Farming and Bargaining Power of Smallholder Farmers

[1]Sumit Kothole
MBA, Marketing Management, Savitribai Phule Pune University, Maharashtra, India
Email: sumitkothole99@gmail.com, **Contact Number:** +91 9960767830, **ORCID:** 0009-0007-2333-5582

Abstract

Contract farming has emerged as a significant mechanism for linking smallholder farmers to organised markets. Within contract farming arrangements, farmers may gain access to inputs, technical assistance, market information and a guaranteed buyer, whereas buyers acquire enhanced control over the supply of agricultural products. Nevertheless, the advantages of contract farming are not invariably distributed equally between farmers and buyers. Disparities in resources, information, market alternatives and negotiating capacity may give rise to unequal bargaining relationships. This paper investigates the relationship between contract farming and the bargaining power of smallholder farmers, paying particular attention to contract transparency, price fairness, information access, buyer dependence and membership in Farmer Producer Organisations (FPOs). The study adopts a conceptual and literature-based research approach. The existing academic literature is reviewed thematically, focusing on contract terms, market power, buyer dependence, collective action and farmer outcomes. The review suggests that contract farming can enhance market access and alleviate certain production and marketing difficulties, yet it does not automatically strengthen farmers' bargaining power. The outcome is contingent upon the structure of the contract, the availability of alternative buyers, access to information, price-setting mechanisms and farmers' capacity for collective action. Evidence from India further indicates that buyer market power can depress farm-gate prices even where contract farming delivers other economic benefits. FPOs and other forms of collective action may reinforce farmers' position by enabling them to aggregate production, share information and negotiate collectively with buyers. Drawing on these observations, the paper proposes a conceptual framework that links contract transparency, price fairness, information access and FPO membership to farmer bargaining power, and subsequently connects bargaining power to income stability and contract satisfaction. Five theoretical propositions are formulated for future empirical testing.

Keywords: Contract farming, smallholder farmers, bargaining power, contract transparency, buyer dependence, Farmer Producer Organisations, collective action, income stability

1 Introduction

In developing economies, agriculture constitutes a significant livelihood source for a substantial number of households. Smallholder farmers hold particular significance, as they add to agricultural output while typically functioning with constrained access to land, capital, information and markets. Because of their limited scale of production, securing inputs at advantageous prices, accessing distant markets and bargaining effectively with large purchasers may prove difficult. Such difficulties grow more pronounced when farmers cultivate crops destined for organised value chains, in which buyers may possess greater financial and informational resources. Within this context, one arrangement that has attracted substantial scholarly attention is contract farming. Contract farming typically entails an agreement concluded between farmers and buyers prior to or in the course of production. Such an agreement may stipulate the crop, production practices, quality requirements, quantity, delivery conditions and the price or the mechanism by which the price is set. Subject to the particular arrangement, buyers may supply inputs, technical advice, credit or other services. In exchange, farmers commonly commit to producing under specified conditions and to selling the agreed output to the buyer. The uploaded reference paper likewise conceptualises contract farming as a relationship encompassing contractual terms, power relationships and farmer outcomes, rather than merely as a mechanism for gaining market access. Contract farming is capable of offering smallholder farmers a number of potential benefits. A farmer may gain access to a buyer without needing to seek out a market once production is complete. Contractual arrangements may additionally furnish access to seeds, fertilisers, technical information and production guidance. Under certain circumstances, contracts are able to lessen uncertainty regarding where the produce will be sold. These characteristics account for why contract farming has frequently been portrayed as a potential means of integrating small farmers into modern agricultural value chains.

Nevertheless, contract farming is also capable of generating problems. The farmer and the buyer do not invariably engage in the relationship on equal footing with respect to resources or bargaining strength. A large buyer may possess superior information concerning market prices, quality standards and alternative suppliers. A small farmer may hold only limited knowledge of the market and may be heavily reliant on a single buyer. Where farmers have few alternative buyers available to them, their capacity to negotiate contract terms may be constrained. Scholarship examining contract farming in Maharashtra has focused explicitly on the ways in which asymmetrical bargaining relations may impact smallholders, and it has called into question the premise that formal contracts by themselves are capable of eliminating more entrenched inequalities embedded in market relations. This problem renders bargaining power a crucial analytical concept for comprehending contract farming. Broadly conceived, bargaining power denotes the capacity of one actor to shape the terms and results of an exchange relationship. Within agricultural markets, bargaining power may be shaped by information access, the presence of alternative buyers, resource control, market concentration, collective organisation, and the capacity to postpone or decline an agreement. The mere presence of a contract does not automatically imply that farmers possess substantial bargaining power. Although a contract may explicitly set out the obligations of both parties, the farmer's actual capacity to negotiate those terms may remain constrained. A farmer, for instance, may comprehend the contract fully yet lack any realistic alternative purchaser. Under such circumstances, transparency by itself may prove insufficient for generating bargaining power. Likewise, a farmer may be aware of the prevailing market price yet be unable to secure a better price when the local market is controlled by a limited number of buyers. Dependence on the buyer

