

# **CONTRACT FARMING IN KARNATAKA: A BOON OR A BANE?**

**S. Erappa**



**Agricultural Development and Rural Transformation Unit  
Institute for Social and Economic Change  
Nagarbhavi, Bangalore-560 072**

**March 2006**

# **CONTRACT FARMING IN KARNATAKA: A BOON OR A BANE?**

S. Erappa

## **EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**



Agricultural Development and Rural Transformation Unit  
Institute for Social and Economic Change  
Nagarbhavi, Bangalore-560 072

March 2006

# CONTENTS

CHAPTER NO.	TITLE	PAGE NO.
	FOREWORD	ii
	PREFACE	iii
	LIST OF TABLES	iv
CHAPTER 1	INTRODUCTION	1-4
CHAPTER 2	REVIEW OF LITERATURE	5-10
CHAPTER 3	OBJECTIVES AND METHODOLOGY	11-14
CHAPTER 4	PROFILE OF THE SELECTED COMPANIES WORKING IN THE STUDY AREA	15-23
CHAPTER 5	SOCIO-ECONOMIC CHARACTERISTICS OF THE SAMPLE CONTRACT FARMERS	24-31
CHAPTER 6	GHERKIN CROP AND ITS INCOME AND EMPLOYMENT GENERATION	32-43
CHAPTER 7	BENEFITS FROM GHERKIN CROP AND PERCEPTIONS OF CONTRACT FARMERS	44-47
CHAPTER 8	CONCLUSIONS AND POLICY RECOMMENDATIONS	48-51
	APPENDIX TABLES 1-5	52-57

REFERENCES  
58-62

## FOREWORD

The structure of Indian agriculture underwent rapid changes during the nineties both due to the pressure of commercialisation and increased dependence on trade. This was fuelled by many overt and covert changes in the sector, but diversification of crops along with the advent of WTO and liberalisation policies were the main players in the structural change. One of the important bottleneck, highlighted by many analysts of Indian agriculture refers to the small size of holdings and the inability of the Indian farmers to compete with the large scale farming of the West. This was manifested in the proverbial "level playing field" often referred to in recent debates. One of the ways to deal with this small scale farm operations is to bring small and marginal holders (not holdings) together in a production system so as to deal with a particular product. This would address three important issues simultaneously. First, the access to technology by the small and marginal farmers has been quite restricted and it is was only available to those who could garner information at a fast speed. The recent NSSO report (59<sup>th</sup> Round) highlights this fact. Second, small and marginal farmers faced discriminated pricing both in the factor and product markets and that has resulted in reducing their net income flow. Lastly, the capability of small and marginal farmers has always been far better than their large holding peers in terms of productivity and quality of land. But all these years that could not be taken advantage of due to the scale and limited access to technology. These aspects need immediate attention and as society responds quietly to the challenges in its own manner, contract farming has emerged in the country like the Pepsi Model initiated in Punjab. The experience has given rise to a large number of controversies including over-exploitation of land, tendency towards monoculture, market dependence, asymmetry about sharing gains between contractors and contractees and the exploitation by contractors. There are a good number of indepth studies available in the literature on contract farming analysing these issues but not much has been done in the context of Karnataka, where it is emerging steadily but firmly as an alternative. It assumes additional significance as in Karnataka, contract farming is emerging in the resource constrained region with low capital formation as its hallmark. The study by Dr. S.Erappa is an attempt to fill this void. The study emerged out of his personal keen interest and persuasion. Therefore, the study indicates his concerted efforts and analytical prowess. He has analysed five different contracting agencies and contract farmers connected with these agencies in Southern Karnataka. The basic hypothesis attempted in the study is to look into the question of "boon or bane". The answer provided is not in terms of monosyllables but provides a good background analysis, in addition to the coverage in the field. He has been successful in bringing out a few basic problems in contract farming in Southern Karnataka.

I am sure that this study would be useful to those who are looking at the regional specification of contract farming models and responses of various farm groups in the process. The study will also be useful to academics working in this field to fish out new questions in the process.

**R S Deshpande**  
**Professor and Head**

**Agricultural Development and Rural Transformation (ADRT) Unit**  
**Institute for Social and Economic Change**  
**Nagarabhavi**  
**BANGALORE 560 072**

## PREFACE

This report is the outcome of a research project, "Contract farming in Karnataka: A Boon or A Bane?", sponsored and funded by the Agro-Economic Research Division of the Department of Agriculture and Cooperation of the Directorate of Economics and Statistics of Ministry of Agriculture, Government of India. The study was executed by the Agricultural Development and Rural Transformation (ADRT) Unit of the Institute for Social and Economic Change (ISEC), Bangalore. We are grateful to the Ministry for the faith reposed in ISEC, particularly in the ADRT Centre, and entrusting this project for execution by us.

We are grateful to Prof. Gopal Kadekodi, Director, ISEC for his constant encouragement in our research pursuits and the enabling atmosphere he sought to provide for the successful execution of the project. We also thank to Prof RS Deshpande, Head, ADRT Unit not only for providing the necessary infrastructure for the project but also for being a constant source of inspiration for our day-to-day work. Our thanks are also due to the Director, Joint Director, Deputy Director and other functionaries of the Directorate of Agriculture, Government of Karnataka, Bangalore with whom we have had very fruitful and insightful discussions on the myriad aspects of Contract farming in Karnataka. Again, it was through departmental efforts that the team was able to be in touch with organisations engaged in contract farming in Karnataka, particularly promoting Gherkin Crop in the State, and collect valuable data for the study. We place on record our sincere appreciation and gratitude for their willing cooperation.

Further, we owe our special thanks to the Chairmen, CEOs, Agricultural, Commercial and Accounts Managers, Agricultural Production Managers, Agricultural Extension Executives, Agricultural Extension Assistants, Procurement Executives, Buyers and Buying Assistants working in the field of the selected companies, viz., Global Green Company Ltd., Unicorn Agri-Tech Ltd., Intergarden (India) Pvt. Ltd., Reitzel India Pvt. Ltd., and Vishal Natural Food Products etc. But for their cooperation and support through discussions etc., successful completion of this study would not have been possible.

We thank Mr. R Venkatesh, Research Assistant, ADRT Unit, ISEC, for conducting fieldwork for the study and assisting in entering data. Mr. Venugopal Reddy spared his valuable time to input the tables in the report. I wholeheartedly thank him for his help. Last but not least, I thank the selected farmers (both contract and non-contract) in the study area for the valuable information they willingly provided for the study.

S . Erappa

LIST OF TABLES

<b>TABLE NO</b>	<b>TITLE OF THE TABLE</b>	<b>PAGE NO</b>
Table 1.1:	Distribution of Number and Area of Operational Holdings according to Sex and Major Size Classes	3
Table 3.1:	Selected Taluks, Companies, Villages and Sample Contract Farmers in Tumkur District	11
Table 3.2:	Characteristic Features of Selected Villages in the Study Area	13
Table 3.3:	Source of Irrigation and Other Details in the Study Area	14
Table 4.1:	Gherkin Grade/s and the Prices.	18
Table 4.2:	Performance of Intergarden (India) Pvt. Ltd. In Karnataka	19
Table 4.3:	The Grades and Prices of Intergarden Company	19
Table 4.4:	Comparative Study of Gherkin Crop in India and Abroad	20
Table 4.5:	Grades and Contract Prices in Reitzel Company	22
Table 5.1:	Distribution of Contract Farmers (CFs) by Companies and Size Class	24
Table 5.2:	Age Classification of CFs (HHs) by size class	24
Table 5.3:	Age Classification by Name of the company and size class	25
Table 5.4:	Marital Status of CFs ( HHs) by Size Class	26
Table 5.5:	Educational Level of the CFs by Size Class	26
Table 5.6:	Educational level of the CFs by Selected Company	27
Table 5.7:	Demographic Profile of the sample Households	27
Table 5.8:	Population into Agriculture by Size Class	28
Table 5.9:	Population into Agriculture by company	28
Table 5.10:	Distribution of CF Households By Caste and Size Class	29
Table 5.11:	Type of House of the CFs by Size Class	29
Table 5.12:	Number of Members Involved in Agriculture Before and During Contract Farming	30
Table 5.13:	Average Annual Income (per HH) from Agriculture Before Contract Farming by Size Class	30
Table 5.14:	Average Annual Income (per HH) from Agriculture During Contract Farming by size class	31
Table 6.1:	Total and Average Land Holdings by Size Class	32
Table 6.2:	Land Holdings by Social Groups	33
Table 6.3:	Land Holdings by Size Class and Social Groups	33
Table 6.4:	Area Under Different Crops Cultivated by CFs and Size Class	34

<b>TABLE NO</b>	<b>TITLE OF THE TABLE</b>	<b>PAGE NO</b>
Table 6.5:	Gherkin Crop Area (Acre) Cultivated by Size Class	35
Table 6.6:	Number of CFs and Area of Gherkin Crop Cultivated by Size Class in the Study Area	35
Table 6.7:	Cost of Cultivation (Per Acre) of Gherkin crop in the study area	36
Table 6.8:	Gross Cost (Per Acre) of the Selected Crops	36
Table 6.9:	Gross Returns (Per Acre) of the Selected Crops	37
Table 6.10:	Net Returns (Per Acre) of the Selected Crops	37
Table 6.11:	Output (Kg Per Acre) of the Selected Crops	37
Table 6.12:	Employment Generation during Harvest of Gherkin Crop	38
Table 6.13:	Prevailing Wage Rate - sex-wise in the Study Area	38
Table 6.14:	Total Labour Cost for Harvest of Gherkin Crop1 and 2	38
Table 6.15:	Contract Price (Per Kg) of Gherkins	39
Table 6.16:	Output of Gherkins per Acre by Crop and Size Class	39
Table 6.17:	Output of Gherkins per Acre by Grades and Size Class	39
Table 6.18:	Livestock Population and Income Derived by Size Class	40
Table 6.19:	Contract Document Both in Kannada/ English or Both	40
Table 6.20:	The Number of Years Growing Gherkin Crop	41
Table 6.21:	Frequency of visits by the Field Staff	41
Table 6.22:	Availability & Utilisation of Services for the Produces	42
Table 6.23:	Services are Available for Primary Producers	43
Table 6.24:	Details About Contracts in the Study Area	43

# CHAPTER 1

## INTRODUCTION

With the emergence of free market economy in the wake of liberalisation, globalisation, privatisation and the fast expansion of agri-business, small-scale farmers may find it difficult to cope up with the resultant volatility in the economy. They tend to be marginalised and migration from rural to urban areas is increasing at an alarming rate all over the country. Consolidation of holdings is, therefore, increasingly becoming the need of the day.

The various state intervention strategies as well efforts by non-governmental organisations to arrest migration of the rural masses, which include promotion of income generation activities, have not succeeded in reversing this trend. One of the strong reasons could be the lack of well established forward and backward linkages (reliable and co-effective) such as extension advice, mechanisation services, supply of seeds, fertilisers and credit, as also guaranteed and profitable markets for their produce (FAO: 2001). Therefore, the need for contract farming, which would hopefully promote the linkages to the small-scale farming community to grow crops on commercial terms.

Contract farming can be defined as an agreement between farmers and processing and/or marketing firms for the production and supply of agricultural products under a forward agreement, generally at predetermined prices. The agreements also allow the purchaser to provide a degree of production support through inputs and technical guidance for the crop cultivation. From the farmer's side, there is a commitment to produce the specified agricultural products within the quality and quantity standards prescribed by the purchaser, and the firm supports, in turn, the farmer's production, and also purchases the produce.

The contractual agreement encompasses three areas viz., market (grower and buyer agree for future sale and purchase), resource (buyer agrees to supply inputs and technical advice) and management specifications (grower agrees to follow the recommended practices for the crop cultivation).

Contract farming has long-term benefits for both grower and purchaser, provided that their long-term association is mutually complementary. A sizable part of the farming community falls under the small and marginal farmers' category in India. Contract farming, therefore, becomes increasingly important as it allows their agricultural produce to be purchased by multinationals, small companies, government agencies, farmers' cooperatives and individual entrepreneurs.

### **History of Contract Farming in Karnataka: A Brief Note**

The practice of contract farming was prevalent in the sugar industry where farmers agreed to grow sugarcane at a pre-notified price for decades. Of late, MNCs have entered into the agricultural sector and introduced a number of horticultural crops, and their products have a high demand in international markets. Contract farming, as it existed then, was different from the design and functioning of contract farming methods obtaining today. In other words, the state notifies the price and extends other facilities i.e., supply of seeds, fertilisers, package of practices, and buy-back from the farmer's field, grade-wise price fixation, and, more importantly stands guarantee for the contract agreement between the farmer and the concerned MNC. The liberalisation of seed policy has enabled the import of new varieties of crops, both hybrids and high-yielding, by corporate bodies through joint ventures.

Karnataka's agrarian structure is very conducive in promoting contract farming in the country. The distribution of number and area of operational holdings across gender and major size classes during 1995-96 and 2000-01 is given in Table 1. The aggregate pattern of percentage variation in the number of operational holdings and the area operated by size class, reveals 13.8 per cent and 1.6 per cent respectively in the 1995-96 and 2000-01 agricultural census. In other words, the number of operational holdings was increasing, while the area operated was declining during the successive agricultural census in the state. It is interesting to note that across all size classes the percentage variation in the medium and large holding categories indicates negative trends. Further, the percentage variation in the operational holdings (male and female) increased by 14 per cent and 27 per cent respectively between 1995-96 and 2000-01. Whereas, percentage variation of female area operated has increased by 14 per cent, while the corresponding figure for male operational holdings shows negative (-0.2 per cent) percentage variation in the state. It is noteworthy that both the number of operational

holdings and area under operation among marginal and small farmers categories have shown increasing trend during the reference period.

