

Original Research Article

<https://doi.org/10.20546/ijcmas.2020.912.116>

## Marketing Systems of Minor Forest Products and Identification of Constraints faced by Tribals for Marketing of Minor Forest Product

Jayshri R. Kankate\*, R.G. Deshmukh and Rushikesh K. Patil

Department of Agriculture Economics and Statistics, Post Graduate Institute, Akola,  
Maharashtra, India

\*Corresponding author

### ABSTRACT

The study was undertaken with a view to study the various channels of marketing of MFP and to analyze the problems faced by the tribal farmers in transacting MFP. Out of twelve tahsil of Gadchiroli district, Dhanora tahsil is a tribal dominated tahsil which was selected purposively on the basis of maximum area under forest. Random sampling technique was followed regarding selection of the villages and tribal farmers. All the villages were listed out and villagers were selected at random. The study based on the primary data of 60 tribal farmers of Dhanora tahsil purposely. The data for year 2017-2018 on the relevant aspect of the study were collected by survey method. In channel I the minor forest products passes through collector to SHG to retailer to consumer. In channel II the products passes through collector to wholesaler to retailer to consumer. Whereas, in channel III the products passes through collector to retailer to consumer. Charoli required highest marketing cost than gum because of high perishability of Charoli pods.

#### Keywords

Marketing Channel,  
Constraints, Forest  
product, Gum,  
Charoli

#### Article Info

Accepted:  
10 November 2020  
Available Online:  
10 December 2020

### Introduction

Human's dependence on plant for their existence dates back to the beginning of the human race. Forest continues to be of great economic importance. The life of all living beings was dependent on forest still the art of agriculture was acquired. Since then human civilization has come a long way and things have changed beyond imagination. It

recognized as renewable natural resources. Forest is considered as means of sustaining ecological balance and the most important single factor to protect the environment.

In India, Minor forest products are an important livelihood source for several communities, particularly those living in forest fringe villages. About 400 million people in India depend on MFP for

sustenance and supplemental income. According to 2011 census, the tribal population in India was 104 million people which accounts for 8.6 per cent of total population of the country. It is estimated that, there is one tribal man for every fourteen Indians. In India, about 53 per cent of total tribal population lives in rural areas and nearly 31 per cent of them are directly dependent on MFP for their livelihood. Government revenue realized from MFP is in the order of Rs 20 billion per year. This provides 50 per cent of household income for 20 to 30 per cent of rural population particularly for tribal.

The nature and extent of MFP trade nationalization varied considerably from state to state and from product to product. However, nationalization affected the communities adversely in several cases. Forest produce mainly divided into two categories i.e. major & minor. Minor forest produce (MFP) is defined as “non wood forest produce, which can be exploited without harming the forest and will not include minerals as well as forest animals or animals part.

As of 2010, the FAO of united nation estimates India's forest cover to be about 68 mha. or 22 per cent of the country's area. Forest industry contributes 0.9 per cent to the Indian GDP with 50,632 sq.km i.e. 16.40 per cent of total forest area cover. According to the National Commission on Agriculture (1976) various items of minor forest products have the potential to bring economic development of the rural and tribal people in the country. Traditional market forces are still effectively operating in marketing and processing of minor forest products. Therefore, it is necessary to know the pattern of arrival of minor forest products in market and analysis the trend in price variation for minor forest products.

The Gadchiroli district of Maharashtra constitutes of 11299 km of the forest lands making a home for a variety of Non Timber Forest Produce (NTFP). The present study of minor forest products is an integral part of development and survival of people living in and around forests and depending on them.

The researcher had some difficulties in getting support from tribals during collection of the data. Tribals usually collect MFP in a group rather than independent, hence quantifying the produce collected, consumed and income earned by individuals was difficult, as respondents gave the information for the group. This challenge was overcoming by frequent interactions with the sample tribal farmers. Collected data is based on tribals past memory. Efforts were made by the researcher to crosscheck data and to make data reliable and accurate.