thus constitutes a further significant factor. Where farmers depend heavily on a single buyer, that buyer is able to exert greater influence over prices and other contractual conditions. Recent Indian evidence indicates that the connection between contract type and market power is consequential. A 2024 investigation of okra production revealed that production contractors possessing monopsonistic power were able to suppress farm-gate prices relative to marketing contractors, even though production contracts continued to yield higher net profits for participating farmers in the study. This result matters because it demonstrates that contract farming may generate economic gains while simultaneously entailing unequal market power. Transparency and information are likewise of considerable importance. Farmers must be able to grasp the contract, the basis on which prices are determined, quality requirements, rejection rules, delivery conditions, and procedures for resolving disputes. Where such information remains unclear, the farmer may find himself or herself in a more vulnerable position. Transparency can thus enhance bargaining power by narrowing the information gap between farmers and buyers. Fairness of price constitutes yet another related concern. Farmers may assess a contract not solely in terms of the absolute sum of money received but also in terms of whether the price appears reasonable relative to market conditions, costs, and the value generated along the supply chain. A transparent mechanism for setting prices could enhance trust and satisfaction, even in cases where the final price is adjusted in response to market conditions. Collective action offers an additional potential avenue for tackling inequalities in bargaining. While individual smallholders may possess only limited negotiating capacity, a group of farmers can aggregate production and negotiate with buyers collectively. Evidence drawn from India indicates that collective models can assist farmers in overcoming disadvantages linked to small farm size and weak bargaining power. By way of illustration, the Small Farmers Large Field model enabled farmers to coordinate selected production and marketing activities, as well as to purchase inputs and sell produce collectively. Farmer Producer Organisations hold particular relevance within this context. The aim of FPOs is to organise farmers and to enhance their access to inputs, services, markets and collective bargaining. In the research literature, FPOs are characterised as institutional mechanisms capable of assisting smallholders in addressing fragmented production, elevated transaction costs and weak bargaining power. Nevertheless, membership in an FPO ought not to be regarded automatically as a guarantee of enhanced bargaining power. An FPO's effectiveness may hinge on its governance, its management, its financial capacity, its market connections and its capacity to represent its members. The present study thus investigates contract farming through the particular lens of bargaining power. The intention is not to contend that contract farming is either beneficial or detrimental to farmers. Rather, the study enquires into the conditions under which contract farming may reinforce or erode the position of smallholder farmers. The principal objective is to examine contract farming and power relationships; to review transparency, dependence and collective action; to identify the conditions that support bargaining power; and to propose a framework.

2 Literature Review

2.1 Contract Farming and Contract Terms

Contract farming typically rests upon an agreement concluded between farmers and buyers regarding the production and sale of agricultural products. Its precise structure differs from one crop to another, across regions, and among buyers. Contractual provisions may encompass production standards, arrangements for inputs, quality specifications, delivery requirements, and pricing arrangements. A potential benefit of a contract lies in its capacity to establish a more organised relationship between production and marketing. Rather than producing first and subsequently seeking a buyer, farmers may be aware of the expected buyer and the requirements prior to production. This may diminish certain forms of

market uncertainty. the contract as such does not ensure equal treatment. The terms may be set out in a formal document, yet the capacity of farmers to negotiate those terms may differ. In a comparable manner, the uploaded reference paper identifies contract farming as a setting in which formal contractual arrangements intersect with wider power relationships. Contract terms assume particular importance where quality standards exist. Buyers may stipulate specific varieties, production methods, sizes, grades, or delivery schedules. Such requirements may assist buyers in maintaining quality, yet they may equally raise production costs or risks for farmers. Where the farmer bears most of the production risk while the buyer controls final acceptance of the product, the relationship may become unequal.

Price terms constitute a further significant component of the contract. Certain contracts specify a fixed price, whereas others employ a formula linked to market prices or quality. A fixed price may offer certainty, yet it may become unattractive should market prices rise substantially. A flexible price may enable farmers to gain from market movements, although it may generate uncertainty where the formula is unclear. The transparency of the contract is therefore of importance. Farmers require an understanding of how the price is determined, what occurs when quality requirements are unmet, who bears production losses, and what happens should either party fail to fulfil the agreement. Research on contract farming in India has likewise raised concerns regarding unequal bargaining power. A critical examination of India's 2020 contract farming legislation contended that farmers could possess diminished bargaining power relative to corporate entities, while emphasizing transparency and accountable contractual arrangements as salient concerns. Consequently, contractual terms ought not to be examined solely through the lens of whether a contract is present. The pivotal question concerns whether farmers comprehend the terms and possess sufficient bargaining capacity to exert influence over the