Karnataka will shortly emerge as one of the food park centres in the food basket of India. Within a short span of time, Karnataka may see billionaires not only in the IT sector but also in agriculture in general, and, in particular, in the food processing segment of the above sector. The Karnataka agro-food processing industry is all set to put the State in the world map: with six food parks ready for take off as public-private

**Table 1.1: Distribution of Number and Area of Operational Holdings according to sex and major size Classes**

Size Class	Number of holdings (in 000*)						P V	Area operated (in 000* hectares)						P V
	2000-01			1995-96				2000-01			1995-96			
	M	F	T*	M	F	T*		M	F	T*	M	F	T*	
Marginal (1ha)	2630 (44)	616 (54)	3252 (46)	2154 (40)	452 (50)	2610 (42)	24.6	1217 (11)	273 (17)	1492 (12)	1039 (10)	208 (15)	1248 (10)	19.6
Small (1-2 ha)	1623 (27)	283 (25)	1909 (27)	1473 (28)	232 (26)	1707 (27)	11.8	2333 (22)	404 (25)	2742 (22)	2143 (20)	335 (24)	2480 (21)	10.6
Semi Medium (2-4 ha)	1095 (19)	162 (14)	1259 (18)	1062 (20)	11 (16)	1204 (11)	4.6	2984 (28)	439 (27)	3429 (28)	2912 (27)	383 (27)	3298 (27)	4.0
Medium (4-10 ha)	504 (9)	64 (6)	569 (8)	534 (10)	59 (7)	594 (10)	-4.2	2942 (28)	366 (23)	3317 (27)	3138 (30)	345 (24)	3490 (29)	-5.0
Large (10 ha)	79 (1)	9 (1)	90 (1)	96 (2)	10 (1)	106 (2)	-15.1	1149 (11)	134 (8)	1327 (11)	1419 (13)	142 (10)	1593 (13)	-16.7
All Sizes	5931 (100)	1134 (100)	7079 (100)	5319 (100)	894 (100)	6221 (100)	13.8	10625 (100)	1616 (100)	12307 (100)	10651 (100)	1413 (100)	12109 (100)	1.6

M: Male, F: Female, T: Total and P V: Percentage Variation.

Note: \* Figures also includes number and area of institutional holdings, which are negligible.

Figures within brackets are percentages to the column totals.

Source: Agricultural Census 2000-01, Report on Operational Holdings in Karnataka, Part – I, Directorate of Economics and Statistics and State Agricultural Census Commissioner, Government of Karnataka, Page 25.

partnerships, the state is ushering India into the multi-billion dollar international market. Mr. Somanath, Managing Director of Food Karnataka Limited, reports that “the agri-food scene now is similar to the IT environment in the late’90s, when nobody believed in our state’s pioneering venture, like ITPL or IT com. We are poised on the verge of a similar revolution in food-processing” (Times of India, 25<sup>th</sup> October, 2004). The Union government is partially funding food park projects in Karnataka and also keeping a benevolent eye on the state in this regard. Currently, the major competitors in food processing are China and India, and both the countries regard food processing as one of the important components of their future economy. Karnataka has already gave an indication of that; the Gherkin (small cucumber) revolution has turned many impoverished farmers into Lakhpathis. This trend is now being replicated in Maharashtra

and Tamil Nadu. Gherkin (baby cucumber) is a much sought after delicacy in the US and in Europe. Gherkin soaked in vinegar is consumed as a pickle or as a salad ingredient. Its farming has now spread to districts of Hassan, Haveri, and right up to Bagalkot, and is grown exclusively for foreign markets. Currently, Karnataka has a 90 per cent share in India's gherkin exports. The six food parks coming up in each of Karnataka's six economic zones - Malur (Kolar), Maddur (Mandya), Hiriyur (Chitradurga), Gangarli (Belgaum), and Jewargi (Gulbarga) and then would mark the next major milestone. Construction work has commenced in these parks and they are expected to be fully operational in a year. The facilities will have provision for cold-storage, grading, processing, etc.

## CHAPTER 2

### REVIEW OF LITERATURE

In this chapter, an attempt is made to review some of the existing literature on contract farming conducted in different countries in the world and also in India.

Tanya Korovkin (1992) examines the social implications of contract farming promoted in smallholdings in a Chilean community. The article highlights the probable advantages of contract farming, such as to elevate the rich peasants into the status OF peasants-capitalists rather than to cause the proletarianisation of the peasant community. This trend finds historical evidence in the agri-business spurts: the tobacco boom of the 1950s and the fruit export expansion of the `70s and `80s, and the resultant socio-economic and organisational development in a Chilean small-holding community. The inherent advantages of contract agriculture (not importantly the higher returns from land) seen to have motivated Chilian farmers. Though the fruit boom helped improve the income of landless families, mitigating marginally their poverty and insecurity, the very seasonal nature of employment, and therefore income, hardly allowed any radical change in their economic status.

Kiresur et.al. (2002) in their paper " Contract farming - An Opportunity for Small and Marginal Farmers in the context of Trade Liberalisation", brings out the true picture of Indian agriculture in general, and the exact position of small and marginal farmers in particular. They have highlighted several mis-matches in Indian agriculture vis-à-vis the agriculture scenario of developed countries though they concede that Indian farmers are participating and competing with their overseas counterparts in marketing agriculture commodities. They recommend contract farming in view of its advantages to both the farming community and contractors as one of the better options for fulfilling the objectives of the Liberalised trade Regime.

Sukpal Singh (2000) looks into the role of contract farming in agricultural diversification and development in terms of its practices and implications for producers and the Punjab economy. The paper focuses on the nature of contracts, studies the perceptions of both the farmer and the firm of the working of the contract system and its effect on the local economy. He highlights hat the summary of the studies on

contract farming “helped farmers for the better, gave more reliable incomes, generated employment especially for women, provided new skills in farming, and did away with the patron-client relationship between large and small producers” (Glover and Kusterer: 1990, Fulton and Clark: 1996). Contract farming has several disadvantages too: poor extension services, low prices to farmers due to haphazard pricing of the produce, inherent higher risk to cultivators, frequent delays in payment (Glover and Kusterer: 1990, Ghosh: 1994), weak bargaining power of farmers, sole dependence on companies for inputs as also credit (Fulton and Clark: 1996), over-exploitation of ground water and the threat of the environmental (Siddique: 1998) and finally, the fact that companies often move to new pastures (virgin plots) to exploit land and water resources at the least cost ,(Torres: 1997) leaving former cultivators high and dry.

One of the reasons for contract farming coming into existence in India was the Land Ceilings Act which stipulated that “agribusiness firms cannot own and cultivate land for their raw materials requirements, .... to overcome the difficulties encountered in procuring from the open market, especially in perishables”. Therefore, the only option for agribusiness firms was to go in for contract farming to safeguard their interests.

The study reveals that for the success of contract farming, there is need for institutional and organisational innovations in the rural sector. Contract farming should be under scrutiny from time to time; wide publicity should be given of the land available for contract farming competitiveness; legal protection to be provided to growers under contract farming, and the Fair Trade Commission should monitor contract farming practices on a continuous basis.

Behrooz Morvaridi's (1995) article on “contract farming and environmental risk: the case of Cyprus” examines the environmental degradation and productivity decline occasioned under contract farming in the context of citrus production in North Cyprus. The study highlights the changes in the terms and conditions of contract farming brought about by farmers' access to key resources like water etc.. The paper highlights the fact that only large farmers are in a position to invest in irrigation to maintain productivity though this trend was found to be short-lived and that “corporate profits are made at the expense of long-term productivity for farmers”. Interestingly, irrigation costs were not included under the contract farming system and these were indeed a huge burden on the growers. Timely intervention of the Trans-National Corporation

(TNC) may help avoid over-exploitation of key resources. Irrigation with saline water has caused many fruit trees to dry up rendering large areas of land unproductive; incidence of this problem was found more in the case of marginalised farmers than their richer counterparts.

Ben White's study on "agri-industry and contract farmers in the hilly southern region of Upland West Java", covers two case studies i.e., the nucleus in one case (a small holder dairy farming co-operative), and the other (a small holder growing hybrid coconuts) a large nationalised plantation corporation under contract farming schemes. In both the cases, "contract farming communities deviate markedly from the neo-populist vision of homogeneous, modernising family farms, and the differentiation is quite marked and wage labour common". Further, the "institutional framework surrounding contract farmers is in serious need of democratisation the problem is not one of formal structures in need of revision but of actual function and subsistence of relationships, which reflect the nature and exercise of power in rural society" (Ben White (1997)).

Piet Konings (1998) while evaluating the agro-industrial enterprises and plantation labour in Cameroon, focuses on the role of contract farmers co-operatives associated with Pamol, a subsidiary of the giant Unilever Company, in the southern west province of Anglophone Cameroon. A small number of large producers of palm oil dominates the co-operatives under the guidance of the Pamol company management and the State. In the early 1980s when the continuance of the company was at stake, farmers themselves started a co-operative. While renewing the contract with the above company, farmers demanded more autonomy vis-à-vis the company whose role was sought to be restricted to providing nurseries, transport and processing facilities.

Olesen's (2003) study on "contract production of peas" examines the contract between farmers and the processor viz., Denisco Foods who had 50 years of experience behind them and have 4,100 ha. The production of peas by farmers was in conformity with the exact requirements of consumers – an objective realised through centralised decision-making. The study focuses on "general problems known from contract theory such as hold-up, moral hazard, risk sharing, and discrimination", and proceeds to suggest that a trade-off between these problems is found in the design of contracts. It was evident that the terms and conditions of contracts had undergone some

modifications, and it is probable that cultivators were able to enhance their bargaining power through negotiations with the processor.

A study by Dileep et.al. (2002) on "Contract farming in tomato: An economic analysis" focusses on the cost, returns and resource use efficiency, and the effect of contract farming on price, production and income of farmers as also yield variation, marketing costs and the possible losses to farmers. The study was conducted in the Ellenabad block of Sirsa district in Haryana, where the contract system has been in practice since 1989. Two processing firms, viz., Hindustan Lever Limited (HLL) and Nijjer Agro Foods Ltd (NAL) were studied. A sample of 50 contract farmers were interviewed (30 under HLL & 20 under NAL), out of 125 tomato growers under the contract system, 50 non-contract farmers were also interviewed during 1999-2000.

The study reveals that the processing firms preferred large farmers for contract farming. The cost incurred, yield and gross return obtained by contract farmers were almost double compared with that of non-contract farmers. The uncertainty over yield and price was much less under contract farming. Surprisingly, the price received for tomato by non-contract farmers was found to be higher than that of contract farmers. Transportation cost was a major component of marketing costs. Farmers demanded that the contract between the farmer and the corporate should be enforceable by law, it is necessary through fresh legislation by the government. Over usage of inputs like fertilisers and pesticides should be brought down to ensure plant protection and to secure higher yields, and farmers need to be educated in this regard. A crop insurance scheme needs to be introduced for tomato farming which induces risk due to higher incidence of diseases and pest attack besides possible adverse climatic conditions.

Clapp (1994) examines the unequal representation of contract farming in Latin America. This could be because of this politics of representation, which is the prime reason for the social relations of contract farming. He suggests that an alternative representation of contract farming, which focuses on the contradictions of wage labour, has an indirect control over labour and an uncertain supply to farmers and that lead to disguised proletarianisation. The politics of representation can be absolved through regulating 'the moral economy of the contract' between the company and peasant community.

Contract farming has taken firm roots and is expanding in the agriculture sector of developed countries, whereas, in developing countries the agro-industrial integration is still to consolidate despite having made initial inroads (Watts: 1992). He argues that the "rural sector in the periphery is less a terrain of independent peasant production and commodity circulation through trade - or indeed of the state or direct foreign investment in estate production – than a crucible in which innovate forms of social integration and agrarian corporatism that link growers to state and private capital is forged".

Agriculture in Punjab has witnessed a second revolution, one of the prime promoters of it being Buta Singh Khullar who is among the growing band of rebels. It was his vision that led to crop diversification from traditional crops like wheat and paddy to the adoption of Hyola, a high yielding variety. These crops ensured food security in the country to a large extent. Secondly, chief minister Amerinder Singh's decision to appoint a committee head by S.S.Johl, who was earlier chairman of the Agriculture Costs and Prices and also Vice-Chancellor of Punjab Agriculture University, to take-up promotion of crops other than wheat and paddy. The Johl committee report recommended that millions of acres under wheat and paddy needed to be brought under other crops, and suggested a Central Government assistance of Rs,1,280 crores to the state government for 'crop adjustment programme', whereby Rs 12,500 per hectare was to be given to farmers to adopt crop diversification (to avoid risk). Similar demands were put forth by other states, which resulted in the above suggestion not being accepted.

Another remedy put forth by the committee was to adopt contract farming to reduce the burden on Punjab Agro Industries Corporation. The book on "Green Revolution Reconsidered", highlights the need for crop diversification. Several other researches, too, have endorsed the above opinion. Since then, contract farming has expanded considerably - from 12,000 acres in 2002-03 to 25,000 acres in 2003-04. (Ranju Sarkar:2004). With this unique contract farming experiment, Punjab is trying to develop a diversified portfolio of crops that can compete with wheat and paddy. The high yielding varieties of oilseeds such as Hyola can give higher returns of Rs 13,300 per acre as compared Rs 10,000 from wheat. Crops grown under contract farming are generally short duration crops, while some are traditional crops.

Rangi and Sidhu's (2003) paper, "Contract Farming in Punjab", examines some of the policy issues related to contract farming in the Punjab State Scheme. The data was culled out of the report of Punjab Agro-Foodgrain Corporation Ltd, Chandigarh, and covers many advertisements in the newspaper on contract farming as also responses of the few contract farmers who were interviewed. Again after a gap of 16 years, the S.S.Johl committee has been reconstituted. The committee recommended that in 10 lakh hectares now under paddy and wheat crops, crop rotation should be introduced to replace paddy/wheat by crops that consume less water to check the adverse effects on the ecology and also to meet the demand for such produces in the country. "Vegetable crops are more labour intensive and can provide 4-5 times more employment opportunities in rural areas, as compared with wheat and paddy crops", says the report.

## CHAPTER 3

### OBJECTIVES AND METHODOLOGY

The following are the objectives and methodology of the study:

1. To make an inventory of on-going contract farming in Karnataka, including data on the structure of contract farming agreements between primary producers and buyers;
2. To examine the type of crop/ activity taken up under contract farming;
3. To assess the impact on income and employment generation for contract farmers and their perceptions on the continuation of the same. Further, the benefits accrued to the concerned company/firm in terms of meeting local demand and that of the export market;
4. And finally, to suggest policy issues, if any, for the sustainability of contract farming.

#### Methodology:

There are 25 firms currently involved in contract farming in Karnataka (for details see Appendix I). All the 25 firms have selected Gherkin (small cucumber) as a crop to cultivate under contract farming, spread over districts of Tumkur, Bellary and Haveri. Tumkur has been selected because of its proximity to the study area. The reference year for the study is 2002-2003. There are 10 companies involved in promoting Gherkin in Tumkur district. The field visits confirm that firms like Global Green Company (GGCL), Unicorn, Reitzel, Vishal and Intergarden are leaders in contract farming business in the district. Table 3.1 gives the details of company, taluk/s, village/s and the number of

**Table 3.1: Selected Taluks, Companies, Villages and Sample Contract Farmers in Tumkur District**

Sl.No	Name of the Taluk	Name of the Company	Name of the Village	Sample HHs
1.	Gubbi	UNICORN	Appanahalli	11
			Unaganahalli	10
			Hosakere	9
2.	Tiptur	REITZEL	Gowdanakatte	16
			Shivapura	14
3.	Gubbi	VISHAL	Ankasandra	15
			Dasappanahalli	15
4.	Sira	GGCL	Gopikunte	8
			Hosahalli	5
			Kammanahalli	6
5.	Gubbi		Hosakere	11
5.	Gubbi	INTERGARDEN	Bidare	30

contract farmers covered in the study. Contract farming is concentrated in taluks like Gubbi, Tiptur and Sira of Tumkur district. Gubbi and Sira taluks form the hub of contract farming activities in the district. Five leading companies are chosen and these covers 11 villages and 30 contract farmers, representing different sizes of holdings. Executives of the above companies extended their co-operation in furnishing relevant details for the study. Therefore, the above companies are chosen for the in-depth study.

