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TOURISM AND POVERTY ALLEVIATION IN FIJI.
EXAMINING THE IMPACT OF CORAL COAST TOURISM ON VILLAGE LIVELIHOODS - THE CASE OF THE VILLAGES OF NAMATAKULA AND VOTUALAILI

Milicent Kado

Tourism and poverty alleviation have been at the forefront of the international tourism agenda since the early 1990s. As antithetical as the terms appear, the World Tourism Organisation has expressed its determination that tourism, apart from its commercial objectives, can be an important catalyst for economic growth in developing nations, and in doing so, effectively bring people out of the poverty trap. In stating its commitment toward poverty alleviation, the tourism industry has implicated itself in the goal toward satisfying the United Nations primary Millennium Development objective: the eradication of abject poverty and hunger worldwide.

However the notion of tourism and poverty alleviation has taken time to be meaningfully absorbed into the agenda of tourism development and national strategic plans. This is in part due to the relative newness of the objective coupled with the fact that implementing development and philanthropic aims within an essentially commercial framework, itself driven by private sector operators and international competitiveness is not obvious. Nevertheless, the dawn of the new millennium has seen a growth in the tourism industry’s awareness of environmental issues, the need to
conserve cultural and indigenous knowledge and a degree of empathy toward host community development issues. These trends have not occurred in isolation but in line with general international development trends which have sought to be cognisant of man’s sociological and environmental concerns in the quest for sustainable solutions to global problems. As an introduction to this study, the theoretical constructs of development and tourism theory and the extent to which the two are linked are explored.

In terms of the Pacific region, trends in the last ten years have indicated that tourism earnings have increased substantially reflecting growing international travel due to decreasing travel costs, easier access to travel information and significant changes in all-round tourist preferences. In light of the significant role played by the tourism industry within the Fiji islands, particularly evident in the past decade during which the sector has been a significant generator of economic growth, this study examines the extent to which the effects of the industry are felt at Fiji’s grassroots level: the village community. The impact of rural based tourism developments on two Fijian villages are analysed from a livelihoods perspective. The fieldwork approach was largely people-centred and involved the perspectives of different stakeholders in Fiji. As seen in the conclusion, the results of the study serve to substantiate widely held assumptions that tourism in Fiji not only produces economic benefits at a macro level including total foreign exchange earnings, investment and employment but is also seen to substantially benefit the lives of local community residents. This relationship implies very strongly that in the face of repeated political instability in Fiji, the survival of the tourism industry is crucial in terms of sustaining the livelihoods of many rural communities and preventing them from slipping into poverty.
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CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

“The greatest of evils and the worst of crimes is poverty...our first duty – a duty to which every other consideration should be sacrificed – is not to be poor”

(George Bernard Shaw, 1856-1950)

1.1 INTRODUCTION

The eradication of poverty lies at the heart of the international development agenda agreed by the world community at the beginning of the new millennium. The aim was to target halving the proportion of people living on less than a dollar a day and suffering from hunger by the year 2015. As ambitious as this developmental goal may seem, it has nevertheless drawn the attention of governments, non-government organizations and private sector mechanisms alike to the significance of implementing measures which will assist in poverty alleviation objectives. An area which has been identified in recent years as contributing significantly to economic growth in poor countries is the tourism sector.

Without doubt, the principal objective of tourism initiatives or ventures worldwide is to operate as viable businesses, rather than satisfy socially correct goals such as the eradication, or alleviation of poverty. However, it is also true that tourism developments by virtue of their direct employment impact on the economy, in addition to associated upstream and downstream linkages, has a substantial impact on domestic economic growth – and more noticeably so in poorer countries where the sector is often the leading industry and major foreign exchange earner. From the poorest nations of the world, tourism is significant in almost 50% of the low-income countries and almost all of the lower-middle income countries (Department for International Development, 1999). At a country level, tourism has been identified as
a key sector for the sustainable development of most Pacific island countries and as a significant source of economic growth through employment (South Pacific Tourism Organisation, 2003). Table 1.1 highlights the contribution of tourism to GDP and employment in several Pacific island nations in 2003.