2.2 Market Power

Market power denotes the capacity of a market actor to shape prices or other terms of exchange. Within agricultural value chains, market power may emerge where buyers are substantially larger than individual farmers, or where only a small number of buyers are active in a given market. Smallholder farmers frequently sell comparatively modest volumes. Taken individually, their capacity to exert influence over the buyer may be constrained. A buyer, by contrast, may source from numerous farmers and thus possess a greater range of alternatives. Such asymmetry can give rise to an unequal bargaining position. The difficulty may be exacerbated in contexts where markets are concentrated. In principle, a farmer may be free to sell to a different buyer; however, where alternative buyers are geographically distant, offer lower prices, or impose stringent quality requirements, the practical options available may be restricted. Evidence drawn from India corroborates the significance of market power within contract farming. The 2024 okra study established that monopsonistic production contractors were able to lower farm-gate prices relative to marketing contractors. Nevertheless, farmers engaged in production contracts continued to record higher net profits in that study. This indicates that the consequences of contract farming cannot be evaluated on the basis of a single outcome alone. A contract may yield greater income than an informal market arrangement while simultaneously conferring on buyers substantial authority over price and contractual terms. Accordingly, bargaining power and farmer outcomes ought to be regarded as interrelated yet analytically distinct concepts.

2.3 Buyer Dependence

Buyer dependence denotes the degree to which a farmer depends on a single buyer, or on a small number of buyers, when selling agricultural produce. Such dependence may emerge for a variety of reasons. A buyer may supply production inputs or credit, which renders it difficult for farmers to switch to other buyers. The buyer may additionally furnish technical services or possess access

to a specialised market. In certain instances, the crop may be cultivated specifically in accordance with the requirements of one buyer. Dependence may exert both beneficial and detrimental effects. On the beneficial side, a dependable buyer is able to diminish uncertainty in marketing. The farmer may devote less time to the search for a market. The relationship may likewise furnish stable demand. On the detrimental side, a high level of dependence may diminish the farmer's capacity to reject unfavourable terms. Where no alternative buyer exists, the farmer may accept the buyer's price or contract conditions Research on potato contract farming in Maharashtra has demonstrated how unequal social and economic relationships can render smallholder farmers vulnerable even when contract farming is presented as an inclusive market arrangement. A further study of contract farming in Maharashtra specifically examines unequal bargaining power and contends that formal regulation of contract terms cannot on its own eliminate the background inequalities that shape farmer-firm relationships. This indicates that buyer dependence ought to be incorporated when farmer bargaining power is studied. The existence of a contract may afford security, yet strong dependence on a single buyer may at the same time weaken the farmer's negotiating position.

2.4 Collective Action

Collective action denotes the collaboration of farmers in pursuit of goals that are likely to prove difficult to attain on an individual basis. Within agricultural markets, collective action may encompass the joint procurement of inputs, collective marketing, the sharing of information, common production planning, and joint negotiation with buyers. Smallholders are placed at a disadvantage owing to the fragmented nature of their production. A buyer may be required to engage with numerous individual farmers, yet each of those farmers may possess only limited bargaining power. By aggregating their output, farmers may enhance their relevance to buyers and may lower transaction costs. Evidence drawn from India lends support to this argument. Under the Small Farmers Large Field model, farmers were organised so as to coordinate their activities and to purchase inputs and sell paddy collectively. The study reported that participating farmers nearly doubled their profits in the pilot and that the model reinforced bargaining power through collective action. A further study, examining voluntary farmer groups within contract farming, found that such groups can constitute an institutional response to asymmetric information and to an imbalance in bargaining power. That study explicitly linked group formation to price transparency and to enhanced bargaining power. Nevertheless, collective action does not succeed automatically. Farmers are required to participate actively, to place trust in the organisation, and to comply with the rules that have been agreed. Organisations likewise demand effective management. Where an FPO suffers from weak governance or inadequate financial management, membership may fail to translate into meaningful bargaining power. Recent research on FPOs in India highlights their potential to improve market access and negotiating power, while also drawing attention to differences among FPOs and to the necessity of considering organisational performance rather than treating all FPOs as identical. Collective action is therefore best understood as a possible mechanism for enhancing bargaining power rather than as an automatic consequence of group membership.

2.5 Farmer Producer Organisations and Bargaining Power

In India, Farmer Producer Organizations (FPOs) are being employed with growing frequency as a means of tackling the challenges confronting small and marginal farmers. Input provision, aggregation, marketing, technical assistance, and access to finance may all form part of their operations. The underlying rationale is simple. A single farmer might offer only a modest volume for sale and possess restricted information. By pooling produce from numerous farmers, an FPO is able to bargain with purchasers on behalf of its members. This

holds the potential to strengthen the farmers' standing. Bargaining power, economies of scale, and farmer mobilisation have been pinpointed by research conducted at ICAR as key justifications for establishing FPOs. A systematic review carried out recently likewise observes that FPOs are capable of facilitating collective bargaining and market access, even though variations in organisational structure affect how well they perform. Access to information can likewise be enhanced through FPOs. Rather than each farmer separately attempting to ascertain market prices, quality standards, or prospective purchasers, an organisation is able to gather and disseminate such information.