Table 3.2 furnishes details of the characteristic features of the selected villages in the study area. Bidare and Hosakere villages in Gubbi taluk have a big population; the rest are small and tiny villages with a few households and a population of less than 1,000. By and large, these villages were found to have basic amenities like schools, drinking water, transport, a combination of pucca and kachha roads and electricity.

The source of irrigation and other details in the study area are given in Table 3.3. It is interesting to note that all selected villages (barring Shivapura and Gowdanakatte in Tiptur taluk and Unaganahalli in Gubbi taluk) had less or no area at all under irrigation as reported in the 1991 Census, but currently these villages have borewells and also irrigated lands, which is one of the primary criteria for a company to identify a village for contract farming. Except Unaganahalli, the other selected villages do not have any forest cover. However, these villages do have cultivable waste lands/or areas not available for cultivation currently.

**Table 3.2: Characteristic Features of Selected Villages in the Study Area**

Sl.No.	Name of the Village	Area (Ha)	Popula-tion	House holds	Educa-tion	Medical Facilities	Drinking Water	Post Office/ph	Communi-cation	Approach To Village	Nearest Town	Power Supply
	GUBBI TALUK											
1	Ankasandra	609	937	197	P, M	-(5-10)	W, HP	P O	Bus	P R	G - 18	E A
2	Dasappanahalli	561	356	73	P, M	-(5-10)	W, HP	-(0-5)	-(0-5)	P R	G- 20	E A
3	Hosakere	311	1614	348	P2, M, H	PHC, FHC	W, TW, HP	P O/Ph	Bus	P R	G- 30	E A
4	Bidare	495	2301	483	P2, M, H	PHC	TW, HP	P O/Ph	Bus	P R	G- 11	E A
5	Kammanahalli	216	674	151	P	-(0-5)	W, HP	-(0-5)	-(0-5)	P R	G- 21	E A
6	Appanahalli	248	719	144	P	-(5-10)	W, HP	-(0-5)	Bus	K R	G- 34	E A
7	Unaganahalli	796	591	118	P	-(0-5)	W, HP	-(0-5)	Bus	P R	G- 32	E A
	TIPTUR TALUK											
1	Gowdanakatte	440	698	140	P2, M, H	-(0-5)	W, HP	-(0-5)	Bus	K R	Tip- 22	E A
2	Shivapura	102	416	73	P	-(5-10)	W, HP	-(0-5)	Bus	K R	Tip- 11	E A
	SIRA TALUK											
1	Gopikunte	317	706	131	P	-(0-5)	W, HP	-(0-5)	-(0-5)	P R	Sira- 22	E A
2	Hosahalli	377	498	96	P	-(10+)	W, HP	-(0-5)	-(0-5)	K R	Sira- 20	E A

Note: P- Primary, M: Middle, H: Higher school, PO: Post Office, Ph: Telephone, BS: Bus, PHC: Primary Health Centre, FPC: Family Planning Centre, W: Well, HP: Hand Pump, PR: Pucca Road, KR: Katcha Road, EA: Electricity Available.

Source: Census of India 1991, Series- II, Part XII- A, District Census Hand Book, Tumkur District.

**Table 3.3: Source of Irrigation and Other details in the Study Area.**

SL.No.	Name of the Taluk / Village	Total Area (in Ha)	Tank	Well	Well with Electricity	Govt. Canal/ Tube Well	Total Irrigated Area (Ha)	Un-Irrigated Land (Ha)	Forest (Ha)	Cultivable Waste (Ha)	Area Not Available For Cultivation.
	GUBBI										
1	Ankasandra	609	24	-	7	14	45	411	-	133	20
2	Dasappanahalli	561	-	4	12	-	16	186	-	354	5
3	Hosakere	311	48	8	26	-	82	130	-	18	81
4	Bidare	496	43	10	19	-	72	343	-	16	65
5	Kammanahalli	216	-	7	13	-	20	161	-	17	19
6	Appanahalli	248	-	4	11	-	15	197	-	28	8
7	Unaganahalli	796	-	-	3	-	3	192	325	77	199
	TIPTUR										
1	Gowdanakatte	440	1	-	-	-	1	256	-	68	115
2	Shivapura	102	-	-	-	-	-	80	-	4	18
	SIRA										
1	Gopikunte	317	6	-	8	-	14	199	-	10	93
2	Hosahalli	377	13	-	-	15	28	229	-	35	85

Source: Same as Table 2.

## CHAPTER 4

### PROFILE OF THE SELECTED COMPANIES WORKING IN THE STUDY AREA

This chapter attempts to furnish a brief profile of the companies operating in the study area.

#### 1. Globle Green Company Limited

Global Green Company Limited (GGCL) is one of the largest industrial units owned by the Thapar Group, a widely respected business house around the globe, which has been making sustained contributions to the Indian economy since the past 80 years. Now, the Thapar Group concentrates on the most important segment of the economy – agriculture. With its emphasis on introducing innovative techniques in the agricultural sector to bring it on a par with global standards, GGCL stands by the philosophy of its founding fathers.

#### ORGANISATIONAL CHART



GGCL's aim is to enable Indian farmers to produce internationally acceptable crops and other products. The company concentrates on small and marginal farmers, disseminating sophisticated technology viz., an excellent package of agricultural practices, a buy-back system at pre-notified prices. The Thapar Group has a vision to holistically develop the horticultural sector with the aid of sophisticated technology and by educating the farmers about efficient cultivation techniques. It also focuses on stepping-up productivity, making assured supply of inputs, constant improvement of production through rigorous research and development techniques. The company's philosophy is evident at different levels viz., agricultural inputs, cultivation, harvesting, processing, packaging, delivery and customer care. GGCL has been awarded ISO 9002 certification for excellence in processing and marketing of preserved foods and vegetables. GGCL products are exported to several European countries, besides many others.

## **2. Unicorn Agro-Tech Ltd:**

The selection criteria for the land and farmers are as follows:

- a. Normally lands with red soil mixed with sand is preferred;
- b. Stagnation of water should be avoided;
- c. Assured irrigation facilities a must'
- d. Preference would be given to own land (sometimes leased-in land is also considered)'
- e. There should be optimum size of family labour.

After identifying lands with the above requirements a contract agreement is signed between the company and the identified farmer. The agreement would lay down that the farmer would grow gherkins according to the company's direction, supply good quality gherkins by grades as prescribed by the company, and also that the farmer should not sell the produce in the open market.

The company then provides technical guidance for preparing the land for cultivation of gherkin crop. The company supplies inputs like seeds, fertilisers, pesticides, GI Wire, jute thread and plastic thread.

The company provides transport facilities to lift the harvested gherkins from the farmer's field and fortnightly payments (after deduction of the cost of inputs supplied to the farmer) are made. The mode of payment are cheques issued in the farmer's name.

### ORGANISATIONAL CHART

Co-ordination Between Company and Farmer:



In the appointment of field officers, complete preference is given to local candidates, because they normally would have good knowledge about the villages and the farmers. Through local field officers the company develops trust among farmers. In other words, FOs act as a facilitator between the company and the farmer, conscious of the company's requirements and expectations from farmers. Gherkin grades and price per kg is indicated in Table 4.1.

## Grading System:

**Table 4.1: Gherkin Grade/s and the Prices.**

GRADES	PRICE (Rs. Per Kg)
160+ = 160 - 180	10.50+0.50=11
60+ = 100 - 160	7.00
30+ = 60 - 100	4.00
-30 - 60	2.00

As per determined grades, filters are manufactured and weighed by the buying assistants and entered into the Passbook. Later, the buyers take the gherkins to the Collection Centre and after securing a gate pass, take the produce to the main factory for processing and export to the contracted country/s.

### **Intergarden (India) Pvt. Ltd.**

Intergarden (India) Pvt.Ltd, (located at Nelamangala on National Highway 48 of Bangalore (Rural) district, Karnataka, India), is one of the leading promoters of gherkin cultivation besides being an exporter of semi-processed gherkin products and other vegetables to selected European countries. The company is a fully-owned subsidiary of Dunakiliti Konzervuzen Kft, Hungary (Company Profile Leaflet). Through contract farming, Intergarden act as a facilitator in growing gherkin in selected districts of Karnataka viz., Bangalore (Rural), Kolar, Tumkur and Hassan. The company has a full-fledged processing unit to cater to 4,460 farmers spread over 586 villages (for details see Table 1) covering a 100 sq km area. The company commands a high degree of professional expertise at all levels of agricultural operations. The company is known internationally for adapting agricultural know-how for dissemination to farmers. Further, company's products conform to the standards sought by consumers around the globe. Intergarden is currently in the process of implementing EUREPGAP standards at the farm level. Intergarden has high class infrastructure facilities required to handle production safely and high quality food products of 10,000 MT. The products conform to global food standards. Regarding research and development, the company has a team of highly skilled scientists who constantly endeavour to develop newer varieties of gherkins and other vegetables particularly more nutritious and disease-resistant varieties. The company has also entered into an R&D collaboration with the University of Agricultural Science, Bangalore.

The performance of Intergarden (India) Pvt. Ltd in Karnataka covering a number of districts, taluks, villages and number of farmers as on 6<sup>th</sup> October, 2004 is given in Table 4.2.

**Table 4.2: Performance of Intergarden (India) Pvt. Ltd. In Karnataka**  
(as on 6.10.2004)

Sl. No	District	Area	No. of Villages	No. of Farmers
1	Bangalore (Rural)	Thyamagondlu	37	137
2	Kolar	Gowribidanur	89	530
3	Kolar	Koratagere	44	233
4	Tumkur	Bukkapattana	54	665
5	Tumkur	Chelur	80	1066
6	Tumkur	Thuruvekere	129	824
7	Tumkur	Kunigal	87	448
8	Hassan	Arasikere	66	557
Total	4	8	586	4460

Inputs supplied by the company include seeds, fertilisers, pesticides, G I wire, jute thread, plastic thread, transport facility and technical guidance. Field life of gherkin is 40 days, while that of crops, the duration is 60 days because of its late harvest. The company advises the farmers to sow in April for optimum yield. The average income from the gherkin is around Rs 30,000 per acre and the volume of yield is about 6 MT.

The grades and prices per kilogramme of gherkins given by Intergarden company is furnished in Table 4.3.

**Table 4.3: The Grades and Prices of Intergarden Company**

Grade	Intergarden Specification	Price per Kg.(in Rs)
I	Intergarden Premium	11
II	Integarden Standard	7
III	Intergarden Regular	3

The comparative picture of gherkin cultivation in India and abroad is given in Table 4.4. It indicates the cultivation of gherkin according to seasons, the availability of labour, wage rates, temperature and the type of irrigation in two different situations.

**Table 4.4: Comparative Study of Gherkin Cultivation in India and Abroad**

Sl.No.	India	Abroad
1	Can be Grown in Three Seasons	One Season: April-May
2	Labour Abundance	Scarcity of Labour
3	Low Wages Rs25-40	High Wages: \$ 5 per hour
4	Favourable Temperature	-20 Degree
5	Manual Irrigation	Drip Irrigation with Fertigation

Since Intergarden Company caters to an export market and in order to match the demand for gherkins abroad, seeds are supplied to farmers in advance. In other words, higher the demand abroad higher is the extent of land sought to be brought under gherkin. The company plans in such a way that the staff has work throughout the year. One of the staff member said that in western countries, the government would provide subsidy to farmers (Rs 9/ per Kg) who grew gherkin.

Intergarden is also a member of the gherkin Promoters Association. We also understand that Intergarden is the only company to get the "EUREPGAP" Certificate.

#### **Reitzel India Private Limited**

Hugo Reitzel started a grocery company in French-speaking Switzerland, and after about 100 year, the company was christened after him (See Reitzel Company Leaflet). The company's products include: pickles (gherkins, onions, mixed pickles), olives and capers, pickled vegetables (carrots, celery, beetroot), mustards and vinegars, ketchup and mayonnaise, salad dressings and fresh sauces (hot and cold).

The company's prime objective is to ensure taste and quality from seed to feed. It follows a rigorous follow-up and verification policy right from seed stock delivered to farmers and right up to the production and packaging of the output in the factory. For example, despite the acclaimed quality of gherkins brought in India, Reitzel has set up a quality team which has been given the responsibility of selecting suppliers and ensuring strict application of its quality criteria. Reitzel, a medium-sized company, which caters to the demands of the consumers, got the ISO 9001 certificate in 1996 and, since then, it has been maintaining the high quality standard for each of its products.

The Development of the Reitzel Group over the years is as follows:

1909: Hugo Reitzel opens his specialised grocery shop in Aigle French-speaking Switzerland.

1960: Enters industrial and commercial agreements with Grey-Poupon in Dijon (France).

1986: Bernard Poupon takes over the administration of Reitzel Company (Switzerland) and creates the Poupon Reitzel Industries holding company one year later.

1990: The holding company acquires the Turkish company, Zey-Tur-San.

1995: Takes over the Conserveries Besiers in Castelsarrasin (France).

1999: Launch of the Hugo Reitzel brand in the Swiss market.


2000: Acquisition of the Guy Briand Company in Bourre (France) and creation of a quality service office in Bangalore (India).

2001: Creation of Reitzel Romania.

2002: The Group assumes the name, Reitzel.

2003: Reitzel India is created.

Like other companies, Reitzel also provides input, a package of practices, purchase the gherkins from farms and also gives transport facilities to farmers. Company's field staff visits farms daily; company's professional experts like agricultural extension officer, visit farms twice a week.



Grades, filter sizes and contract prices fixed by Reitzel is given in Table 4.5.

**Table 4.5: Grades and Contract Prices in the Reitzel Company**

Grade	Filter Size (in mm)	No. of Gherkins (Per Kg)	Contract Price (in Rs / Per Kg)
RI- A	14mm	160+	11.00
RI- B	20mm	60-160	6.00
RI- C	More than 20mm	-60	2.00

### **Vishaal Natural Food Products**

Vishaal Natural Food Products (a sole proprietary concern) (VNFP) was established in 1998 near Korategere town, Tumkur District. The thrust areas of VNFP are sectors like agriculture and exports of agricultural products. Madhusudan, the present chairman of VNFP, intends to set up a 100 per cent export-oriented unit (EOU) to process and export gherkins (hybrid cucumber).