Table 1.1 Economic contribution by the Tourism Sector, 2003

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Tourism as % of GDP</th>
<th>Tourism as % of employment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cook Islands</td>
<td>47.0</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fiji</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French Polynesia</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kiribati</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Niue</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palau</td>
<td>49.0</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Papua New Guinea</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samoa</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solomon Islands</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tonga</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuvalu</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vanuatu</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td>12.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unweighted average</td>
<td>17.2</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: South Pacific Tourism Organisation and individual country estimates

On an international level (reflected by World Tourism Organization and Department for International Development interest) there has been a substantial amount of attention and research in relation to sustainable tourism and poverty alleviation issues in recent years, reflected in particular by different symposia held by the World Tourism Organization (WTO), and its various support groups. The advantages of promoting the development of this relationship from a tourism perspective hinges on several key factors:

- tourism is one of the few industries with which developing countries can maintain a comparative advantage in relation to developed countries;
- steady growth in consumer demand for “untouched” destinations;
- the potentially far-reaching linkages created within an economy by tourism;
- the labour intensive nature of many tourism ventures, low-entry employment barriers within the industry as well as non-material benefits such as the development of local culture and promotion of awareness and protection of the natural environment (Yunis, 2005).
The most direct action taken on an international level toward sustainable tourism and poverty alleviation was reflected by the launching in 2002 during the World Summit on Sustainable Development (WSSD) of the “Sustainable Tourism as an Effective tool for Eliminating Poverty” (ST-EP) concept. This links together the goal of the World Tourism Organisation for sustainable tourism development with the United Nations led objective of global poverty alleviation.

Although there is a significant body of interest at the international level in terms of the tourism-poverty alleviation scenario, the concept has taken longer to make its way into the Pacific regional policy framework on tourism. The South Pacific Tourism “Strategy for Growth” (2003) report that outlines the South and Central Pacific regional tourism strategy for 2003-2013 and The Pacific Plan (2005), substantially cover the need to develop tourism industry planning, marketing and environment awareness and protection within a Pacific regional context. There is also reference to poverty reduction being a prime strategic objective for sustainable development. However, no reference is made on specific key development initiatives or approaches linking the two. Clearly, in terms of principal areas of concern for regional development, tourism and poverty issues are not “natural partners” in terms of overall regional policy criteria. However it is also noted that many Pacific island nations are faced with uncertain economic and political environments and that the tourism industry is still attempting to stabilise its markets in order to strengthen its viability and sustainability within the economy.

With seemingly scant reference in the Pacific regional context in relation to the link between tourism and poverty alleviation, Fiji specific documentation on the same has proved equally sparse. However, efforts have been made in the draft report of
the Fiji Tourism Development Plan 2007-2016 (18 March 2007 version) to include poverty alleviation concepts within overviews on land and community benefit issues as well as thoughts on tourism and sustainable development (pgs 108-123). Despite the relative lack of literature referring to the tourism-poverty alleviation concept within Fiji, there is nevertheless no shortage of reference material in relation to poverty related studies concerning various issues that are of general concern to the nation (Bryant-Tokelau 1995, Fiji National MDG report 2004). Thus, the notion that addressing poverty within Fiji is critical in terms of its development agenda is widely acknowledged. The Asian Development Bank Poverty Discussion Paper (2003) takes the analysis of poverty within Fiji further by drawing on research data in urban and rural areas in an attempt to identify poverty alleviation strategies that may be implemented nationally. Poverty in Fiji is generally (but not exclusively) one of relative poverty or hardship and is more about the “poverty of opportunities” (ADB, 2003). This implies the lack of being able to participate fully in the socio-economic life of the Fiji community and a lack of adequate resources (including cash) to meet the basic needs of the household or customary obligations to the extended family, village community and/or the church.

The association of tourism as a tool for poverty alleviation is thus an increasingly relevant issue in many developing countries. The concept is central to the nature of this study. This chapter firstly identifies the problem statement of the research, followed by an outline of the study objectives and a discussion of the general hypothesis. The significance of the research will be covered as well as discussion of the thesis framework and concluding comments on principal points that outline the chapters to follow.
1.2 PROBLEM STATEMENT

In light of the significant role played by the tourism industry in Fiji, the current research looks at examining the impact of tourism on the livelihoods of two Fijian villages. As stated earlier, tourism development initiatives do not primarily have poverty alleviation at the heart of their development agenda. This is no less true in the case of Pacific island nations, where some of the most exotic resorts and hotels have emerged in the last ten years, in response to tourists seeking different holiday experiences coupled with a travel market facilitated and made more accessible by virtue of globalisation and internationalisation trends. Events in New York of September 11th 2001, in addition to the Bali bombings of 2002, have created an appeal for far-flung “safe destinations” as the rest of the world fumbles uncomfortably with international security provisions and checks. In the past decade these reasons have contributed to an increase in visitor arrivals in South Pacific destinations.