2.6 Farmer Outcomes

The concluding issue concerns outcomes for farmers. The framework set out here centres on two outcomes: stability of income and satisfaction with the contract. Stability of income is not equivalent to merely obtaining a high income. It is possible for a farmer to obtain a high income in a given year while nevertheless confronting considerable uncertainty regarding prices and production. A contract may hold value where it delivers more predictable returns, lessens marketing risk, or enhances access to inputs. Satisfaction with the contract pertains to the farmer's evaluation of the contractual relationship. Such satisfaction may hinge on whether the contract was explained clearly, whether the price was perceived as fair, whether the buyer honoured the agreement, and whether disputes were resolved appropriately. Accordingly, the outcomes experienced by farmers ought not to be assessed solely in terms of price. A farmer may be willing to accept a somewhat lower price where the contract guarantees reliable demand and diminishes uncertainty. Conversely, a farmer may remain dissatisfied even when the price is reasonable, should the buyer alter terms without consultation or reject produce without clear justification. The nexus between bargaining power and farmer outcomes is thus of considerable importance. Farmers who possess greater bargaining power may be more capable of negotiating terms that safeguard both their income and their satisfaction.

Nevertheless, being a member of an FPO may not, on its own, protect farmers. An FPO must possess adequate scale and management as prerequisites. capacity and access to markets. Members must likewise have confidence in the organisation. Should the FPO depend on a single buyer in the same manner as individual farmers do, its bargaining power may continue to be limited. Consequently, the question is not merely whether a farmer belongs to an FPO. Of greater importance is the question of whether membership in an FPO provides the farmer with genuine alternatives, information and the capacity to negotiate collectively.

3 Research Gap, Objective And Research Questions

3.1 Research Gap

Prior scholarship indicates that contract farming may yield divergent outcomes for smallholder farmers. Certain investigations document advantages, including access to markets, provision of inputs and enhanced income, whereas other investigations document difficulties stemming from buyer power, dependence and asymmetrical relationships. The core problem is that such outcomes cannot invariably be attributed to contract farming in isolation. The existing literature tends to analyse discrete factors, for instance contract design, market access, buyer power, collective organisations or farmer outcomes. Nevertheless, these factors are intricately interrelated. It is possible for a farmer to possess a written contract while wielding only restricted bargaining power. A different farmer may secure a more favourable price yet remain heavily reliant on a single buyer. A further farmer may be affiliated with an FPO yet derive limited advantage where that FPO lacks market connections. Consequently, the principal research gap that this study identifies is that contract farming scholarship reports mixed benefits owing to the inconsistent integration of bargaining power,

transparency and collective membership. This gap is significant because contract farming does not constitute a purely economic transaction. It is likewise a relationship that encompasses information, negotiation and power. The evidence from Maharashtra is especially pertinent, as it demonstrates that formal contracts function amid broader social and economic inequalities. The present paper addresses this gap by integrating contract transparency, price fairness, information access, buyer dependence and FPO membership within a single conceptual framework.

3.2 Research Objective

The aim of this study is as follows:

To investigate contract farming and the dynamics of power; to assess transparency, dependence, and collective action; to determine the conditions that foster bargaining power; and to put forward a framework.

3.3 C. Research Questions

RQ1: To what extent does contract farming enhance farmers' bargaining power?

RQ2: In what ways do contract transparency and dependence on buyers influence power?

RQ3: Does membership in an FPO serve to safeguard farmers?

An interconnection exists among these questions. The initial question concerns the general association between contract farming and bargaining power. The second centres on two conditions that could either reinforce or diminish that association. The third examines whether collective organisation is able to furnish farmers with further bargaining capacity

4 Theoretical Foundations

4.1 A. Bargaining Power Perspective

The concept of bargaining power constitutes the first theoretical foundation. Within a transaction, the bargaining power of each party is shaped by the alternatives that are available to them. A party possessing a greater number of alternatives may occupy a stronger position, given that it is able to reject an unfavourable offer. In the case of smallholder farmers, such alternatives may encompass other buyers, local markets, cooperatives, FPOs, or direct marketing channels. Where these alternatives are constrained, the buyer is able to exert greater influence. This perspective contributes to explaining why the mere existence of a contract does not suffice to establish farmer empowerment. A farmer may sign a transparent contract and yet continue to possess limited bargaining power in the absence of an alternative buyer.

4.2 B. Resource Dependence Perspective

Another valuable explanation is offered by the concept of resource dependence. Farmers rely on buyers in order to gain access to markets, whereas buyers rely on farmers for agricultural products. Nevertheless, this dependence may not be symmetrical. If a buyer can readily secure products from other farmers, whereas an individual farmer cannot readily locate another buyer, then the farmer may be the more dependent party.

This contributes to an explanation of Proposition P3:

The bargaining power of the buyer is diminished by buyer dependence. This relationship is not inevitably automatic. It is contingent upon the availability of alternatives and upon how important the buyer is to the farmer.

4.3 Collective Action Perspective

Collective action theory offers an explanation for the ways in which farmers can become stronger through organisation. A single farmer commands only a restricted volume of production. A collective is able to consolidate output, information and bargaining capacity. Consequently, the group may establish a more advantageous position in its dealings with buyers. This theoretical perspective underpins the proposed function of FPO membership. It further accounts for why the effectiveness of an FPO is contingent upon participation, coordination and organisational capacity.