#### **Field :**

Contract farming method was adopted to procure produce from over 600 farmers spread over 40 villages, covering Chitradurga and Tumkur districts and providing farmers technical and financial support by way of advancing inputs (seeds, fertilisers, pesticides and growth promoters) to farmers. The price of the produce (based on the grades) would be agreed upon before the crop is sowed and an understanding on payments is arrived upon. Farmers are given guidance through the company employed field assistants and field officers who have expertise in agriculture. Officials of VNFP, those from the industry like seed and pesticide suppliers and university professors make regular visits. The company takes appropriate measures regularly to improve crop standards.

**Processing :**

VNFP has a four-acre office complex, which can store about 30 MT of fresh produce everyday. Also the company has cold storage facility to accommodate 15 MT of produce. The infrastructure like machinery to clean, wash and grade gherkins is of international standard. Gherkins are moved to cold storage as they arrive from the fields in the evening, and are taken for processing the following day; processing, i.e, cleaning, washing and drying is done by women employees. The graded product is put into drums with the desired solution (i.e., brine, acetic acid or vinegar). The processed product is subjected to quality checks before being packed and shipped.

**Market :**

VNFP is presently exporting gherkins to USA, Canada, France, Spain, Italy, Netherlands, Japan, Australia and Thailand.

**Turnover :**

The company's turnover was Rs 630 lakh during 2003-04.

## CHAPTER 5

### SOCIO-ECONOMIC CHARACTERISTICS OF CONTRACT FARMERS

The distribution of contract farmers (Head of the Household) by selected company and size class is given in Table 5.1. Of the total 150 Contract farmers selected, small and marginal farmers constitute 52 per cent, medium farmers 38 per cent, and large farmers 10 per cent. And from each of the five companies, 30 contract farmers representing all the sizes of holdings were selected and interviewed for the study.

**Table 5.1: Distribution of Contract Farmers (CFs) by Company and Size Class**

Size Class	Name of the Companies					Total
	IG	GGCL	REITZEL	UNICORN	VISHAAL	
Marginal	10	9	5	7	6	37
%	33.3	30.0	16.7	23.3	20.0	24.7
Small	7	7	7	10	9	40
%	23.3	23.3	23.3	33.3	30.0	26.7
Medium	10	11	14	11	11	57
%	33.3	36.7	46.7	36.7	36.7	38.0
Large	3	3	4	2	4	16
%	10.0	10.0	13.3	6.7	13.3	10.7
Total	30	30	30	30	30	150
%	100	100	100	100	100	100

Tables 5.2 & 5.3 provide the age profile of CFs (HHS) by size class and company affiliation in the study area. Seventy per cent of heads of households of CFs are in the age group of 26 to 50 years, 25 per cent are above 51 years, and less than five per cent below 25 years. Similar are the trends observed across the size of holdings in the case of small and medium farmers. In the case of large farmers, 50 per cent of CFs are in the age group of around 50 or 50 plus: and eight out of 150 CFs are below 25 years.

**Table 5.2 : Age Classification of CFs (HHS) by size class**

Size Class	Age Classification			
	<25	26 to 50	51 to 75	Total
Marginal	2	31	4	37
%	25.0	29.5	10.8	24.7
Small	2	28	10	40
%	25.0	26.7	27.0	26.7
Medium	3	39	15	57
%	37.5	37.1	40.5	38.0
Large	1	7	8	16
%	12.5	6.7	21.6	10.7
Total	8	105	37	150
%	100	100	100	100

All the five companies taken together, around 75 per cent of the CFs are in the age group of 26 to 50 years. REITZEL and UNICORN selected CFs around 40 per cent in the age group of 51 plus years. The distribution of CFs within the company across the size of holdings, small and marginal CFs constitute around 55 per cent, medium CFs category 35 per cent and large CFs 10 per cent in the study area.

**Table 5.3: Age Classification by Name of the company and size class**

Size Class	Age	Name of the company					Total
		IG	GGCL	REITZEL	UNICORN	VISHAL	
Marginal	<25	2					2
		20.0					5.4
	26 to 50	8	8	4	5	6	31
		80.0	88.9	80.0	71.4	100.0	83.8
	51 to 75		1	1	2		4
			11.1	20.0	28.6		10.8
	Sub-Total	10	9	5	7	6	37
		100	100	100	100	100	100
Small	< 25	2					2
		28.6					5.0
	26 to 50	5	5	3	8	7	28
		71.4	71.4	42.9	80.0	77.8	70.0
	51 to 75		2	4	2	2	10
			28.6	57.1	20.0	22.2	25.0
	Sub-Total	7	7	7	10	9	40
		100	100	100	100	100	100
Medium	< 25	2			1		3
		20.0			9.1		5.3
	26 to 50	7	8	10	5	9	39
		70.0	72.7	71.4	45.5	81.8	68.4
	51 to 75	1	3	4	5	2	15
		10.0	27.3	28.6	45.5	18.2	26.3
	Sub-Total	10	11	14	11	11	57
		100	100	100	100	100	100
Large	<25	1					1
		33.3					6.3
	26 to 50	2	2	1		2	7
		66.7	66.7	25.0		50.0	43.8
	51 to 75		1	3	2	2	8
			33.3	75.0	100.0	50.0	50.0
	Sub-Total	3	3	4	2	4	16
		100	100	100	100	100	100

Table 5.3 (Conti...)

Total <25	7	-	-	1	-	8
%	23			3		5
26 to 50	22	23	18	18	24	105
%	74	77	60	37	20	70
51 to 75	1	7	12	11	6	37
%	3	23	40	37	20	25
Grand Total	30	30	30	30	30	150
%	100	100	100	100	100	100

The marital status of the CFs (HHs) by size class is shown in Table 5.4. Over 93 per cent of contract farmers are married. Similarly, over 95 per cent of the small and marginal farmers are married.

**Table 5.4: Marital Status of CFs ( HHs) by Size Class**

Size Class	Marital Status		
	Married	Unmarried	Total
Marginal	35	2	37
	(94.6)	(5.4)	(100)
Small	38	2	40
	(95.0)	(5.0)	(100)
Medium	52	5	57
	(91.2)	(8.8)	(100)
Large	15	1	16
	(93.8)	(6.3)	(100)
Total	140	10	150
	(93.3)	(6.7)	(100)

Note: Figures in the brackets denote percentage to total.

Tables 5.5 & 5.6 indicate the educational status of CFs by size class. By and large, CFs have a high literacy rate (99 per cent). CFs who have studied beyond primary and high school levels account for 69 per cent and 19 per cent respectively. It is interesting to note that almost all the CFs identified by the companies were literates (Table 6).

**Table 5.5: Educational Level of the CFs by Size Class**

Size Class	Educational Level				
	Illiterate	Primary	High School	Graduation	Total
Marginal	1	5	23	8	37
%	2.7	13.5	62.2	21.6	100
Small	1	10	26	3	40
%	2.5	25.0	65.0	7.5	100
Medium		10	34	13	57
%		17.5	59.6	22.8	100
Large		4	7	5	16
%		25.0	43.8	31.3	100
Total	2	29	90	29	150
%	1.3	19.3	60.0	19.3	100

**Table 5.6: Educational Level of the CFs by Selected Companies**

Name of the Company	Educational Level				
	Illiterate	Primary	High School	Graduation	Total
IG		9	18	3	30
		30.0	60.0	10.0	100
GGCL	2	4	20	4	30
	6.7	13.3	66.7	13.3	100
REITZEL		5	17	8	30
		16.7	56.7	26.7	100
UNICORN		5	21	4	30
		16.7	70.0	13.3	100
VISHAAL		6	14	10	30
		20.0	46.7	33.3	100
Total	2	29	90	29	150
	1.3	19.3	60.0	19.3	100

The demographic profile of CFs by size class is given in Table 5.7. The average size of CFs is 6.7. The size of holdings and the average size of family are positively correlated. The number of male children (0-14 age group) and female children to the total population, on an average, all the size classes show the same percentage (18 per cent). Similar trends are also witnessed in the case of male adults (15-50 age group) and female adults (22 per cent), and also male elders (50 and above) and female elders (9 per cent). Nevertheless, across the size of holdings there exists a mixed trend. It is observed that smaller the holdings the percentage of female adults and slightly less percentage in the case of larger holdings. It is noteworthy that dependents (children and elders) are less in percentage term in the case of small holdings as compared to their larger counterparts.

**Table 5.7: Demographic Profile of the Sample Households**

Size Class	( Per cent)							Total Population	Average Size of Family
	Male children	Male Adults	Male Elders	Female Children	Female Adults	Female Elders			
Marginal	19	27	7	19	24	4	188	5.0	
Small	15	23	10	20	23	9	265	6.6	
Medium	15	23	11	18	22	10	371	6.5	
Large	20	21	8	20	20	10	177	11.1	
Total	18	23	9	19	22	8	1001	6.7	

Table 5.8 & 5.9 furnish details of male and female members of CFs involved in agriculture by size class and affiliated companies. Of the total population of 1,001 (Table 5.7), 71 per cent (709) are into agriculture. All the companies put together, 52 per cent of the total members involved in agriculture were females and the rest male. A similar trend exists across the five companies operating in the study area.

**Table 5.8: Population into Agriculture by Size Class**

Size Class	Males Involved in Agriculture	Females Involved in Agriculture	Total
Marginal	67	65	132
Small	90	100	190
Medium	129	139	268
Large	58	61	119
Total	344	365	709

**Table 5.9: Population into Agriculture by company**

Name of the company	Males Involved in Agriculture (%)	Females Involved in Agriculture (%)	Total	Actual
IG	48	52	100	118
GGCL	47	53	100	132
REITZEL	49	50	100	157
UNICORN	46	54	100	143
VISHAAL	46	54	100	159
Total	48	53	100	709

The distribution of CFs by caste and size class is given in Table 5.10. Of the 150 CFs covered in the study area, backward castes (BCs) and SC/STs form 89 per cent and 11 per cent respectively while the percentage figures across size classes vary significantly. It is interesting to note that BCs and SC/STs among marginal farmers account for 68 per cent and 32 per cent respectively. In other words, the numbers of SC/STs are more among marginal farmers than among the others. This trend could be attributed to 1) the land gained by SC/STs through land distribution by the state, and 2) sub-division and fragmentation of land among family members over the years. Higher size of holdings are negligible in the SC/ST category.

**Table 5.10: Distribution of CF Households By Caste and Size Class**

Size Class	Caste		Total
	BC	SC & ST	
Marginal	25	12	37
%	67.6	32.4	100
Small	39	1	40
%	97.5	2.5	100
Medium	54	3	57
%	94.7	5.3	100
Large	16	-	16
%	100	-	100
Total	134	16	150
%	89.3	10.7	100

Table 5.11 furnishes details of the type of dwellings of the CFs by size class. Almost all CFs own pucca houses, 88 per cent of which have tiled roof; eight per cent have thatched roof and four per cent have RCC roof. Higher the size of land holdings better is the quality of housing. Among small holdings, the picture seems to be quite the opposite.

**Table 5.11: Type of House of the CFs by Size Class**

Size Class	Type of House			Total
	Thatched Roof	Tiled	RCC	
Marginal	8	29	-	37
%	21.6	78.4	-	100
Small	1	39	-	40
%	2.5	97.5	-	100
Medium	3	53	1	57
%	5.3	93.0	1.8	100
Large		11	5	16
%		68.8	31.3	100
Total	12	132	6	150
%	8.0	88.0	4.0	100

Information on the number of CF households involved in agriculture both Before Contract Farming (BCF) and After Contract farming (ACF) is given in Table 5.12. The number of CF household members involved in agriculture registered a marginal increase i.e., two per cent after the introduction of contract farming. But the percentage increase is higher in the case of small farmers than large farmers.

**Table 5.12: Number of Members Involved in Agriculture Before and During Contract Farming**

Size Class	Members Involved in Agriculture BCF	Members Involved in Agriculture DCF	Total Population	BCF %	DCF %	Total
Marginal	132	140	118	70	74	100
Small	190	200	265	72	75	100
Medium	268	275	371	72	74	100
Large	119	119	177	67	67	100
Total	709	734	1001	71	73	100

Note: BCF: Before contract farming, DCF: During Contract farming.

Tables 5.13 & 5.14 give the average annual income of contract farmers both BCF and ACF by size class. Of the 150 CFs, 131 (87%) reported an average annual income of less than Rs 20,000 per year before contract farming. The average annual income of eight per cent of the total CFs was in the range of Rs 20,000-Rs 30,000. There were only seven CFs whose average annual income was Rs 30,000 and above BCF. It was observed that 10 per cent of the CFs, whose average annual income was less than Rs 20,000, had moved to the next income bracket ACF. Further, the number of CFs whose average annual income was Rs 30,000 and above registered an income of 15 per cent ACF.

**Table 5.13: Average Annual Income (Per HH) Agriculture Before Contract Farming by Size Class**

Size Class	Average Annual Income BCF (agri)						Total
	<20000	20001 to 30000	30001 to 40000	40001 to 50000	50001 to 60000	60001 & above	
Marginal	36		1	-	-	-	37
%	97.3		2.7	-	-	-	100
Small	37	3	-	-	-	-	40
%%	92.5	7.5	-	-	-	-	100
Medium	51	4	-	2	-	-	57
%	89.5	7.0	-	3.5	-	-	100
Large	7	5	-	2	1	1	16
%	43.8	31.3	-	12.5	6.3	6.3	100
Total	131	12	1	4	1	1	150
%	87.3	8.0	.7	2.7	.7	.7	100

**Table 5.14: Average Annual Income (per HH) from Agriculture During Contract Farming by Size Class**

Size Class	Average income during contract farming						Total
	<20000	20001 to 30000	30001 to 40000	40001 to 50000	50001 to 60000	60001 & above	
Marginal	34	1		1		1	37
%	91.9	2.7		2.7		2.7	100
Small	34	4	1	1			40
%	85.0	10.0	2.5	2.5			100
Medium	43	9	2	1	1	1	57
%	75.4	15.8	3.5	1.8	1.8	1.8	100
Large	5	3	4		1	3	16
%	31.3	18.8	25.0		6.3	18.8	100
Total	116	17	7	3	2	5	150
%	77.3	11.3	4.7	2.0	1.3	3.3	100

## CHAPTER 6

### GHERKIN CROP AND ITS INCOME AND EMPLOYMENT GENERATION

In this chapter, an attempt is made to assess the land holding pattern of contract farmers, area under gherkin crop, the package of practices employed for cultivation, as well as income and employment generation aspects.