The inevitable questions however are, while this is “good for business and the economy” what are the real implications in terms of the overall livelihoods of the local community, particularly the more disadvantaged? Secondly, what are the impacts on the natural environment of the host country? While substantial studies have been carried out on the macro-economic and environmental implications of tourism investments (or activities) within the Pacific and more specifically in relation to Fiji (Rao A 1983, Racule A 1983, Prasad B C 1998), there has been scant micro-level research conducted to examine the impact of tourism on the livelihoods of Fiji’s local communities from a poverty alleviation perspective.
The research problem is to determine the extent of the impact of tourism in Fiji on local rural village residents directly and indirectly involved in the industry. Two rural villages along the Coral Coast area on Viti Levu island in Fiji, were the subject areas of the study.

1.3 OBJECTIVES

The main objective of the research is to examine the impact of tourism on overall local village livelihoods beyond simply measuring income and employment related data. A holistic approach is implemented in identifying, gathering and analysing information on community livelihoods. This assists in examining the link between tourism and poverty alleviation in the Fiji context.

The specific objectives sought to identify principal livelihood strategies and livelihood outcomes of local village communities and examine to what extent tourism plays a part in shaping these realities. As the fieldwork was people-centred and participatory in nature, the data derived is largely based on the views of the villagers. Also examined are the opinions of different stakeholders directly or indirectly involved with the village communities and/or tourism industry. This proves useful in gaining an all round perspective of the tourism and community development scenario in Fiji.

1.4 HYPOTHESIS

The study of tourism on rural community livelihoods from a poverty alleviation perspective is relatively new in Fiji therefore this research had several assumptions.
The assumptions were based on the following:

(i) Village communities experience levels of hardship rather than poverty due to reasonable access to land and sea resources;

(ii) The communities rely significantly on tourism developments in terms of employment;

(iii) The communities have relatively good access to utilities, basic infrastructure facilities and goods and services providers;

(iv) Traditional customs and obligations are still observed by rural village communities;

(v) Tourism has enabled communities to remain in their villages while affording them different levels of empowerment, through direct and indirect employment activities.

1.5 SIGNIFICANCE OF STUDY

This study is significant for three main reasons. Firstly it examines a topic that has hardly been researched in the same light. Secondly, the sustainable livelihoods research approach implemented in the study is participatory, people-centred in nature and is holistic in its coverage of different aspects of community livelihoods. Thirdly, the study has sought to quantify some commonly held beliefs about the impact of tourism on local village communities in Fiji, which to date have not been properly substantiated. The usefulness of being able to analyse the tourism - sustainable livelihoods/poverty alleviation equation within Fiji in such a manner, will contribute to establishing areas of strengths and weaknesses in the relationship. This might enable further discussion and analyses on the subject in terms of establishing more holistic strategies for tourism sector developments, which will enhance the net benefits for the poor in society without compromising the commercial viability and stance of tourism operations.
1.6 THESIS FRAMEWORK

Chapter Two establishes the theoretical framework of this study by examining issues relating to both poverty and tourism and analysing the two within the context of development theory. In doing so, links are identified in terms of understanding the institutional influences (economic, political, social and ideological) that have shaped the course of tourism development and approaches toward poverty. The chapter concludes with a discussion of the research approach adopted by this study to examine the various issues involved in the subject matter. Chapter Three is an account of the methodology (both quantitative and qualitative) utilised to carry out the research which includes a detailed description of interviews and sample types for the two case studies selected to illustrate the research problem.

Prior to discussing the results of the study in Chapters Five and Six, an overview of Fiji in relation to a basic socio-economic background to the country is discussed including profiles on the poverty and tourism situation, in Chapter Four. Also covered are references to traditional and cultural influences and political and environmental constraints. This chapter is considered useful in terms of contextualising the area of study and highlighting factors which have shaped the development of tourism and the nature of poverty in Fiji.

Chapter Five seeks to identify particular aspects about the livelihoods of the communities studied, which determine the types of livelihood strategies that many of the households employ. Information relating to household socio-demographic information as well as employment related issues are examined, in addition to household perceptions on many other aspects relating to village community life, such as the importance of tradition, culture, religion and basic well-being. Chapter
Six carries this analysis further by determining the livelihood outcomes that appear evident as a result of the particular strategies employed. Thus income and food security statuses of households are established as well as description of household perceptions relating to well-being, vulnerability and personal empowerment. The chapter concludes with remarks made by different stakeholders in Fiji in relation to the relationship between tourism and community livelihoods.