4.4 Transaction Cost Perspective

Costs associated with locating buyers, negotiating terms, monitoring activities, and enforcing transactions are all encompassed within transaction costs. By establishing a relationship between the farmer and the buyer, contract farming is capable of lowering certain transaction costs. Nevertheless, should the contract prove complex or hard to enforce, these costs may be transferred toward farmers. Through the aggregation of farmers and the coordination of marketing activities, FPOs are able to lower certain transaction costs. This offers an additional explanation for the manner in which collective organisations may reinforce farmer participation in value chains.

5 Proposed Conceptual Framework And Theoretical Propositions

5.1 A. Proposed Conceptual Framework

The framework posits that transparency in contracts, access to information, and membership in an FPO are capable of enhancing farmers' bargaining power. Dependence on buyers is anticipated to diminish bargaining power. Bargaining power is subsequently anticipated to enhance income stability and satisfaction with contracts. Fairness in pricing is posited to bear a direct positive relationship with satisfaction regarding contracts. The framework refrains from asserting that these relationships have already been empirically substantiated. Rather, it furnishes a foundation for subsequent empirical investigation.

B. Transparency in Contracts and Bargaining Power

Transparency denotes that salient contractual information is communicated to farmers in a clear manner. This may encompass rules for price-setting, quality standards, delivery conditions, rules for rejection, and procedures for dispute resolution. A contract that is transparent is capable of reducing informational disparities between farmers and buyers. Where farmers comprehend the terms, they may be better positioned to assess the agreement and to identify conditions that are unfair. Nevertheless, transparency alone may prove insufficient. A farmer may comprehend an unfavourable contract yet still accept it owing to a restricted range of alternatives. Consequently:

P1: Transparency in contracts enhances bargaining power. The proposition implies that transparency functions as a supporting condition for bargaining power rather than as a comprehensive remedy for market relationships that are unequal.

5.2 Price Fairness and Contract Satisfaction

It is probable that farmers will assess contracts partly according to whether the price seems fair. Perceptions of fairness may hinge on market conditions, production costs, quality, risks, and how other parties are treated. Confidence in the contract can be enhanced by a pricing mechanism that is both clear and reasonable. If farmers perceive the process of setting prices as fair, their satisfaction with the contractual relationship may increase.

Consequently:

P2: Contract satisfaction rises with price fairness. Rather than asserting outright that price fairness invariably enhances bargaining power, this proposition centres on satisfaction.

5.3 D. Buyer Dependence and Bargaining Power

Buyer dependence matters because farmers who possess few alternatives may be less able to reject terms that are unfavourable to them. A farmer reliant on a single buyer for inputs, credit, technical support and output marketing may be disinclined to challenge that buyer. Consequently, the buyer may be able to exert greater influence. Recent evidence from India indicates that market power can influence farm-gate prices within contract farming.

Accordingly: P3: Buyer dependence diminishes bargaining power. The relationship anticipated is negative.

5.4 E. FPO Membership and Bargaining Power

Membership in an FPO may afford farmers opportunities for collective marketing, access to information, procurement of inputs, and negotiation. Where farmers engage in collective negotiation, buyers could be confronted with a supply base that is more organised.

Access to market information may likewise be improved for farmers. Studies of Indian farmer organisations lend support to the potential contribution of collective organisation toward enhancing bargaining power and access to markets.

Accordingly: P4: Membership in an FPO enhances bargaining power. The proposition does, however, presuppose participation that is meaningful and an FPO that functions effectively. Where membership is unaccompanied by active services or collective negotiation, the impact may be limited.

F. Bargaining Power and Income Stability

The capacity of farmers to negotiate prices and other contractual conditions can be influenced by bargaining power. Greater bargaining power may additionally assist farmers in pursuing risk-sharing arrangements that are clearer. Should farmers be able to negotiate conditions that are more favourable and predictable, their income may become more stable. Accordingly: P5: Bargaining power enhances income stability. What the proposition addresses is income stability, not merely a higher level of income.

6 Research Methodology

6.1 Research Approach

The present investigation adopts a conceptual research design grounded in the relevant literature. Such an approach is fitting, given that the paper seeks to synthesize existing scholarship on contract farming and to construct a conceptual framework that accounts for bargaining power. A comparable conceptual orientation is evident in the reference paper that was uploaded. Rather than gathering primary survey data, it draws on previously published studies to isolate key themes, identify a research gap, and put forward proposed relationships.

6.2 Research Design

A thematic literature review combined with conceptual synthesis constitutes the methodological approach adopted in this study.

The literature is structured according to five principal themes:

Contractual terms, market power, buyer dependence, collective action, and farmer outcomes

To link these themes, further concepts are drawn upon, including transparency, price fairness, access to information, FPO membership, and bargaining power.

6.3 Literature Search

The identification of pertinent literature was carried out by employing search terms including:

Contract farming, Smallholder farmer, Bargaining power, Contract transparency, Buyer dependence, Market power, Farmer Producer Organisations, Collective action, Agricultural value chains, Income stability, Contract satisfaction. Particular emphasis is placed in this review on studies pertaining to India, since the institutional and market circumstances surrounding smallholder farming differ from one country to another.