Table 6.1 indicates the land holding pattern of CFs by size class. The average land holding of a CF is 4.78 acres, of which dryland and irrigated land holdings account for 2.32 acres and 2.46 acres respectively. It is clear from Table 6.1 that on an average, the extent of irrigated land of CFs is higher than that of dry land. All the CFs identified by the five companies fulfil one or the other of the conditions for being selected as CF in the study area. It is interesting to note that, across all sizes of holdings, the extent of irrigated land is higher than that of dry land in the case of small and marginal farmers, while it is quite the opposite in the case of medium and large holdings.

**Table 6.1: Total and Average Land Holdings by Size Class**

Size Class		Dry land	Irrigated land	Total land
Marginal	Sum	19.38	46.00	65.38
	Mean	.5238	1.2432	1.7670
Small	Sum	40.50	88.00	128.50
	Mean	1.0125	2.2000	3.2125
Medium	Sum	194.50	149.00	343.50
	Mean	3.4123	2.6140	6.0263
Large	Sum	93.00	86.00	179.00
	Mean	5.8125	5.3750	11.1875
Total	Sum	347.38	369.00	716.38
	Mean	2.3159	2.4600	4.7759

Land holding pattern of CFs by caste and size class is given in Tables 6.2 & 6.3. It is observed that among social groups the average size of holdings owned by backward castes in both dry land and irrigated land had an edge over the land holdings of SC/STs in the study area. This is a historical phenomenon that exists in rural India. It is clear from the Table 3 that the selected companies were not concerned with the caste of the CF; rather the primary requisite of the CF is to have irrigated land. A representation of SC/STs land holdings exists among all sizes of holdings except in the large holding category because the size of SC/STs land holdings does not exceed 10

acres in the study area. Under the small farmers category, the average size of irrigated lands among SC/STs rank higher than backward castes.

**Table 6.2: Land Holdings by Social Groups**

Social Group		Dry land	Irrigated land	Total land
BC	Sum	328.38	346.00	674.38
	Mean	2.4506	2.5821	5.0327
SC & ST	Sum	19.00	23.00	42.00
	Mean	1.1875	1.4375	2.6250
Total	Sum	347.38	369.00	716.38
	Mean	2.3159	2.4600	4.7759

**Table 6.3: Land Holdings by Size Class and Social Groups**

Size Class	Social Group		Dry land	Irrigated land	Total land
Marginal	BC	Sum	14.38	32.50	46.88
		Mean	.5752	1.3000	1.8752
	SC & ST	Sum	5.00	13.50	18.50
		Mean	.4167	1.1250	1.5417
Small	BC	Sum	40.50	84.00	124.50
		Mean	1.0385	2.1538	3.1923
	SC & ST	Sum	.00	4.00	4.00
		Mean	.0000	4.0000	4.0000
Medium	BC	Sum	180.50	143.50	324.00
		Mean	3.3426	2.6574	6.0000
	SC & ST	Sum	14.00	5.50	19.50
		Mean	4.6667	1.8333	6.5000
Large	BC	Sum	93.00	86.00	179.00
		Mean	5.8125	5.3750	11.1875
	SC & ST	Sum	93.00	86.00	179.00
		Mean	5.8125	5.3750	11.1875
Grand Total	BC	Sum	328.38	346.00	674.38
		Mean	2.4506	2.5821	5.0327
	SC & ST	Sum	19.00	23.00	42.00
		Mean	1.1875	1.4375	2.6250
Total	Sum	347.38	369.00	716.38	
	Mean	2.3159	2.4600	4.7759	

Table 6.4 shows the area under different crops by size class. There are nine major crops cultivated in an area of 781.75 acres, of which ragi and coconut plantations account for 30 per cent and 23 per cent respectively. Gherkin comes third with 19 per

cent. Among other crops, the major crops are areca nut (23 per cent) and groundnut (11 per cent) grown by CFs in the study area. It is interesting to note that 36 per cent and 24 per cent of the cropped area respectively account for marginal and small farmers across all sizes of holding. The area under gherkin owned by the medium and large farmers category account for 15 per cent and 11 per cent respectively of the selected CFs.

**Table 6.4: Area under different crops cultivated by CFs and Size Class**

Sl.No	Crop	Marginal Farmer	Small Farmer	Medium Farmer	Large Farmer	Total
1	Gherkin C 1	19.00	21.50	29.75	10.50	80.75
2	Gherkin C2	14.00	15.50	25.00	9.50	64.00
	Sub-Total	33.00 (36)	37.00 (24)	54.75 (15)	20.00 (11)	144.75 (19)
3	Ragi	18.00 (20)	36.00 (24)	116.00 (33)	63.00 (350)	233.00 (30)
4	Groundnut	3.50 (4)	2.00 (1)	59.00 (17)	22.00 (12)	86.50 (11)
5	Sunflower	-	-	-	1.00 (1)	1.00 (neg)
6	Paddy	1.00 (1)	-	-	-	1.00 (neg)
7	Coconut Garden	16.00 (18)	44.25 (29)	74.00 (21)	44.00 (24)	178.75 (23)
8	Areca nut	11.00 (12)	17.25 (11)	48.00 (13)	30.00 (16)	106.25 (13)
9	Vegetables	8.50 (9)	12.00 (3)	5.00 (1)	1.00 (1)	26.50 (3)
10	Banana	-	4.00 (3)	-	-	4.00 (1)
	Total	91.50 (100)	152.50 (100)	356.75 (100)	181.00 (100)	781.75 (100)

Note: Figures in bracket denote percentage to total

Tables 6.5 & 6.6 gives details of the number of CFs and the area under gherkin by size class. Of the 150 CFs, over 87 per cent of the total gherkin crop 1 and 2 cultivated in an area of 0.50 acre and rest in the area of 0.75 acre and 1 acre. Out of 128 CFs, around 55 per cent of them cultivated 0.50 acre of gherkin by small and marginal farmers, and medium and large farmers constitute 35 per cent. The proportion of CFs who cultivate gherkin crop 1 and 2 under 0.50 acre across the sizes of holdings is almost the same. Whereas, medium and large farmers cultivate gherkin crop 1 & 2 under the area of 0.75 acre and 1 acre. The total area under gherkin crop 1 & 2 accounts for 80.75 acres and 64 acres by the CFs. Gherkin crop 1 is grown in Khariff

season and crop 2 during summer (Table 6.6). The total area i.e., 80.75 acres under gherkin crop 1, is equally shared by small and marginal farmers and medium and large farmers in the study area. Whereas, the second crop under gherkin accounts for higher (56 per cent) in the case of the latter size of holdings. On an average, gherkin area cultivated by CFs is 0.50 acre.

**Table 6.5: Gherkin Crop Area (Acre) Cultivated by Size Class**

Size Class	Gherkin Crop 1		Gherkin Crop 2	
	No. of CFs	Area	No. of CFs	Area
Marginal	37 (25)	19.00 (23)	28 (24)	14.00 (22)
Small	40 (28)	21.50 (27)	30 (25)	15.50 (24)
Medium	53 (36)	29.75 (37)	45 (38)	25.00 (39)
Large	16 (11)	10.50 (13)	15 (13)	9.50 (15)
Total	146 (100)	80.75 (100)	118 (100)	64.00 (100)

**Table 6.6: Number of CFs and Area of Gherkin Crop Cultivated by Size Class in the Study Area**

Size Class	.50 Acre		.75 Acre		1.00 Acre		Total	
	C 1	C 2	C 1	C 2	C 1	C 2	C 1	C 2
Marginal	36 (28)	28 (27)	-	-	1 (8)	-	37 (25)	28 (24)
Small	37 (29)	29 (28)	-	-	3 (23)	1 (17)	40 (28)	30 (25)
Medium	45 (35)	36 (35)	3 (60)	7 (78)	5 (38)	2 (33)	53 (36)	45 (38)
Large	10 (8)	10 (10)	2 (40)	2 (22)	4 (31)	3 (50)	16 (11)	15 (13)
Total	128 (100)	103 (100)	5 (100)	9 (100)	13 (100)	6 (100)	146 (100)	118 (100)

Table 6.7 gives the break-up of the cost of cultivation per acre of gherkin. To cultivate one acre of gherkin, the gross cost comes to Rs 26,500, of which 48 per cent is spent on harvesting of the produce. The other major cost components are fertilisers (16 per cent); seeds (11 per cent); farm yard manure (5 per cent); and pesticides (4 per cent) (see appendix 2). Establishment costs like staking and G I wire, jute thread and

plastic thread account for 10 per cent of the gross cost. Across the size of holdings, cost components do not show much variation. The gross and net returns approximately are Rs 47,000 and Rs 20,000 respectively. The average yield of gherkins per acre is 6,300 kgs.

Table 6.8 gives details of the gross cost (per acre) of the selected crops in the study area. It is interesting to note that the gross cost of gherkin is the highest at Rs 26,500, followed by sunflower at Rs 8,000, groundnut at Rs 7,687, vegetables crops at Rs 6,000 and garden crops like coconut at Rs 4,000 and areca nut at Rs 3,000. The lowest in gross cost is ragi at Rs 1,700.

**Table 6.7: Cost of Cultivation (Per Acre) of Gherkin crop in the Study Area**

Sl.No	Particular	Marginal Farmer	Small Farmer	Medium Farmer	Large Farmer	Total
1	Land Development	750	800	900	1000	852
2	Farm Yard Manure	1300	1250	1400	1450	1350
3	Seeds	3000	3000	3000	3000	3000
4	Sowing	200	200	200	200	200
5	Fertiliser	4194	4236	4250	4585	4150
6	Weeding	500	550	600	800	620
7	Staking / GI Wire	718	666	684	630	678
8	Jute thread	1126	1117	1200	1200	1150
9	Plastic thread	595	583	591	533	582
10	Pesticides	1000	940	938	909	947
11	Irrigation	400	400	400	400	400
12	Harvesting	12400	12650	12800	13000	12680
13	Gross Cost	26183	26392	26963	27707	26309
14	Gross Returns	46228	46526	47558	47723	46992
15	Net Returns	20045	20134	20595	20016	20683
16	Output (Kgs)	5963	6423	6339	6505	6295

**Table 6.8: Gross Cost (Per Acre) of the Selected Crops**

Sl. No.	Crop	Marginal Farmer	Small Farmer	Medium Farmer	Large Farmer	Total
1	Gherkin	26183	26392	26963	27707	26309
2	Ragi	1925	1945	1727	1439	1698
3	Groundnut	3171	2950	2655	26733	2687
4	Sunflower	-	-	-	8200	8200
5	Paddy	4000	-	-	-	4000
6	Coconut Garden	3667	3816	4292	3555	3938
7	Areca nut	3818	3513	2673	2850	2978
8	Vegetables	5894	5708	6480	6100	5928

The gross returns of the selected crops per acre are indicated in Table 6.9. gherkin ranks first, followed by sunflower, garden crops like coconut, vegetable crops, areca nut, paddy, groundnut and ragi. Similar trends are found with regard to net returns of the other selected crops in the study area (Table 6.10).

**Table 6.9: Gross Returns (Per Acre) of the Selected Crops**

Sl. No.	Crop	Marginal Farmer	Small Farmer	Medium Farmer	Large Farmer	Total
1	Gherkin	46228	46526	47558	47723	46992
2	Ragi	3092	3497	3370	2739	3197
3	Groundnut	5228	5400	4593	4136	4521
4	Sunflower	-	-	-	17200	17200
5	Paddy	7000	-	-	-	7000
6	Coconut Garden	14133	13220	12770	10682	12493
7	Areca nut	10000	10435	8896	8417	9437
8	Vegetables	10588	12083	12000	10000	11509

**Table 6.10: Net Returns (Per Acre) of the Selected Crops**

Sl. No.	Crop	Marginal Farmer	Small Farmer	Medium Farmer	Large Farmer	Total
1	Gherkin	20045	20134	20595	20016	20683
2	Ragi	1167	1551	1643	1300	1498
3	Groundnut	2057	2450	1938	1463	1834
4	Sunflower	-	-	-	9000	9000
5	Paddy	7000	-	-	-	7000
6	Coconut Garden	10466	9404	8478	7127	8555
7	Areca nut	6182	6922	6223	5567	6459
8	Vegetables	4694	6375	5520	3900	5581

Regarding output kgs/per acre of the selected crops, gherkin comes first, followed by groundnut and garden crops like coconut and areca nut, paddy, sunflower and ragi (Table 6.11).

**Table 6.11: Output (Kgs/Per Acre) of the Selected Crops**

Sl. No.	Crop	Marginal Farmer	Small Farmer	Medium Farmer	Large Farmer	Total
1	Gherkin	5963	6423	6339	6505	6295
2	Ragi	522	517	495	427	482
3	Groundnut	314	400	300	236	273
4	Sunflower	-	-	-	800	800
5	Paddy	1000	-	-	-	1000
6	Coconut Garden	2406	2395	2243	1932	2219
7	Areca nut	218	339	299	351	312

Details of harvest days of gherkin as reported by CFs by size class are given in Table 6.12. A large number of CFs, i.e., 103 CFs out of 146 sample households, reported that the harvesting period ranges from 41 to 60 days, whereas, 28 per cent of the CFs reported to have harvested gherkins for 20 to 40 days.

**Table 6.12: Employment Generation during Harvest of Gherkin Crop**

Size Class	Number of days of Harvest			Total
	20 to 40	41 to 60	61 & above	
Marginal	9 (24)	27 (73)	1 (3)	37 (100)
Small	8 (20)	32 (80)	- -	40 (100)
Medium	19 (36)	33 (62)	1 (2)	53 (100)
Large	5 (31)	11 (69)	- -	16 (100)
Total	41 (28)	103 (71)	2 (1)	146 (100)

The prevailing wage rates for hired labourers gender-wise is given in Table 6.13. The wage rate for both the crop 1 and 2 is around Rs 40 for male and Rs 30 for female labourers in the study area.

**Table 6.13: Prevailing Wage Rates by Sex-wise in the Study Area**

Size Class	CROP 1 HIRED		CROP 2 HIRED	
	M	F	M	F
Marginal	43	30	42	30
Small	43	30	43	30
Medium	39	30	42	30
Large	40	30	42	30
Total	41	30	42	30

Details of the total labour cost incurred on harvesting gherkin (1 and 2) are given in Table 6.14. On an average, the total labour cost incurred to harvest crop 1 and 2 was found to be Rs 8,694 and Rs 7,050, respectively.