Chapter Seven outlines the initial objectives and hypotheses with respect to this study in addition to discussing the appropriateness and effectiveness of the research approach utilised in the research fieldwork. The chapter concludes with closing remarks on implications of the study, recommendations and suggestions for further areas of research.
CHAPTER TWO
THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

“The assumption is that while qualities we perceive with our five senses actually exist as parts of nature, the conceptual distinctions that tell us where one thing ends and the next one begins both in space and across time are social and mental constructs” – Ollman, (1986)

2.1 INTRODUCTION

2.1.1 General

This chapter seeks firstly to highlight the relevance of theoretical application to the current study. The main part of the chapter seeks to discuss principal concepts regarding development and tourism theories, the way in which tourism has evolved in relation to development paradigms and the different aspects of development and tourism issues that are relevant to the research. Reference is also made to poverty issues including reflections on definitions of poverty, poverty concepts and participatory approaches that are both used in poverty related research. The chapter concludes with mention of the methodological approach adopted in the study.

2.2 DEVELOPMENT PARADIGMS AND TOURISM THEORIES

2.2.1 The development of “development”

Sharpley and Telfer (2004) state that “Development theory and tourism have evolved along similar lines since the Second World War, yet there has been little work connecting the two fields of study”. To understand the links between principal development and tourism theories and the extent to which tourism itself can be considered as a ‘vehicle for development’, it is important to firstly define ‘development’, secondly understand the basic concepts behind the principal
development theories that have emerged since the mid-twentieth century and examine the link between tourism and development theories.

The notion of development is generally recognised as a concept that has grown out of West European and American experience, for the past three centuries. Probably the earliest type of link to ‘development’ thinking emerged during the period of Enlightenment and was reflected in the writings of 17th century European philosophers such as Hobbes and Locke, who bandied about the idea of the ‘self-preservation of mankind’. This concept was further stretched by thoughts of not only working toward bettering oneself, but improving conditions for the community and the nation as whole, encapsulated vividly by preoccupation with the Theory of Progress and subsequent hedonism that prevailed in much of Western Europe (Kothari, 1995). In summary, this philosophical leaning served as the catalyst for the emergence of the rolling ball effect of industrialisation, technological change and the dogma of Modernisation in the Western world.

The philosophical evolution of development theories has not evolved in isolation, but has been largely influenced by the course of global history, itself fashioned by social, economic and political changes. The past two centuries have been characterised by significant events, typically reflected by the occurrence of two World wars. The Second World War not only served as a turning-point for reviewing the economical re-structure of Western Europe and subsequent links with the rest of the world, but also served as an opportunity for nations to identify the most suitable approach or ‘development theory’ that would underpin political and socio-economic progress.
Discussing the array of development paradigms and philosophical approaches that emerged throughout the twentieth century would be too lengthy a process for purposes of this study. This chapter will seek only to mention the principal development paradigms that have emerged in recent history including Modernisation, Dependency, Economic neo-liberalism and Alternative development. From initially focusing on economic growth mechanisms in the 1950s to relative disillusionment in the late 1960s to early 1970s, the emphasis in the past twenty years has been on the implementation of a mixture of strong neo-liberal led policies sprinkled with conscious-fraught assertions that alternative development ideologies ought to be part of the overall development agenda. This latter concern has arisen in the face of fundamental problems such as increasing poverty, global warming and threats to international security.

2.2.2 Tourism theories

Luvanga & Shutundu (2003) prefer to use the definition of tourism adopted at the United Nations Conference on International Travel and Tourism of 1963 which defined tourists as “temporary visitors who spend more than 24 hours in destinations other than their normal place of residence”. Chachage (2003) prefers to comment on different concepts about tourism citing it as being “a commodity and therefore an expression of social relations which is differentiated in time and space”. Beeton (2006) states that tourism has been variously defined in terms of the traveller, the services rendered by the industry and the places the tourist goes through and prefers to use Williams & Shaw’s (cited in Sharpley and Telfer, 2004) approach to understanding tourism which is to not only consider tourism within the confines of analysis of tourists, destinations and market forces, but to also examine linkages of tourism within the community i.e. “simply put, tourism exists in
communities, not outside them” (Beeton, 2006). For purposes of the current research the following interpretation utilised by Jafari (1977) is identified as offering the most holistic definition of tourism: “The study of man away from his usual habitat, of the industry which responds to his needs and of the impacts that both he and the industry have on the host’s socio-cultural, economic and physical environments”.