6.4 Source Selection

This study gives precedence to scholarly research that has undergone peer review as well as dependable publications from institutions. Pertinent evidence encompasses scholarship on contract farming in Maharashtra, Indian findings concerning market power, investigations into farmer collective action, and examinations of FPOs.

6.5 Thematic Analysis

The literature is examined thematically, instead of being arranged as a catalogue of discrete studies. The aim is to determine which findings are shared, where they diverge, and which conditions account for the varying outcomes that contract farming yields for farmers.

6.6 Conceptual Synthesis

Subsequently, the results reported in the literature are synthesized and integrated into the framework that is proposed here.

The purpose of this framework is to account for the ways in which:

Contractual conditions + market conditions + information + collective action

are able to exert an influence on:

The bargaining power of farmers

which in turn has the potential to shape:

Stability of income + satisfaction with the contract.

6.7 Methodological Limitation

Given the conceptual nature of the study, the five propositions are not subjected to statistical testing. Consequently, the framework calls for empirical investigation in subsequent research. These conclusions ought to be understood as a synthesis of prior research and a proposed theoretical model, rather than as evidence gathered directly from farmers.

7 Thematic Analysis And Discussion

7.1 Does Contract Farming Improve Farmer Bargaining Power?

The existing body of scholarly work fails to provide a straightforward affirmative or negative response.

In certain contexts, contract farming is capable of enhancing the position of farmers. A farmer may secure access to a dependable purchaser, agricultural inputs, technical support, and well-structured markets. Such advantages are able to alleviate certain challenges that accompany small-scale agricultural production. Nevertheless, these advantages do not inevitably imply that the farmer possesses enhanced bargaining power. It is possible for a farmer to enjoy market access while remaining heavily reliant upon a single buyer. A farmer may obtain inputs yet exert only restricted influence over the conditions governing the provision of those inputs. A farmer may be paid a predetermined price while lacking any capacity to negotiate that price. An important illustration is offered by research conducted in Maharashtra. The investigation of potato contract farming demonstrates how asymmetrical power relations are able to render participating households susceptible, notwithstanding the potential benefits that contract farming offers. A valuable analytical distinction is likewise furnished by the 2024 Indian study of okra. Farmers engaged in production contracts were able to realise greater net profits, although contractors possessing superior market power were capable of lowering farm-gate prices. Consequently, contract farming ought not to be regarded as empowering in an automatic sense. The outcome is contingent upon the conditions under which the contract is implemented.

7.2 Role of Contract Transparency

Transparency has the potential to enhance the farmer's capacity to comprehend the relationship.

The following constitute important information:

The manner in which the price is determined, quality specifications, quantity specifications, delivery schedules, rejection criteria, input costs, penalty provisions, and dispute resolution procedures

Should such information remain unclear, farmers could encounter difficulties in assessing the contract. Transparency is also capable of strengthening accountability. Where both parties possess a clear comprehension of their respective responsibilities, disagreements may prove easier to pinpoint. Nevertheless, transparency needs to be accompanied by bargaining alternatives. Should a farmer comprehend a contract yet lack any alternative outlet for selling, transparency may exert only a limited practical influence. Consequently, P1 ought to be interpreted as a component of a wider system rather than as a standalone solution.

7.3 Role of Buyer Dependence

A considerable power imbalance may arise from the dependence of the buyer. Take, for instance, a farmer who cultivates a specialised crop within the framework of a contract. It is possible that the farmer will acquire inputs in accordance with the specifications set by the buyer. The crop in question may prove unsuitable for alternative markets. Consequently, the farmer may encounter difficulty in switching to a different buyer. Switching costs are thereby generated. The bargaining position of the buyer is strengthened, given that the farmer possesses fewer alternatives. This consideration is of particular significance in contexts where buyers are concentrated. The 2024 study of Indian okra production demonstrates that both the contract type and the market

structure are capable of influencing farm-gate prices. Accordingly, policies on contract farming and the associated business models ought to take into account not merely the existence of a contract but also the number of realistic alternatives available to farmers.

7.4 Role of Information Access

Bargaining power can be influenced by information in a number of ways.

A farmer requires information regarding:

Prevailing market prices, buyer specifications, input costs, quality standards, alternative purchasers, contractual conditions, and accessible support

In the absence of such information, a farmer may be unable to determine whether a contract is advantageous. FPOs may be able to ameliorate this situation by gathering market information and disseminating it among their members. Consequently, access to information underpins both transparency and collective bargaining. Nevertheless, it is essential to differentiate between possessing information and possessing the capacity to act upon it. A farmer might be aware that a different buyer is offering a higher price, yet may remain unable to reach that buyer owing to constraints related to transport, quality, or quantity. Accordingly, information is a necessary but potentially insufficient condition for bargaining power.