**Table 6.14: Total Labour Cost for Harvest of Gherkin Crop 1 and 2**

Size Class	CROP 1	CROP 2
Marginal	7554	5856
Small	9155	7244
Medium	8599	7091
Large	10486	8890
Total	8694	7050

The Contract Price per/Kg of gherkins by grades is fixed at the time of contract between the company and the farmer (Table 6.15). On an average, the contract price for grade 1 is Rs 10; grade 2 Rs 6; and grade 3 Rs 3. Contract prices are almost uniform with all the selected companies in the study area.

**Table 6.15: Contract Price (Per/Kg) of Gherkins**

Size Class	CROP 1			CROP 2		
	Grade 1	Grade 2	Grade 3	Grade 1	Grade 2	Grade 3
Marginal	10	6	3	10	6	3
Small	10	6	3	10	6	3
Medium	10	6	3	10	6	3
Large	10	6	3	10	6	3
Total	10	6	3	10	6	3

Tables 6.16 & 6.17 give details of the output of gherkin by crops, grades and size classes. The average output of gherkins for crop 1 and 2 are 3,434 kgs and 2,594 kgs, respectively. The gross returns for crop 1 and 2 are Rs 25,668 and Rs 18,423 respectively. The output for grade 1 accounts for 53 per cent of the total output for crop 1 (Table 6.17); and for grade 2 and 3, 33 per cent and 14 per cent respectively.

**Table 6.16: Output of Gherkins per Acre by Crop and Size Class**

Size Class	CROP 1		CROP 2	
	Qty Kgs	Value (Rs)	Qty Kgs	Value (Rs)
Marginal	3060	23782	2195	15550
Small	3609	26300	2258	16344
Medium	3316	24879	2677	19268
Large	4282	31256	4063	27257
Total	3434	25668	2594	18423

**Table 6.17: Output of Gherkins per acre by Grades and Size Class**

Grades	Number of Gherkins	
	CROP 1	CROP 2
Grade 1	1802	1385
Grade 2	1130	922
Grade 3	501	287
Total	3433	2594

Details of the live-stock population and income derived from it by size class are presented in Table 6.18. The net income derived from live-stock of all the size of holdings comes to Rs 2,646 per household. The live-stock population as also the net income derived directly from it is proportionate to the size of holdings.

The contract document between the company and the CF is in three formats, i.e., Kannada, English and both (see appendix 3). About 80 per cent of the CFs reported having signed the CD in Kannada, five per cent in English only and 15 per cent in both English and Kannada (Table 6.19)

**Table 6.18 : Live stock population and Income Derived by Size Class**

Size Class	Number of Livestock	Value of Animal Investment	Number of Member Involved	Income Derived	Value of Bye-product	Family Labour	Feeds	Total Cost	Net Income Derived
Marginal	1	7783	1	4445	1243	459	2432	2905	1540
Small	2	11175	1	6750	1750	850	3450	4300	2450
Medium	3	12298	1	7736	2324	903	3982	4903	2798
Large	4	20562	1	13062	3375	1594	6313	7906	5156
Total	2	11767	1	7230	2017	853	3707	4570	2646

**Table 6.19: Contract Document in Kannada/English or Both**

Size Class	Kannada	English	Both	Total
Marginal	28	5	4	37
	75.70%	13.50%	10.80%	100.00%
Small	33	2	5	40
	82.50%	5.00%	12.50%	100.00%
Medium	46	-	11	57
	80.70%	-	19.30%	100.00%
Large	13	-	3	16
	81.30%	-	18.80%	100.00%
Total	120	7	23	150
	80.00%	4.70%	15.30%	100.00%

Table 6.20 indicates the number of years CFs have been growing gherkin in the study area. A large number of CFs, i.e., 73 per cent, reported that they have been cultivating gherkin for one year, while 25 per cent of the CFs have been into it for form two years.

The Field Inspection Report (see appendix 4) and the frequency of field visits (see appendix 5) by the company's field staff by size class is given in Table 6.21 (see appendix 4 & 5). Around 82 per cent of the CFs reported that field staff visited them twice a week, 11 per cent said once in two days and seven per cent once a week.

**Table 6.20: The Number of Years Growing Gherkin**

Size Class	No. of Years Growing Gherkins				Total
	1 year	2 years	3 years	More than 3 years	
Marginal	26	10	1	-	37
	70.30%	27.00%	2.70%	-	100.00%
Small	30	10	-	-	40
	75.00%	25.00%	-	-	100.00%
Medium	42	14	-	1	57
	73.70%	24.60%	-	1.80%	100.00%
Large	11	4	-	1	16
	68.80%	25.00%	-	6.30%	100.00%
Total	109	38	1	2	150
	72.70%	25.30%	0.70%	1.30%	100.00%

**Table 6.21: Frequency of Visits by the Field Staff**

Size Class	Frequency of Visits			Total
	Once in two days	Weekly twice	Weekly once	
Marginal	6	30	1	37
	16.20%	81.10%	2.70%	100.00%
Small	4	36	-	40
	10.00%	90.00%	-	100.00%
Medium	5	44	8	57
	8.80%	77.20%	14.00%	100.00%
Large	1	13	2	16
	6.30%	81.30%	12.50%	100.00%
Total	16	123	11	150
	10.70%	82.00%	7.30%	100.00%

The availability and utilisation pattern of services provided by companies is given in Table 6.22. The services provided by companies such as transport (lifting gherkins from the field), training facilities (dissemination of knowledge on the package of practices), technical support, and their utilisation by CFs, were found to be totally satisfactory (Table 6.23).

**Table 6.22: Availability & Utilisation of Services for the Produce**

Services	Quality Criteria	Marginal		Small		Medium		Large		Total	
		Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No
Transport	Available	*	-	*	-	*	-	*	-	*	-
	Utilised	*	-	*	-	*	-	*	-	*	-
Accounts/Audits	Available	*	-	*	-	*	-	*	-	*	-
	Utilised	*	-	*	-	*	-	*	-	*	-
Technical Support	Available	*	-	97	3	95	5	94	6	97	3
	Utilised	97	3	97	3	90	10	*	-	95	5
Market Access	Available	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Utilised	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Training	Available	*	-	*	-	*	-	*	-	*	-
	Utilised	*	-	*	-	*	-	*	-	*	-

\* Denote 100 per cent

Table 6.24 furnishes details of the contract between the company and the primary producer. Awareness about the contract document (CD), the format of the CD (see appendix 4), signing the CD, (signing both for one year and longer), knowledge about pesticides, adoption of precautionary measures, frequency etc. of vehicles lifting gherkins from the field as also field visits by the field staff etc. were found to be perfect. Whereas, 65 per cent of CFs reported that did not have a copy of the CD with them. The selected companies used to charge three per cent of the gross as transport cost. Further, the company would not purchase the entire produce when the size of gherkins did not conform to the norms prescribed in the CD.

**Table 6.23: Services are Available for Primary Producers**

Services	Quality Criteria	Marginal		Small		Medium		Large		Total	
		V	G	V	G	V	G	V	G	V	G
Transport	Availability	100	-	100	-	100	-	100	-	100	-
	Accessibility	92	8	95	5	84	16	81	19	89	11
	Cost of Service (%)	-	3	-	3	-	3	-	3	-	3
	Quality of Service	100	-	100	-	100	-	100	-	100	-
Accounts /Audits	Availability	100	-	100	-	100	-	100	-	100	-
	Accessibility	100	-	100	-	100	-	100	-	100	-
	Cost of Service	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Quality of Service	-	100	-	100	-	100	-	100	-	100
Technical Support (Maintenance etc)	Availability	100	-	97	3	88	12	100	-	95	5
	Accessibility	100	-	100	-	91	9	100	-	97	3
	Cost of Service	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Quality of Service	100	-	100	-	100	-	100	-	100	-
Market Access (Linkages)	Availability	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Accessibility	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Cost of Service	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Quality of Service	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Training	Availability	100	-	100	-	100	-	100	-	100	-
	Accessibility	-	100	-	100	-	100	-	100	-	100
	Cost of Service	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Quality of Service	-	100	-	100	-	100	-	100	-	100

**Table 6.24: Details About the Contract in the Study Area**

Sl. No.	Particulars	Marginal		Small		Medium		Large		Total	
		Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No
1	Contract Document Written	100	-	100	-	100	-	100	-	100	-
2	Aware of C D	100	-	100	-	100	-	100	-	100	-
3	Sign the C D	100	-	100	-	100	-	100	-	100	-
4	Sign C D for 1 Year	100	-	100	-	100	-	100	-	100	-
5	Do you have C D	35	65	40	60	30	70	44	56	35	65
6	Aware of Pesticides	100	-	100	-	100	-	100	-	100	-
7	Problems faced Spraying Pesticides	-	100	-	100	2	98	-	100	1	99
8	Precautionary Measures	100	-	100	-	100	-	100	-	100	-
9	Vehicles Pick the Produce	100	-	100	-	100	-	100	-	100	-
10	Transport Charges	100	-	100	-	100	-	100	-	100	-
11	Aware of Market Price	-	100	-	100	-	100	-	100	-	100
12	Domestic Consumption	-	100	-	100	-	100	-	100	-	100
13	Field Staff – Visits	100	-	100	-	100	-	100	-	100	-
14	Co. Purchases entire Produce	89	11	95	5	84	16	81	19	88	22

## CHAPTER 7

### BENEFITS FROM GHERKIN AND PERCEPTIONS OF CONTRACT FARMERS

This chapter attempts to assess the benefits accrued from the cultivation of gherkin, besides the contract farmers' perceptions about sustainability of the crop in the study area.

#### **Benefits for Contract Farmers:**

The following are the benefits derived by contract farmers in Karnataka.

1. Gherkin crop is grown throughout the year (all seasons).
2. The crop keeps farmers engaged throughout the year by attending to the crop in the field.
3. It provides employment opportunities to the family members of both land holders and landless labourers in rural areas.
4. Gherkin can be cultivated in the temperate climatic conditions prevalent in the districts of Tumkur, Bellary, Hassan, Davanagere, Chitradurga, Kolar, etc.
5. Pre-fixed prices for the crop largely eliminate risks from the gherkin growing community.
6. Companies provide all inputs like seeds, fertilisers, pesticides, and a package of practices (except staking materials (sticks), jute thread and plastic thread) to contract farmers.
7. The income generated from this crop could be used to repay loans borrowed from different sources.

8. Gherkin consumes less water for irrigation, i.e. one and a half inch size pumped water is sufficient to irrigate one acre.
9. Commission agents and/or middlemen are excluded as companies themselves act as facilitators for transport and marketing of the produce.
10. There is a transparent and fool-proof weighing and accounting system. Buyers weigh gherkins in front of the farmers according to grade/s and enter the quantity into the passbook, maintained by the CF.
11. Farmers get timely technical guidance from the company's field officer/s to prevent the spread of diseases/pests from crops grown in plots adjoining the area where gherkin is grown.
12. This being a short duration crop (three months), harvesting begins after 28 to 30 days and closes between 70 and 80 days, depending on the standard of crop husbandry.
13. Gherkin is eminently suitable for marginal and small holdings because such households generally have members who can help in daily farm activities. Smaller holdings with assured irrigation seems to be ideal for growing gherkin.
14. Gherkin cultivation can be taken up with low investment per acre – Rs 12,000 to Rs 15,000. This is so because companies provide all necessary inputs, except staking. Labour costs are also minimised by pooling in family labourers and avoiding paid out cost (for hired labourers).
15. In conventional farming farmers get returns under gherkin cultivation, farms (CFs) get regular income fortnightly, which helps them meet recurring expenditure for other crops as also to meet domestic expenditure.
16. It is a profitable crop and also economically viable. Compared with other commercial crops, Gherkin generates more income and employment within a short gestation period. Returns to investment in percentage terms are higher than any other comparable crop.

### **Perceptions of Contract Farmers:**

1. Companies should extend credit facilities also to gherkin farmers.
2. Minimum Support Price (MSP) should be fixed for various grades of gherkins, through legislation by Government.
3. Companies can introduce other crops under the contract farming system, if found feasible.
4. Provisions should be made to purchase all grades of gherkins other than those specifically notified in the contract agreement.
5. Uniformity needs to be maintained in extending facilities/ inputs like medicine kit (to preserve pesticides), GI wire, jute thread, plastic thread, sprayer and spraying dress (to prevent health hazards).
6. Stipulate uniformity in grades of gherkins to be grown, in order to help farmers to gather expertise in their given segments.
7. As per the contract agreement, the disbursement of money was fortnightly. At times it was found to exceed that duration (field evidences show that one of the firms did not make a single payment despite the crop harvest having been over, the reason being that the company was a constructing new building).
8. In case of any lapses from the companies, the Government should intervene and come to the rescue of farmers.
9. Promotion of domestic consumption of gherkins will definitely come to the rescue of farmers in the event of a fall in price or demand in the international market.
10. NABARD should evolve a collateral security system between the corporate bodies involved in contract farming and farmers.

11. Fertiliser subsidies should be extended to corporate bodies in order to help the contract farmers to avail fertiliser at affordable prices.
12. Motivating private insurance companies to participate in the contract farming sector may be considered to act as a liaison authority between corporate bodies and contract farmers in the form of a Crop Insurance Scheme, both as a facilitator and guarantor in the event of crop failure. This would also address the problem of natural calamities like droughts or floods that wipe out gherkin crops.
13. The introduction of the Drip Irrigation Programme among contract farmers with suitable subsidies.
14. Agents other than established corporate bodies involved in Contract Farming need be discouraged. Such agents often cheat farmers by not making payment and also by not lifting the whole produce.
15. Prices fixed under a contract needs upward revision corresponding with grades of the produce.
16. Government should, on a trail basis, enter into CFs, particularly in crops/areas where distress sale of agricultural produce is often reported.
17. In the initial stages of the crop, visits by field staff found to be regular, as the crop advances the frequency of visits comes down. It was also observed that the field staff rarely, or in some cases never, visit fields of experienced farmers. Assured timely visits by the field staff would strengthen the expertise of farmers both experienced and fresher, and thereby, ensure uniform high levels of gherkin fields.
18. Gherkin needs heavy dosages of pesticides (as part of the prescribed package of practices), and regular spraying. Farmers handling pesticides for longer periods are prone to various afflictions, and it would be a great help to farmers if the companies come forward with health insurance schemes to cover vulnerable farmers.

## CHAPTER - 8

### CONCLUSIONS AND POLICY OPTIONS

#### **Introduction:**

With the emergence of the free market economy in the wake of liberalisation, globalisation, privatisation and the fast expansion of agri-business, small farmers may find it difficult to cope up with the resultant volatility in the economy. They tend to be marginalised and migration from rural to urban areas is increasing alarmingly all over the country. As a result, consolidation of holdings is increasingly becoming the need of the day. One of the strong reasons could be the lack of well-established forward and backward linkages, such as extension advice, mechanisation services, supply of seeds, fertilisers and credit, as also guaranteed and profitable markets for their produce. Therefore, the need of the hour is to mitigate the difficulties in the contract farming system, which would hopefully popularise it further among small farmers. The agreements between the farmer and the firm provides for the purchaser to extend a degree of production support through inputs and technical guidance for crop cultivation. There is a commitment from the farmer's side to produce the specified agricultural products by conforming to the quality and quantity prescribed by the purchaser, and the firm supports, in turn, the farmer's production, and also purchases the produce.