Even though the earliest accounts of tourism appears to have its roots in records of pilgrimages to sacred sites (Beeton, 2006), identifiable tourism research began in earnest around the 1960s (Sharpley & Telfer, 2004) although early papers have been identified as early as the 1930s. The emergence of tourism discourse in the 1960s was a reaction to changes in world tourism trends whereby mass tourism grew after the end of the Second World War (Sharpley & Telfer, 2004). Prior to this wave of new travellers “en masse”, journeys around the world for pleasure and and/or adventure were characteristically undertaken by a certain category of people – generally those with means. The 1960s and 1970s were typically characterised by travels to the world’s sun-spots or “pleasure periphery” in search of the triple “S” factors, sun, sand and sex adventures (Chachage, 2003), while the 1980s and 1990s heralded a new era of the more discerning tourist who was suddenly sensitive to environmental realities, seeking instead areas that nurtured “environmental beauty and ecological diversity” (Chachage, 2003).

Changing trends in consumer demands had to be met by a growing goods and services market. Tourism literature has revolved largely around the study of the supplier and consumer side of the equation and factors that characterise, affect and are a result of this relationship. The current study however, with its emphasis on the
impact of tourism developments on the livelihoods of local village communities in Fiji will not dwell on the traditional tourism theories that have centred around destination and tourist-led phenomena giving rise to models such as Butler’s Tourist Area Life Cycle or Leiper’s Industrial Tourism System (Beeton 2006). Instead the following sections seek to discuss the extent to which tourism plays a significant role in the whole development scenario.

2.3 DEVELOPMENT AND TOURISM: COMMUNITY AND EMPLOYMENT ISSUES

2.3.1 General

Even though the fields of development and tourism have evolved along similar lines – not least because they have been subjected to similar political and socio-economic contextual realities worldwide – the two areas have rarely undergone a comparative analysis of their “theoretical constructs” (Sharpley and Telfer, 2004). This section looks firstly at how tourism can be analysed within the framework of development theory and discusses the model devised by Telfer (in Sharpley and Telfer, 2004). Also discussed are theoretical issues relating to tourism and community development as well as tourism employment issues. These two areas are considered in the light of their relevance to the current research case studies.

2.3.2 Development and tourism

Dann cited in Sharpley and Telfer (2004) adds that a better understanding of issues underlying tourism development is required as he feels tourism studies in general have had “low levels of theoretical awareness”. Telfer thus proposes an analysis of the four main development paradigms mentioned earlier in terms of the extent to which they have influenced tourism research (Table 2.1) and in doing so, essentially examines tourism as a vehicle of development.
This type of analysis is deemed by authors such as Butler and Jenkins (cited in Sharpley and Telfer, 2004) as useful for the process of constructing a suitable tourism policy whereby questions such as “what is the role of government – active or passive?”, “is ownership and control public or private?” and “appropriate for whom, for how long and under what conditions?” can be addressed. It is essential that if tourism is to fit appropriately into a local community that the appropriate “type, scale and levels of industrial organisation of tourist development is employed” (Sharpley and Telfer, 2004). In the same text Brohman (1995) summarises the usefulness of considering tourism within a development theory context by stating that the “appropriateness of tourism development should be measured according to the changing interests and conditions in the host community”.

In summary and as with development discourse, considering tourism within a development conceptual framework is seen to be vital not least because it provokes addressing issues that are influenced by political, socio-economic and environmental concerns. This holistic approach underlines the increasing realisation nowadays that development of any productive sector cannot be considered in isolation of other factors in society. With many natural resources of the planet under the current threat of exhaustion should appropriate planning not be implemented, the need for a sustainable development approach in areas that impact on man and his environment is vital – and tourism certainly seems to be no exception to the rule.
Table 2.1. Tourism and Development Theory: A framework for analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Components of Development</th>
<th>Modernisation</th>
<th>Dependency Structuralism</th>
<th>Economic Neoliberalism</th>
<th>Alternative Development</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(A) Scale and Control of Development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus</td>
<td>Economic</td>
<td>Economic</td>
<td>Economic</td>
<td>sustainability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>scale of development</td>
<td>Large</td>
<td>Large/small</td>
<td>Large</td>
<td>Small</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rate of development</td>
<td>Fast</td>
<td>Fast</td>
<td>Fast</td>
<td>Incremental</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic distribution</td>
<td>trickle down</td>
<td>Local owners</td>
<td>SALP</td>
<td>Local owners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>Top down</td>
<td>top down</td>
<td>Top down</td>
<td>bottom up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>local involvement</td>
<td>Limited</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Limited</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ownership</td>
<td>Foreign</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>Foreign</td>
<td>Local</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industry control</td>
<td>External</td>
<td>Internal</td>
<td>External</td>
<td>Internal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>role of government</td>
<td>high-low</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High-low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>management origin</td>
<td>Foreign</td>
<td>Domestic</td>
<td>Foreign</td>
<td>Domestic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>accommodation type</td>
<td>Enclave</td>
<td>Mix</td>
<td>Enclave</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spatial distribution</td>
<td>Concentrated</td>
<td>Varied</td>
<td>Concentrated</td>
<td>Disbursed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourist type</td>
<td>mass tourist</td>
<td>Mix</td>
<td>mass tourist</td>
<td>special interest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>marketing target</td>
<td>Package tours</td>
<td>Mix</td>
<td>Package tours</td>
<td>independent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>employment type</td>
<td>Formal</td>
<td>in/formal</td>
<td>Formal</td>
<td>in/formal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>infrastructure type</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High/low</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital inputs</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High/low</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>technology transfer</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Mix</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Mix</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(B) Environmental and Community Linkages