### **Materials and Methods**

The Gadchiroli district in Maharashtra state was selected purposively for the study, because most of the backward tribal tract and 76.13 per cent of area under forests fell under this district. Random sampling technique was followed regarding selection of both the villages and tribal farmers. Two important minor forest products i.e. Gum, Charoli were considered for the study as they were having maximum arrival in Adivasi Co-operative Society of Dhanoratahsil of Gadchiroli district.

Out of twelve tahsil of Gadchiroli district, Dhanora tahsil is a tribal dominated tahsil which was selected purposively on the basis of maximum area under forest. Random sampling technique was followed regarding selection of the villages and tribal farmers. All the villages were listed out and villagers were selected at random. From this tahsil 3 villages (Chatgaon, Sawargaon, Lekhamendha) were selected for study.

For collecting the information pertaining to marketing of MFP, four self-help group, five wholesalers and eight retailers from each marketing channel were selected at random in the study area. All the necessary information for the study was collected by “survey method”. Primary data were collected from tribal farmers by personal interview. For this purpose, a pre-tested questionnaire, specially designed for the study was used. While collecting the information every effort had been made to cross examine the informant to get accurate and reliable data. Personal and family expenses were excluded and only expenditure on collection of the MFP was strictly taken into consideration. Data from tribals collected in morning hours on farmers farm.

Data in respect of arrivals and prices were collected personally by visiting forest offices. Similarly, the data of arrivals and prices were collected for the period of last 5 years of selected minor forest product. The secondary data of arrival and prices of MFPs were collected from Adivasi Co-operative society in Dhanora tahsil of Gadchiroli district.

## **Results and Discussion**

### **Distribution of tribal's according to size of holding**

Table 1 presents the distribution of tribal's in the three categories i.e. small, medium and large according to their size of land holding. Out of total 60 selected tribal's 78.33% belongs to small holding groups, 16.66% tribal's belonged to medium holding group and only 5% tribal's belongs to large group of land holdings.

Table 1 revealed that average size of land holding in case of small group, middle group and large group was 0.65 hectares, 2.32 hectares and 4.23 hectares respectively.

### **Marketing system: Distribution of selected minor forest products to different agencies**

Agencies wise sale of MFPs in Dhanora tahsil of Gadchiroli district presented in table 2.

#### **Collectors (tribal's)**

It is seen from table 2 that, total collection of 60 tribals was 641 kg of charoli, from that collectors were sold 291 kg (45.39%) to four self-help groups, 209 kg (32.6%) of charoli to five wholesalers and 141 kg (21.99%) of Charoli to eight retailers at average rate of 110 rupees per kg.

From total collection of gum that is 998 kg, collectors sold 508 kg (50.9%) gum to four selected self-help group, 383 kg (38.37%) to five wholesalers and 108 kg of gum directly sold to the retailers at average rate of 233 rupees per kg.

#### **Self-help groups**

Four self-help groups were sold 291kg of charoli at average rate of 171.25 rupees per kg and 508 kg of gum at average rate of 256.45 rupees per kg.

#### **Wholesaler**

Five wholesalers were sold 209 kg of charoli and 383 kg of gum at average rate of 170.45 and 264.23 rupees per kg respectively.

#### **Retailer**

Eight retailers were sold 141 kg charoli at average rate of 186.28 rupees per kg and 108 kg gum at average rate of 280.76 rupees per kg.

#### **Channel wise distribution of MFPs**

During the study, it was observed that in channel I the minor forest products passes

through collector to SHG to retailer to consumer. In channel II the products passes through collector to wholesaler to retailer to consumer. Whereas, in channel III the

products passes through collector to retailer to consumer. And in channel IV, directly from collectors to consumer (Table 3).

**Table.1** Distribution of tribal’s according to land holding

Sr. No	Size of holding	Tribal’s selected	Average size of holding(ha)
1	Small	47 ( 78.33)	0.65
2	Medium	10 (16.66)	2.16
3	Large	3 (5.01)	4.23
4	Total	60 (100)	1.11

(Figure in parenthesis indicate the per cent to total)

**Table.2** Agency wise sale of MFPs

Sr No	Name of agencies	No. of agencies involved	Charoli		Gum	
			Quantity (kg)	Price/kg	Quantity (kg)	Price/kg
1	Collectors	60	641	110	998	233
			(100)		(100)	
2	Self-help group	4	291	171.25	508	256.45
			(45.39)		(50.90)	
3	Wholesaler	5	209	170.45	383	264.23
			(32.60)		(38.37)	
4	Retailer	8	141	186.28	108	280.76
			(21.99)		(10.82)	