Contract farming has long-term benefits for both the grower and the purchaser, provided that their long-term association is mutually complementary. A sizable part of the farming community falls under the small and marginal category in India. Contract farming, as it existed then was different from the design and functioning of contract farming method today. Karnataka will shortly emerge as one of the food park centres in the food basket of India. Karnataka has already given an indication of that. Gherkin revolution has brought much needed income to impoverished farmers, many of whom are now lakhpathis. This trend is being replicated in Maharashtra and Tamil Nadu. Gherkin is a much sought after delicacy in US and in Europe. Currently Karnataka has a 90 per cent share in India's gherkin exports.

Generally, summer crop is sown during the months of December and early January. Farmers' inputs on raising gherkin seem to be optimal. This could be attributed

to the fact that farmers were now free to focus on gherkin alone, after having tried out other crops. Concerned companies in the field also concentrate more on gherkin with less area and lesser farmers. As a result, yields per acre is definitely higher as compared to other crops. Added to this, the environment is also favourable for better yield rates.

### **Objectives and Methodology:**

The objectives of the study are: to make an inventory of firms involved in contract farming in Karnataka, the structure of agreement between the primary producer and the firm, the type of crop promotion under contract farming, to assess the impact on income and employment generation for contract farmers and their perceptions on continuation, benefits accrued for both farmers and firms, meeting the demands of both the local and export markets and, finally, to suggest policies for its sustainability.

There are around 25 firms involved in contract farming and promoting gherkin spread over districts of Tumkur, Bellary and Haveri in Karnataka. Tumkur district is purposely selected for the in-depth study. And about 10 firms promote gherkin in the district. Out of these, five leading companies are chosen and 11 villages and 30 contract farmers (CFs) from each company representing the different size of holdings are covered. A structured questionnaire is prepared and 150 CFs interviewed. The reference year for the study is 2002-03.

### **Findings:**

- By and large, the selected five companies fix price per kilo of gherkins by grade i.e., first Rs 11 to Rs 10.50; second Rs 7 to Rs 6; third Rs 4 to Rs 2; and lost grade Rs 2 to Re 1. And above companies supply inputs like seeds, fertilisers, pesticides and technical guidance to contract farmers (CFs).
- Of the total 150 CFs selected, small and marginal farmers constitute 52 per cent, medium farmers 38 per cent, and large farmers 10 per cent. Seventy per cent of the heads of households (HH) of CFs are in the age group 26 to 50 years. Over 93 per cent of CFs are married. Almost all CFs (99 per cent) are literate. The average family size of CF was 6.7 persons. Around 70 per cent of the total population in the

study area is involved in agriculture. Out of 150 CFs, backward castes and SC/STs form 89 per cent and 11 per cent respectively. Almost all CFs own pucca houses and higher the size of holdings better is the quality of house. The average annual income mobility observed before contract farming and after contract farming is between 10 and 15 per cent, and 10 per cent of CFs crossed above the poverty line in the study area.

- The average land holding of CF is 4.78 acres, of which dry and irrigated land account for 2.32 acres and 2.46 acres respectively. There are nine major crops cultivated, of which ragi and coconut plantation rank first and second, followed by gherkin (19 per cent of the total cultivated area), areca nut and groundnut.
- The area under gherkin ranges between 0.50 acre and 1 acre, and the majority of CFs cultivate gherkin in an area of 0.50 acre to 0.75 acre. To cultivate one acre of gherkin, the gross cost comes to Rs 26,500, of which 48 per cent is spent on harvesting of the produce. Gross returns and net returns account for approximately Rs 47,000 and Rs 20,000 respectively. The average yield of gherkins per acre is 6,300 kgs. Gherkin ranks first in terms of gross and net returns, followed by sunflower, garden crops like coconut, vegetable crops, areca nut, paddy and groundnut, the lowest being ragi. The average number of harvested days of gherkins ranges from 41 to 60 days, and the labour cost ranges from Rs 7,000 to Rs 8,694.
- About 80 per cent of CFs reported to have signed contract documents in Kannada, five per cent in English and 15 per cent in both English and Kannada. Around 73 per cent of CFs have been cultivating gherkin for a year, while 25 per cent have been into it for two years. Eighty two per cent of field staff visits fields twice a week, eleven per cent once in two days and seven per cent once a week. The availability and utilisation pattern of services i.e., the package of practices, input supplies and a buy-back system were found to be totally satisfactory.
- Gherkin is grown throughout the year, consumes less water, keeps CFs engaged in the crop husbandry and also provides employment opportunities to landless rural labourers. Pre-fixed prices for gherkins largely eliminate the risk to growers,

middlemen are totally absent and there is a high level of transparency in terms of weights and measures, accounting and payments.

**Policy Options:**

- Financial institutions should step in to extend credit/loan facilities to CFs, MSP should be fixed for the various grades of gherkins through legislations by the Government.
- Provision should be made to purchase the entire produce. Other inputs like GI wire plastic and jute thread, sprayer and sprayer dress (to prevent health hazards) should be provided. And in the case of any lapse from the companies, the Government should come to the rescue of CFs.
- NABARD should evolve collateral security between the company and contract farmers.
- Existing drip irrigation facilities may be extended with suitable subsidies to the loan amount through the horticulture department.
- Private insurance companies should insure the crop in the event of crop failure or natural calamities.
- The role of NGOs/Vos in closely monitoring CFs and companies in maintaining a cordial relationship, which benefit them mutually.

## Appendix – 1

### Gherkin Promoting Companies in Karnataka

1. Ace Agri-Exports Pvt. Ltd.
2. Bharath Associates
3. Blossom Showers Agro-Export Pvt. Ltd.
4. Blossom Showers Pvt. Ltd.
5. Global Green Co. Ltd.
6. Green Agro Pack Pvt. Ltd.
7. Green Pickles Pvt. Ltd.
8. Ken Agri Tech Pvt. Ltd.
9. Koelman Indian Pvt. Ltd.
10. Southern Garden India Pvt. Ltd.
11. Sterling Agro Products Processing Pvt. Ltd.
12. SMS Foods Technologies Ltd.
13. Indo-Danish Pvt. Ltd.
14. UNICORN Agro-Tech Ltd.
15. Vishal Natural Products Pvt. Ltd.
16. Indo-Spanish Pvt. Ltd.
17. RITZEL (India) Pvt. Ltd.
18. Inter-Garden (India) Pvt. Ltd.
19. Bharathi Agro-Industrial Foundation
20. Calipso Foods Pvt. Ltd.
21. Unillever Best Foods Pvt. Ltd.
22. Neo Foods Pvt. Ltd.
23. Indo-Spanish Tasty Foods Pvt. Ltd.
24. Indian Tropical Food Products Pvt. Ltd.
25. Capricorn Food Products India Pvt. Ltd.

**Appendix – 2**

**Pesticides Spray Schedule for 0.5 Acres (New)**

Sl. No	Day	SPV	Pest & Disease	Inputs	Pacing Unit	Units To Issue	Consumption Per Round	Bal With Farmer
	1	0	Sowing	Ajax Seed		4000Nos	4000 Nos	0
			Basal Fert. Application	D.A.P + M.O.P		50 Kg + 25 Kg		
			Micronutrient	Soil Micro-nutrients	10 Kgs	1	10 Kgs	
				Grow More	20 Kgs	1	20 Kgs	
1	10	35 lit	Insect control	exodus	100ml	1 unit	50 ml	50 ml
			Disease control	mancozeb	100 gms	1 unit	100 gms	0
			Micronutrient	nil	nil	nil	nil	Nil
			Growth promoter	nil	nil	nil	nil	Nil
			Foliar fert	nil	nil	nil	nil	Nil
			Fert. Soil application	nil	nil	nil	nil	Nil
2	17	50lit	Insect control	Azadirectin 10000 ppm	100ml	1 unit	100ml	0
			Disease control	Mancozeb+	100gm	1 unit	100gm	0
			Disease control	Potta phos	250ml	2 units	150ml	100ml
			Micro nutrient	nil	nil	nil	nil	Nil
			Growth promoter	-	-	-	-	-
			Foliar fert	Nitroplus	100ml	nil	100ml	0
			staking	G I Wire	-	10Kg	-	-
3	24	100lit	Insect control	Exodus	-	-	-	0
			Disease control	Potas phos+	250ml	1 unit	300ml	Nil
			Disease control	Mancozeb+	250gms	1 unit	250gms	Nil
			Micro nutrient	nil	nil	nil	nil	Nil
			Foliar fert	Nitroplus	Nitroplus	100ml	nil	100ml
			Fert. Soil.Appli	Nil	nil	nil	nil	Nil
4	31	150lit	Insect control	Flee wevil	500ml	1 unit	500ml	0
			Disease control	Cymo+man	nil	nil	nil	nil
			Micro nutrient	cucumix	250gms	2 unit	500gms	0
			Growth promoter	Daman+	10ml	2 units	20ml	0
			Foliar fert	Nitoplus	500gms	1 unit	500gms	325gms
			Fert soil Applica	CAN+MOP	nil	nil	nil	Nil
5	38	175lit	Insect control	Dr.Repell	500ml	1 unit	500ml	Nil
			Disease control	Potas phos+	250ml	2 units	500ml	0
			Disease control	Mancozeb+	250gms	2 units	500ml	0
			Micro nutrient	nil	nil	nil	nil	Nil
			Growth Promoter	-	100ml	2 units	200ml	0
			Fert Soil Applica	CAN+MOP			25 KG + 25 KG	

Continued.....

			Growth promoter	-	-	-	-	-
			Foliar fert	Nitroplus	100ml	nil	100ml	0
			staking	G I Wire	-	10Kg	-	-
6	45	100lit	Insect control	Azadirectin 10000ppm	200ml	1 unit	200gms	0
			Disease control	Potas Phos+	100ml	5 units	500ml	0
				Mancizeb+	100gms	5 units	500gms	0
			Micro nutrient	cucumix	500gms	1 unit	500gms	Nil
			Growth promoter	Danam+	10ml	3 units	30ml	Nil
			Foliar fert	nil	nil	nil	nil	Nil
			Fert Soil Applica	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil
7	52	200lit	Insect control	Dr.Repell	500ml	1 unit	500ml	0
			Disease control	Curzate	100gms	2 units	20gms	Nil
			Micro nutrient	-	500gms	1 unit	500gms	Nil
			Growth promoter	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil
			Foliar fert	CA NO3 or	500gms-		250gms	0
				KNO3	500gms	-	500gms	0
			Fert Soil Applica	nil	nil	nil	nil	Nil
8	59	200lit	Insect control	Flee wevil	500ml	1 unit	500ml	0
			Disease control	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil
			Micro nutrient	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil
			Growth promoter	Daman+	10ml	3 units	30ml	nil
			Foliar fert	nil	nil	Nil	nil	nil
			Fert Soil Applica	nil	nil	Nil	nil	nil
9	66	250		Azadira- chtrin 10000ppm	300ml	-	-	-

### Appendix - 3

#### Gherkin Contract Production Agreement Copy

----- residing in the village having----- acres furnishing the details of cultivating gherkin crop based on agreement prepared with the following conditions and the produce will be supply to Reitzel India (Pvt) Ltd, 63/2, 9 th "A" Cross, 12 th Block, Kumara Park West, Bangalore.

#### Both are agreed mutually to the conditions mentioned below

1. Farmer should cultivate gherkin crop under good irrigation conditions as advised by the agricultural officer of the company.
2. The quantum of pesticides to spray as prescribed by the agricultural officer and should not spray pesticides other than that suggested by the company, such gherkin produce will only be purchased.
3. Farmers are expected to have complete information about crop husbandry, quality of information, harvesting of gherkins, filtering gherkins by grades and technical aspects and adhere to those.
4. Not properly tie the creeper, difference in the harvested gherkins (soiled, bend, white colour, dried, gherkins with flower, virus affected) such items will not be purchased and farmers should grade affected gherkins.
5. Gherkins should not be sold to other than the notified company or in open market. If such situation is found, agreement will be cancelled and the dues from the farmer recovered.
6. Grades and price fluctuation in the International market will be informed to farmers. In the event of strike/s, farmers should cooperate in supplying gherkins to the local office.
7. Out of the total supplied gherkins, three per cent will be deducted towards transportation charges.
8. Fortnightly once on the notified dates payment will be disbursed to farmers.
9. Gherkins grades/ filters and price fixed are as follows.

Grade	Filter size	No. of Gherkins	Price
RI – A	14 mm	160+	11.00
RI – B	20 mm	60-160	6.00
RI - C	>20 mm	-60	2.00

-----  
Signature of the Farmer

-----  
Signature of the concerned  
Officer from

The Company

Name -----

Father's Name -----

Village -----

Taluk -----

District -----

Name -----

Dept/ Section -----

Date -----

**Appendix - 4**

**Unicorn Agrotech Limited**

**Field Inspection Report**

No.  
Date.....  
Farmer;s Name.....  
Time of Visit.....  
Village.....  
A/C. No.....  
Dt. Of Sowing.....

**OBSERVATIONS:**

Thrips .....%  
Mites ..... %  
Fr. Borer..... %  
Leaf Borer..... %  
D. Mildew.....%  
P. Mildew.....%  
F. Rot.....%  
Virus.....%

**OTHERS :**

Harvest Till Date.....Kg. N % P % K %

Balance (Approx).....Kg.

Stage Health Staking

**Recommendations:**

- 1) Fertilisers: 1..... 2.....
- 2) Chemicals: 1..... 3.....  
2..... 4.....
- 3) Others: 1..... 2.....