| resource use | High | High/low | High | Low |
| Environment protection | Low | Mix | Low | High |
| hinterland integration | Low | High | Low | High |
| Inter-sectoral linkage | Low | High | Low | High |
| cultural awareness | Exploitative | Protective | Exploitative | Protective |
| Institution development | Low | High | Low | High |
| local compatibility | Low | High | Low | High |
| adaptive capacity | Low | Low | Low | Low |

Source: Sharpley and Telfer (2004)

2.3.3 Community Development Issues and Tourism

As recent as the topic may appear, there is no shortage of literary material in relation to theoretical discourse on tourism and community development issues. In line with concerns noted in the previous section for a sustainable approach in regard to tourism development, considering overall tourism planning in relation to host community needs is increasingly seen as vital in terms of ensuring the long-term viability of the tourism industry.
The benefits channelled toward the different components of the tourism industry which includes the destination host community, imply that relationships can be mutually beneficial yet dependent in nature. A description of the different components and linkages within the tourism industry will not be entered into here; however the issue of dependency between the different stakeholders is worth mentioning in relation to larger theoretical implications within the context of community and tourism development.

Sustainable and community-based tourism approaches and initiatives centre on identifying ways in which tourism can lead to more involvement in the decision-making process by local communities which as a result increases their levels of empowerment. That is, empowerment financially, socially, psychologically and culturally (Table 2.2). This people-centred approach is particularly significant in the development of tourism community policies in developing nations, with relatively small economies such as micro-island states. It is also theoretically a direct challenge to the basis of the centre-periphery tenet of Dependency theory: that is dependency both in terms of external dependence of local host communities with regard to the involvement and control of foreign tourist investors, and secondly, internal dependency on the goodwill of central urban governance and private sector structures, who may decide not to prioritise development of peripheral rural communities – which more often than not are those involved directly with tourism developments.

However, as discussed by Timothy (cited in Sharpley and Telfer, 2004), theorising on the virtues of a participatory community approach to tourism development has to take into account certain constraints in terms of implementation; namely, contextual realities such as the socio-political environment, traditional influences, gender
attitudes and institutional weaknesses. A theoretical ‘cut and paste’ approach in terms of community policy implementation therefore is not deemed workable. While general development assumptions may apply, each community has its own particular needs and specificities. Haywood and Simmons (cited in Sharpley and Telfer, 2004), mention that a convenient way of identifying what best suits the needs of local communities in terms of the tourism industry is the conducting of participatory research through household surveys. This approach is implemented in the current research using the same line of reasoning.

Table 2.2. Types of community empowerment in tourism development

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Signs of empowerment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Economic</td>
<td>Tourism brings long-term financial benefits to a destination community. Money is spread throughout the community. There are notable improvements in local services and infrastructure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychological</td>
<td>Self-esteem is enhanced because of outside recognition of the uniqueness and value of their culture, natural resources, and traditional knowledge. Increasing confidence in the community leads members to seek out further education and training opportunities. Access to jobs and cash leads to an increase in status for usually low-status residents, such as women and youth.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social</td>
<td>Tourism maintains or enhances the local community’s equilibrium. Community cohesion is improved as individuals and families cooperate to build a successful industry. Some funds raised are used for community development initiatives like education and roads.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political</td>
<td>The community’s political structure provides a representational forum through which people can raise questions and concerns pertaining to tourism initiatives. Agencies initiating or implementing the tourism ventures seek out the opinions of community groups and individual community members, and provide chances for them to be represented on decision-making bodies.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Sharpley and Telfer (2006)