(Figure in parenthesis indicate the per cent to total)

**Table.3** Marketing channel observed in study area

Sr. No	Channels			
	I	II	III	IV
1	Collector	Collector	Collector	Collector
2	SHG	Wholesaler	-	-
3	Retailer	Retailer	Retailer	-
4	Consumer	Consumer	Consumer	Consumer

**Table.4** Constraints faced by the tribals (collectors of MFPs) during marketing of MFPs

Sr. No.	Constraints	Frequency (N=60)	Percentage
1	Poor transportation facilities	18	30
2	Storage problem	9	15
3	Less quantity available	6	10
4	Lack of availability of timely market information	4	6.66
5	No primary processing unit	8	13.33
6	Improper pricing of raw produce	7	11.68
7	Time consuming	8	13.33
	<b>Total</b>	<b>60</b>	<b>100.00</b>

(Figure in parenthesis indicate the per cent to total)

### Constraints in marketing of minor forest produce

Constraints occurred in the process of marketing of MFPs are presented in table 4. The table indicates that transportation was the main constraints faced by 30 percent of the sampled MFPs collectors followed by storage problem, time required, no primary processing unit and improper pricing of raw produce are amongst other constraints at 15, 13.33, 13.33 and 11.68 per cent respectively.

The present investigation was concluded to the following points:

Average size of land holding in case of small group, middle group and large group was 0.65 hectares, 2.32 hectares and 4.23 hectares respectively. Total average land holding size 1.11 hectares. Out of total collection of Charoli, tribal's sold highest quantity to the self help group (45.39 per cent) followed by wholesaler (32.60 per cent) and lowest to the retailer (21.99 per cent). And from gum highest quantity sold to the wholesaler (50.90 per cent) followed by self help group (38.37 per cent) and lowest to the retailer (10.82 per cent).

Following four channels of distribution of MFPs were identified in study area.

- A. Channel I: Collector → S.H.G. → Retailer → Consumer
- B. Channel II: Collector → Wholesaler → Retailer → Consumer
- C. Channel III: Collector → Retailer → Consumer
- D. Channel IV: Collector → Consumer

The major constraint for marketing of MFPs was not availability of transportation facilities identified in study area, which was 30 per cent.

### References

Alibaba, M.D. and D.V. Subbarao, 2005. Marketing of minor forest produce in Adilabad District of Andhra Pradesh, *The Andhra Agricultural Journal*, 52 (1&2): 232-23

Bodade, V.M., P.R. Awaghad, Bodade, A.A. 2016. Marketing of minor forest product in Amravati District, *International Journal of applied and pure science and agriculture*, Scientific Journal Impact Factor 3.762

Devi, S. A. 2005. Socio-Economic conditions

- of tribes. Sonali publications, New Delhi.
- Namdeo, R. K and Pant, N. C. 1994. Role of minor forest products in tribal economy. *Journal of Tropical Forestry*, 10 (1): 36-44
- Olawoye, J. E. 1996. Sociological issue for sustainable forest management, Ghana *Journal Of Forestry*, Special Edition, Vol. 3: 18-33
- Rao D. Pulla, 2013.socio economic status of scheduled tribes, MERC Global international Journal of management, Vol. 01, issue: 01.
- Sharma, M.C. Masih and Sharma, C.B. 1997. Collection of NTFP and their share in tribal economy. *J. Tropical forestry*. 13(4): 220-225.
- Yadav M., Basera, K. 2013. Status of forest products production and trade, working paper series (2013/1).

**How to cite this article:**

Jayshri R. Kankate, R.G. Deshmukh and Rushikesh K. Patil. 2020. Marketing Systems of Minor Forest Products and Identification of Constraints faced by Tribals for Marketing of Minor Forest Product. *Int.J.Curr.Microbiol.App.Sci*. 9(12): 960-965.  
doi: <https://doi.org/10.20546/ijcmas.2020.912.116>