\_\_\_\_\_  
Field Staff Sign

\_\_\_\_\_  
Farmer sign



## REFERENCES

1. Allen, G.R. 1972. An Appraisal of Contract Farming, *International Journal of Agricultural Economics (IJAE)*, 23, 89-98.
2. Arnon, I. 1981. *Modernisation of Agriculture in Developing Countries: Resource, Potentials and Problems*, New York, John Wiley.
3. Beets, W. 1990. *Raising and Sustaining Productivity of Small holder farming systems in the Tropics: A Handbook of Sustainable Agricultural Development*, Alkmaar, Holland, AgBe Publishing.
4. Benziger, Vincent. 1996. Small Fields, Big Money: Two Successful Programs in Helping Small Farmers make Transition to High Value Added Crops, *World Development* 24(11), 1681-1693.
5. Boehlji Michael (2001) *The Moral Economy of the Contract in Living Under Contract* (eds) Peter D Little and Michael J Watts, The University of Wisconsin Press, Wisconsin.
6. Burch, D. 1994. Agribusiness, Peasant Agriculture and the State: the case of Contract Farming in Thailand, in D. T. Lloyd & O. Morrissey, eds. *Poverty, Inequity and Rural Development*, London, Macmillan, p.163.
7. Burch, D., Rickson, R.E. & Annels, R.1992. Contract Farming, Social Change and Environmental impacts: the Implications of the Australian Experience, in K. Walker & P. Tighe, eds. *Environmental issues and Public Policy*, Sydney, University of New South Wales Press, p.12-30.
8. Byres, T.J. 1983. Historical Perspectives on Sharecropping, *Journal of Peasant Studies*, 10(2/3): 7-41.
9. Coase R H (1937). Nature of the Firm, *Economica*, 4, Pp. 386-405.
10. Center for Research and Communications. 1990. *Corporations and Small Farmers: the Big Helping the Small*, in Executive Briefings, Part I:1-22, Manila, Agribusiness Unit of the Center for Research and Communication.
11. Clapp, Roger A 1994. *The Moral Economy of the Contract in Living under Contract* eds.Peter D Little and Micheal J Watts, The University of Wisconsin Press, Wisconsin.
12. Daddich, C.K. 1994. Contract Farming and Palm Oil Production in Cote d'Ivoire and Ghana., in P. D. Little & M. J. Watts eds. *Living under Contract: Contract Farming and Agrarian Transformation in Sub-Saharan Africa*, Madison, University of WisconsinPress, p. 188-215.

13. Davis (1979) Property without Power: A Study of the Development of Contract Farming in the US Ph. D Dissertation Cornell University op.cit in Little D Peter and Micheal J Watts (eds) Living Under Contract: Contract Farming and Agrarian Transformation in Sub Saharan Africa, The University of Wisconsin Press, Wisconsin, 1994.
14. Deodhar Satish Y (2001). WTO Agreements and Indian Agriculture Retrospection and Prospects in Implications of WTO Agreements and Indian Agriculture, Oxford and IBH New Delhi.
15. Dileep, B K, R K Grover and K N Rai 2002 Contract Farming in Tomato: An Economic Analysis, Indian Journal of Agricultural Economics, April-June Vol. 57, No.2.
16. Dolinsky, D. 1992. Contract Farming at Lam Nam Oon: An Operational Model for Rural Development, Institute Report, East Asian Institute, Colombia University.
17. Dunham, D. 1995. Contract Farming and Export Horticulture: Can Agribusiness Revitalise the Peasant Sector in Sri Lanka? Research Studies Agricultural Policy Series No. 3, Institute of Policy Studies, Colombo.
18. Eaton, C.S.1998. Directed Small-holder Farming in Fiji: A Case Study of Virginia Tobacco Production (Unpublished M.A. thesis), School of Social and Economic Development, University of the South Pacific, Suva.
19. .... 1990. The Possibilities of the Private Sector's Participation in Small-holder Agriculture in Fiji and Vanuatu, Research Report 15, Pacific Island Development Program, East-West Centre.
20. .... 1998a. Contract Farming Structures and Management in Developing Nations in D. Birch, G. Lawrence, R. Rickson, & J. Goss, eds. Australasian Food and Farming in a Globalised Economy: Recent Developments and Environmental Science, Monash University, Melbourne.
21. .... 1998b. Adaptation Performance and Production Constraints of Contract Farming in China (Unpublished Ph.D. thesis), Department of Geography, University of Western Australia, Perth.
22. Eaton, Charles and Andrew W Shepherd 2001. Contract farming: Partners for Growth, Agricultural Services Bulletin, 145, FAO, Rome.
23. Ghee, L.K. & Dorell, R.1992. Contract Farming in Malaysia in D.J.Glover & L.K. Ghee, eds. Contract Farming in South East Asia, Kuala Lumpur, University of Malaysia, p. 71-118.
24. Glover, D. 1983. Contract Farming and the Transnationals. (Unpublished Ph.D thesis), University of Toronto, Toronto
25. Glover, D 1984. Contract Farming and Smaller holder Out grower Schemes in the Less Developed Countries, World Development, Pp. 1143-1157.

26. Glover, D 1987 Increasing the Benefits to Smaller holders from Contract Farming Problems for Farmer's Organisations and Policy makers, *World Development*, 15(4), Pp. 441-448.
27. Glover, D. & Kusterer, K. 1990. *Small Farmers, Big Business: Contract Farming and Rural Development*, London, Macmillan.
28. Grossman, L.S. 1998. *The Political Ecology of Bananas: Contract Farming, Peasants and Agrarian Change in the Eastern Caribbean*, Chapel Hill and London, University of North Carolina Press.
29. Jackson, J.C. & Cheater, A.P. 1994. Contract Farming in Zimbabwe: Case Studies of Sugar, Tea, and Cotton in P.D.Little & M.J. Watts eds. *Living Under Contract Farming and Agrarian Transformation in Sub-Saharan Africa*, Madison, University of Wisconsin Press, p. 97-139.
30. Joger M F Win 2000 *Food Supply Chains from Productivity toward Quality in Fruit and Vegetables Quality: An Integrated View* (eds) Shewfelt L Robert and Bernhard Brucker Technomic Publishing Company Inc. Lancaster.
31. Key Nigel and David Runsten 1999 Contract Farming, Small holders and Rural Development in Latin America, The Organisation of Agroprocessing firms and the scale of Outgrower Production, *World Development*, 27(2), Pp. 381-401.
32. Kinsalla, K. 1987. Problems of Sub-Contractors in Common Problems with Contruction Contracts, *College of Law, Syney*, p.25-52.
33. Kiresur, V R, Paril, S A, and Vijayakumar, A S (2002) Contract Farming Opportunity for Small and Marginal Farmers in the context of Trade Liberalisation, *PII, Agricultural Economics Research Review*, Pp 78-87.
34. Laramée, P.A. 1975. Problems of Small Farmers under Contract Marketing: with special reference to a case study in Chiangmai Province, Thailand, in *Economic Bull for Asia and the Pacific*, No. 26, p. 43-57.
35. Little, P.D. 1994. The Development Question in P.D. Little & M.J.Watts. eds. *Living under Contract: Contract Farming and Agrarian Transformation in Sub-Saharan Africa*, Madison, University of Wisconsin Press, p. 216-257.
36. Little. P.D. & Watts, M.J. 1994. *Living under Contract: Contract Farming and Agrarian Transformation in Sub-Saharan Africa*, Madison, University of Wisconsin Press.
37. Miller, L. 1995. Agribusiness, Contract Farers and Lanfd-Use Sustainability in North-West Tasmania, in *Australian Geographer*, No. 26(2), p. 104-111.
38. Mishra, P.K. 1996. *Agricultural Risk, Insurance and Income: A Study of the Impact and Design of India's Comprehensive Crop Insurance Scheme*, Aldershot, Avebury.

39. Morrissy, J.D. 1974. *Agricultural Modernisation through Production Contracting: the role of the Fruit and Vegetable Processor in Mexico and Central America*, Praeger, New York.
40. Mosely, P. & Krishnamurthy, R.1995. *Can Crop Insurance Work? The case of India*, in P.K. Mishra (eds). *Ibid*.
41. National Bank for Agriculture and Rural development (NABARD),1999. *News Review*, Jan-March, Volume 15 No. 1, p. 56.
42. Patrick, Francois and Roberts Joanne (2003) *Contracting Productivity Growth*, *Review of Economics Studies*, January, Vol. 70 (1), Issue 242, Pp. 59-85.
43. Rangji, P S and Sidhu, M S (2003) *Contract Farming System*, *Punjab State Policy Issues, Productivity*, October – December, Vol. 44, No. 3, Pp. 484-491.
44. Rickson, R.E. & Burch, D. 1996. *Contracting on Organisational Agriculture: the effects upon Farmers and the Environment.*, in D. Burch, R.E. Ricksomn & G.E.Lawrence, eds. *Globalisation and Agri-food restructuring: Perspectives from the Australasia Region*, Aldershot, Avebury Publishing, Pp. 173-202.
45. Roth Ilyse Randi 1992 *Contract Farming Breeds Big Problems for Growers* <http://www.flaginc.org>.
46. Roy Ewell Paul 1963 *Contract Farming*, The Interstate Printers and Publishers Inc. Denville Illinois.
47. Sahay B S 2000 *Supply Chain Mangement in the 21<sup>st</sup> Century* Macmillan India Ltd, Delhi.
48. Singh, Gurdev, S R Asokan and Asopa, V N 1990 *Seed Industry in India: A Management Perspective*, Oxford and IBH, New Delhi.
49. Singh, Sukpal 2000 *Contract Farming and Agricultural Diversification in the Indian Punjab: A Study of Performance and Problems*, *Indian Journal of Agricultural Economics*, 55(3), July-September, Pp. 283-294.
50. Tsoulouhas Theofanis and Tomislav Vukina 1999 *Integrator Contract with Many Agents and Bankruptcy*, *American Journal of Agricultural Economics*, Vol. 81, No. 1, February.
51. Unnevehr Laurian and Nancy Hirschhorn 2000 *Food Safty Issues in the Developing World*, *The World Bank Technical Paper 469*, The World Bank, Washington DC.
52. Von Bulow, D. & Sorensen, A. 1988. *Gender Dynamics in Contract Farming: Women's role in Small-holder Tea Production in Kericho District, Kenya*. CDR Project Paper, No. 88.1, Centre for development research, Copenhagen.

53. Watts, M. J. 1994. Life under Contract Farming, Agrarian restructuring, and Flexible Accumulation in P.D.Little & M.J.Watts, eds. Living under Contract: Contract Farming and Agrarian Transformation in Sub-Saharan Africa, Madison, University of Wisconsin Press, p. 21-77.
54. Welsh Rick 1997 Vertical Coordination, Producer Response and the Locus of Control over Agricultural Production Decisions, Rural Sociology, Vol. 62, No. 4, Pp. 491-507.
55. Williamson Oliver 1986 Transaction Cost Economics: The Governance of Contractual Relations in Economic Organisation, Firm, Market and Policy Control, Wheat sheaf Books Ltd, Sussex.
56. Williams, S & Karen, R. 1985. Agribusiness and the Small-scale Farmer: a dynamic partnership for Development, West view Press, London

## Responses to the Comments Received from the Indian Institute of Management-Ahmedabad

### Selection of Gherkin Crop

Gherkin is one of the most important contract farming crop in Karnataka and it is emerging very strongly both in terms of area and trade. However, no systematic data are collected about the crop either in terms of its coverage or yield. Therefore, we do not have any official statistics to choose the regions which are having concentration of the crop. Most of the evidence are in terms of writings of different people and sporadic. Given this situation, it was difficult to make the 'usual' exercise of selection of crop as done in most of the AERC studies.

## Sampling Design

Notwithstanding the fact that there are no data available on the area under Gherkin crop the sample was selected on the basis of well informed sources in the State Government and the producers. It will be futile to design a sample frame for a crop for which there is hardly any 'population frame' available. As the data on Gherkin is neither collected nor stored anywhere, one cannot expect a scientific sample design 'with crop' or 'without crop', identifying villages and along with the usual dogma of statistical sample. Needless to add that the sampling design is purposive and 'snowball sampling' is used. Here, the researcher has gone from one Gherkin contract farmer to another one equipped with the knowledge collected during the first phase of interview. Therefore, the question of 'with' and 'without' situation and 'pre adoption' and 'post adoption' situation does not arise. It is very clearly stated in the objective that we are interested in the income generation *per se* and not in the relative income generation as is usually done in many studies. Therefore, the question of using the "trade of the mill" method of selecting 'with' and 'without' or 'adopters' and 'non-adopters' does not arise at all. In the same vein, we would like to emphasise that the tables 2.2 and 2.3 are essentially the tables for information and certainly not for comparison with anything

The review of literature is always constrained by the availability of the material to the author. It would have been a great help to the author if the reviewer had indicated the studies which he/she has accused us of neglecting. We are still in the process of locating such studies which are available on internet and elsewhere and that would take some time and may be incorporated while publishing the results of the report.

- The organizational chart is given in order to make clear the process of contract farming. It could have been easily dropped, however, its presence makes information clear if not adding to the existing information. The organizational chart also provides the technical personnel available in the company and their background which otherwise is not provided elsewhere.
- The socio-economic characteristics of the sample of contract farmers are presented in order to make understand the region-specific characteristics thereby providing information to the readers who are not familiar with the region.

- We have not attempted any relative analysis in the strict crop economics framework and therefore this simple analysis focusses on Gherkin, its income and employment generation. However, we have provided the relative income and employment from the other crops of the same farmer. That serves as a proxy for control.
- We failed to understand, how the reviewer has missed the crop-specific benefits presented in the tables 5.12, 5.13, 5.14, 6.8, 6.9, 6.10, 6.11 and 6.12. These tables amply provide information about the benefits derived from Gherkin farming.
- After receipt of the comments, significant changes are made in the report and the author expresses his gratitude to the reviewer for going through the report painstakingly.

**S. Erappa**  
**Project Director**

**R.S. Deshpande**  
**Professor and Head,**  
**ADRT Centre**

**GHERKIN PROMOTING COMPANIES IN KARNATAKA**

1. Ace Agri-Exports Pvt. Ltd.
2. Bharath Associates
3. Blossom Showers Agro-Export Pvt. Ltd.
4. Blossom Showers Pvt. Ltd.
5. Global Green Co. Ltd.
6. Green Agro Pack Pvt. Ltd.
7. Green Pickles Pvt. Ltd.
8. Ken Agri Tech Pvt. Ltd.
9. Koelman Indian Pvt. Ltd.
10. Southern Garden India Pvt. Ltd.
11. Sterling Agro Products Processing Pvt. Ltd.
12. SMS Foods Technologies Ltd.
13. Indo-Danish Pvt. Ltd.
14. UNICORN Agro-Tech Ltd.
15. Vishal Natural Products Pvt. Ltd.
16. Indo-Spanish Pvt. Ltd.
17. RITZEL (India) Pvt. Ltd.
18. Inter-Garden (India) Pvt. Ltd.
19. Bharathi Agro-Industrial Foundation
20. Calipso Foods Pvt. Ltd.
21. Unilever Best Foods Pvt. Ltd.
22. Neo Foods Pvt. Ltd.
23. Indo-Spanish Tasty Foods Pvt. Ltd.
24. Indian Tropical Food Products Pvt. Ltd.
25. Capricorn Food Products India Pvt. Ltd.