7.5 Role of FPO Membership

Membership in an FPO is capable of mitigating certain vulnerabilities that individual smallholders face. Through collective organization, a group is able to aggregate produce and negotiate transactions of greater scale. Furthermore, it may lower the search and transaction costs incurred by individuals. Evidence drawn from India suggests that collective action has the potential to enhance bargaining capacity. The Small Farmers Large Field model, for instance, employed collective purchasing and selling practices in order to counter the disadvantages linked to small farm size.

7.6 Price Fairness and Contract Satisfaction

The extent to which farmers are satisfied with a contract is probably shaped by whether they perceive the price as fair.

Farmers might evaluate the contract price against:

- Prices prevailing in the local market
- The costs incurred in production
- Prices that other farmers obtain
- Anticipated market prices
- The risks borne by the farmer

A contract price is more likely to be regarded as fair when the farmer comprehends how it was determined and trusts that the buyer applies the same rules consistently. Fairness consequently encompasses both an economic and a relational aspect. Should farmers suspect that the buyer has relied on concealed information or altered the terms after production, their satisfaction may decline, even where the final payment is not especially low. This lends support to P2.

7.7 G. Bargaining Power and Income Stability

The concluding association within the framework concerns the link between bargaining power and income stability.

Enhanced bargaining power may potentially assist farmers in negotiating:

• Better pricing
• More transparent payment terms
• Fairer quality standards
• Arrangements for sharing risk
• More foreseeable contract conditions

This does not imply that bargaining power is capable of eliminating all agricultural risks. Weather, disease, input prices and market demand can still have an impact on farm income. Nevertheless, improved bargaining conditions may lessen the share of risk arising from unequal contractual relationships. The association between bargaining power and income stability should thus be regarded as a possible contribution rather than a guarantee.

8 Managerial And Policy Implications

8.1 Promote Clear and Simple Contracts

Enterprises engaged in contract farming ought to employ contractual agreements that are comprehensible to farmers.

Crucial provisions ought to be articulated in plain language and should explicitly clarify:

Cost, Quality, Quantity, Delivery, Payment, Rejection, Penalties, Dispute resolution

A contract that is transparent is capable of diminishing misunderstandings.

B. Enhance Price Transparency

Purchasers ought to explicitly elucidate the manner in which prices are established. Where the price is determined by market conditions, the pertinent market and the calculation methodology ought to be explicated. This is capable of enhancing trust and diminishing disputes.

8.2 C. Provide Market Information

It is essential that farmers are able to obtain information regarding market prices as well as alternative avenues for marketing. This information can be supplied with the assistance of FPOs, extension agencies, and other institutions.

8.3 D. Develop Effective Dispute Resolution

An accessible mechanism for resolution ought to be available for contract disputes. The financial means to engage in protracted legal proceedings may be lacking among small farmers. Consequently, mechanisms for dispute resolution that are both simple and affordable hold significant importance.

8.4 E. Strengthen FPOs

- FPOs ought not to be regarded solely as organisations for registering or aggregating farmers.
- They should cultivate practical competencies in the following areas:
- Marketing conducted collectively
- Negotiation of prices
- Management of quality
- Information on markets
- Reviewing of contracts
- Identification of buyers
- Management of finances

8.5 F. Reduce Excessive Buyer Dependence

It is desirable that farmers possess access to multiple marketing channels. This is not to suggest that farmers are required to switch buyers on a frequent basis. Instead, the availability of alternatives may strengthen their bargaining position.

8.6 G. Policy Implications

- It is incumbent upon policymakers to attend to market concentration as well as to the position occupied by small farmers within contract farming arrangements. Scholarship on contract farming in India has drawn attention to concerns regarding farmers' comparatively weaker bargaining position and to the necessity of contract arrangements that are transparent and responsible.
- Areas where policy support may be directed include:
- Transparency of contracts
- Awareness among farmers
- Development of FPOs
- Information on markets
- Resolution of disputes
- Competition among buyers

9 Limitations And Future Research

9.1 A. Limitations

The present study is conceptual in nature and draws upon previously published literature. Primary data are not gathered from smallholder farmers in this research. Consequently, the relationships proposed here have not undergone statistical testing. The reviewed literature additionally spans a range of crops, geographical regions and contractual arrangements. Findings derived from a single crop or region may not be directly transferable to others. The function of FPOs likewise differs in accordance with their organisational structure and their market linkages. Accordingly, the proposed framework ought to be subjected to empirical testing prior to drawing

generalised conclusions regarding all contract farming arrangements.

9.2 B. Future Research

Subsequent investigations may empirically validate the proposed framework by drawing on primary data collected from smallholder farmers.

A significant avenue for inquiry concerns comparative analysis across different crops. Contract farming arrangements in potatoes, vegetables, poultry, dairy, or other commodities may entail varying degrees of buyer concentration and production risk.

Subsequent investigations may likewise undertake comparisons of differing buyer structures, for instance:

- Individual traders
- Cooperatives
- Processing companies
- Retail-linked buyers
- Multinational companies

A further valuable comparison would involve FPO members as against non-members.