2.3.4 Employment Issues and Tourism in Developing States

In an article on tourism employment issues in Indonesia, Cuckier (cited in Sharpley and Telfer 2004) argues that existing literature on tourism employment research has largely centred on examples taken from developed countries which has produced fairly negative results in relation to reporting comparative income levels and levels of social stigma associated with tourism related work. Cuckier argues that this is
largely due to the fact that within developed economies of scale, viable employment alternative options exist for the employable populace, unlike small economies which tend to have less employment options. Differences in attitude toward the industry in terms of social status also exists between countries. Fairly recent empirical research (Pizam et al, 1994) has indicated that in much of Asia and the Pacific, the notion of providing “services to others” is considered culturally ‘natural and honourable’. Thus service-related employment opportunities such as those offered within the tourism industry are positively viewed by participants who retain a sense of self-esteem in the conduct of their work. Although tourism employment research in developing countries in recent years has not been conducted extensively throughout the globe, existing accounts in that regard have been carried out in a few locations such as South-East Asia (Sharpley and Telfer, 2004). Results of these studies indicate that contrary to tourism and employment based findings relevant to developed countries, in countries such as Bali, tourism maintains a comparatively high status, is generally well-paid in comparison to other traditional employment options and provides opportunities to otherwise marginalised groups in society such as women and migrant workers.

Apart from differing theoretical employment assumptions on social attitudes between developed and developing countries, recent tourism employment research has also identified the difficulty of measuring employment impacts due to the direct, indirect and induced linkages within the sector. Tourism literature widely acknowledges (Sharpley and Telfer, 2004) that tourism employment includes both formal and informal activities making it difficult to obtain reliable research data as national employment figures normally only include formal sector figures. This renders employment research particularly unreliable in developing countries in
which informal sector employment comprises a large proportion (in some cases up to 40-50%) of total employment activities. Another increasingly significant area of research in terms of tourism and employment implications is that of the role of women in tourism related work. This is particularly the case in traditionally patriarchal developing societies in which transformations on the social role of women who are employed in the tourism industry significantly changes the structure of families and women’s status in society. Levy and Lerch (cited in Sharpley and Telfer, 2004), state that women are not necessarily marginalised as a result and instead become empowered financially and often employ multi-task functions that include both formal and informal sector involvement in order to supplement overall family income levels.

These types of findings have important implications with regard to similar research in other developing countries. For the current research and Fiji-specific case, implications in relation to cultural attitudes, multi-employment and gender roles in relation to tourism employment is an issue further explored in the analysis of research results (Chapters Five and Six).

2.4 DEVELOPMENT AND POVERTY

2.4.1 General

Poverty and development discourse is reflected in many sources of literature. This section will seek to highlight a few contributions to the poverty debate thereby covering some of the factors that are relevant to analysis of the subject and its place in development. Further comments on the development and poverty situation in relation to the current research area are discussed in Chapter Four.
2.4.2 Reflections on poverty

In “Poverty, Human Consciousness and the Amnesia of Development” Kothari, (1995) discusses the emergence of the “consciousness” of poverty as a reaction to its increase in a global society which has evolved since the 18\textsuperscript{th} century into one that has been driven by a succession of goals generally geared toward ‘affluence’. Kothari (ibid) states that for many years the capitalist objective of economic growth has attempted to ensure that society grows out of poverty, rather than be seen as a cause for poverty and associated ills.

In defining the term “poverty” the Oxford dictionary (Wehmeier S, 2004) refers to “the state of being poor…a lack of something; poor quality”. Indeed, the term has evolved across time to include different states of deprivation of a person or a community. In some areas of the world the meaning is clearly abject, and in others the measurement of poverty is seen more in terms of lacking the ability to improve one’s wellbeing. Since the 1990s the United Nations Development Programme has strived to sensitize in a global manner, an awareness of the different levels of poverty or hardship that have beset many developing countries. The Human Development Index has sought to quantify an international ranking of countries worldwide in relation to development levels – in doing so different types and levels of deprivation are noted. These include access to food, safe drinking water, shelter, or social resources such as access to information, education, health care, social status, political power, or the opportunity to develop meaningful connections with other people in society.

Poverty may also be defined in relative terms. Thus wealth disparities are seen as an indicator of poverty and the condition of poverty is linked to issues relating to scarcity and distribution of resources and power.
For purposes of establishing a working definition for the current study the following broad conceptual definition of poverty will be implemented which was developed as a result of Asian Development Bank (ADB) led research in 2003 on poverty issues in Fiji.