Investigators might assess whether FPO members in fact possess:

Longitudinal investigations may additionally explore whether bargaining relationships undergo change across a span of several years. Subsequent research should likewise examine whether transparency exerts a more pronounced effect in circumstances where farmers have access to alternative buyers. This matters because transparency and bargaining power may interact with one another. Information may prove more beneficial when farmers possess the capacity to act upon that information.

10 Conclusion

Contract farming may generate opportunities for smallholder farmers by linking them to organised markets and, under certain arrangements, by furnishing access to inputs, technical assistance and more predictable demand. Nevertheless, the mere presence of a contract does not by itself guarantee that farmers possess substantial bargaining power. The pivotal concern is the distribution of power between farmers and buyers. The body of literature examined in this paper indicates that the outcomes of contract farming are contingent upon a number of conditions. Transparency in contracts can assist farmers in comprehending their rights and obligations. Access to information can assist them in assessing market and contractual conditions. Fairness of price can enhance satisfaction with the contractual relationship. Dependence on the buyer, conversely, may diminish the farmer's capacity to negotiate where alternative buyers are scarce. Evidence drawn from Indian contract farming demonstrates that buyer market power can influence farm-gate prices even in instances where contractual arrangements deliver other economic benefits. Collective action constitutes a further possible response to inequalities in bargaining. FPOs and farmer groups are able to aggregate production, enhance access to information and negotiate with buyers collectively. Evidence from Indian collective-action initiatives lends support to the potential of organisation to strengthen the position of small farmers. Yet membership in an FPO should not, on its own, be regarded as sufficient. The effectiveness of an FPO is contingent upon its management, governance, market connections and capacity to represent farmers. On the basis of these findings, this paper proposes a framework in which contract transparency, information access and FPO membership bolster farmers' bargaining power, whereas buyer dependence may erode it. Price fairness is posited to enhance contract satisfaction, while stronger bargaining power is anticipated to contribute to income stability and contract satisfaction. The principal contribution of the proposed framework lies in its integration of factors that are frequently treated separately within contract farming research. Rather than regarding contract farming solely as a mechanism of market access, the framework conceives of it as a relationship moulded by information, dependence, market power and collective action. The response to the first research question is thus conditional: contract farming can improve the position of smallholder farmers,

yet it does not automatically enhance their bargaining power. The answer is contingent upon how contracts are designed, how transparent they are, how dependent farmers are on buyers, and whether farmers possess meaningful collective support. With respect to the second research question, transparency in contracts may enhance bargaining power through a reduction in information asymmetries, whereas dependence on buyers may diminish bargaining power by narrowing the alternatives available to farmers. Regarding the third research question, membership in an FPO may safeguard farmers by strengthening collective bargaining, information, and market access; however, the realised effect is contingent upon the quality and effectiveness of the FPO. The propositions advanced here offer a foundation upon which subsequent empirical investigation can be built.

11 Bibliography

[1] M. Cohen, "Living under value chains: The new distributive contract and arguments about unequal bargaining power," Journal of Agrarian Change, 2022.

[2] A. Baruah, S. Mohanty, and A. C. Rola, "Small Farmers Large Field (SFLF): A synchronized collective action model for improving the livelihood of small farmers in India," Food Security, vol. 14, 2022.

[3] "The relation between contract type and market power: Evidence from a high-value crop in India," Food Policy, vol. 127, Art. no. 102683, 2024.

[4] M. Vicol, "Is contract farming an inclusive alternative to land grabbing? The case of potato contract farming in Maharashtra, India," Geoforum, vol. 85, pp. 157–166, 2017.

[5] P. Barik, "A critical analysis of India's Contract Farming Act 2020," Agricultural Economics Research Review, vol. 34, pp. 165–174, 2021.

[6] S. Roy Chowdhury, D. Ghosh, and T. Joji Rao, "Sentiment and success potential of farmers' producer organizations: A systematic literature review," Journal of Rural Studies, 2024.

[7] A. Chadda, C. M. L. Chadda, and B. P. Chadda, "Contract Farming and Strategies to link with Farmer Producer Organizations (FPOs): A Review," Journal of Agricultural Extension Management, vol. 23, no. 1, 2022.

[8] V. Nikam, P. Singh, A. Ashok, and S. Kumar, "Farmer producer organisations: Innovative institutions for upliftment of small farmers," Indian Journal of Agricultural Sciences, vol. 89, no. 9, 2019.

[9] "Group contracts and sustainability: Experimental evidence from smallholder seed production," 2021.

[10] "Empowering Small and Marginal Farmers: Unveiling the Potential and Addressing Obstacles of Farmer Producer Organizations in India," Research on World Agricultural Economy, vol. 5, no. 1, 2024.

[11] "What makes Farmer Producer Organizations work? A multi-level analysis of performance determinants in India," Journal of Rural Studies, 2026.

[12] "Farmer Producer Organisations and Rural Market Power: A Review of Economic and Extension Perspectives," Journal of Scientific Research and Reports, 2026.

[13] "Unveiling the dynamics of farmer producer organizations in India: A systematic review of status, challenges, and future directions," Humanities and Social Sciences Communications, 2025.