Box 2.1 – ADB Definition of Poverty in Fiji

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Poverty = Hardship</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“An adequate Level of Sustainable Human Development”, manifested by</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- a lack of access to basic services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- a lack of opportunities to participate fully in the socio-economic life of the community; and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- a lack of adequate resources (including cash) to meet the basic needs of the household or customary obligations to the extended family, village community and/or the church”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Kothari (1995) considers two approaches to the definition of poverty: firstly considering it as a ‘social construct’ i.e. a description of the way society is structured and secondly, as a condition in which a certain number of individuals are found. Although the author refers specifically to India and its colonial heritage, parallel instances can be drawn in comparison to India’s case when considering the prevalence of poverty in other developing nations and subsequent consciousness thereof. An example is the reference to India’s governance structures and approaches throughout the years and how this has impacted on the country’s relative inability to address the core of the poverty issue – firstly, by neglecting to deal directly with them and addressing instead the effects of poverty e.g. crime and related ills, and secondly through the formulation of countless development plans which are hardly ever transformed into practical intervention schemes that are implemented directly and meaningfully among the most needy.
2.5 POVERTY RELATED APPROACHES

2.5.1 Poverty research

In seeking to quantify the extent of poverty levels and trends around the world, one is faced with the inevitable question: “What type of measure is being used?” “How is it being measured?” and “Are the methods reliable?”. Global statistics and levels of measuring and monitoring poverty are too numerous to mention for purposes of this study. However, suffice it to say that countries require a reliable and workable poverty monitoring system or poverty approaches to gauge their progress towards the targets for eradicating extreme income poverty and reducing levels of hunger globally. In the past two decades, poverty related approaches have been developed worldwide to assist different governments and non-government organizations identify mechanisms which will help the poor and needy. In terms of tourism and poverty alleviation, the following two approaches are have been commonly implemented by development organizations (DFID, OXFAM International) worldwide in terms of applying appropriate interventions in developing countries.

2.5.2 Pro-poor tourism approach

Support in recent years for the ‘tourism for poverty alleviation’ goal has not only drawn interest from the World Trade Organization and United Nations linked agencies, but also from various government development agencies such as the United Kingdom’s Department for International Development (DFID) which has developed and promoted through extensive research and literature, a pro-poor tourism approach that seeks to make tourism work for the poor in society. The pro-poor approach, while having specific themes or target approach areas, seems also to give way to a degree of generality or flexibility in order to enable its effective application to country specific situations. The emphasis of the approach is stated to
be the support of inclusive policies in regard to the poor in society – that is, encouraging the active participation of the poor in tourism activities.

Pro-poor tourism (PPT) is defined as being “tourism that generates net benefits for the poor” (ODI, IIED, 2001). It seeks to unlock opportunities for the poor in society for economic gain, enhanced livelihoods and greater engagement in decision-making. Pro-poor strategies tend to focus less on expanding the size of tourism and more on creating opportunities for particular groups of the poor. These strategies are integrated within the overall tourism development plan of the host country normally involving two key areas of focus: destination focusing which brings all key stakeholders together to provide a supportive policy framework, and national policy led programmes which govern aspects such as tenure laws, tourism training, infrastructure development and tourism incentives and regulations. Five priority areas are emphasised in terms of overall pro-poor objectives:

- Expansion of business and employment opportunities for the poor
- Addressing environmental effects of tourism
- Addressing social and cultural effects
- Building a supportive policy framework
- Developing pro-poor processes and institutions

2.5.3 Sustainable Livelihoods Framework

Since the 1980s the need to address a whole range of poverty alleviation issues has led to institutes such as the Institute of Development Studies, NGOs (CARE and OXFAM) and donors such as DFID developing and refining research approaches which enable a better understanding of issues linking people, the context in which they live and the livelihood choices they make in society. One such approach that
has emerged and which was used in the current study is the Sustainable Livelihoods Approach (SLA) which is essentially an attempt at a more holistic form of research and analysis that puts people at the forefront of analysis (Ashley and Carney 1999). The concept of “sustainable livelihood” is widely acknowledged as being coined by Robert Chambers of the Institute of Development Studies (IDS) in the United Kingdom who together with Gordon Conway co-authored a 1992 discussion paper mentioning a working definition of the term. Since then the definition has been incorporated in the development of related concepts and frameworks:

A livelihood comprises the capabilities, assets (stores, resources, claims and access), and activities required for a means of living; a livelihood is one which can cope with and recover from stress and shocks, maintain or enhance its capabilities and assets, and provide sustainable livelihood opportunities for the next generation; and which contributes net benefits to other livelihoods at the local and global levels and in the short and long-term (Chambers and Conway, 1992:7 cited in Solesbury 2003).

The Sustainable Livelihoods Approach framework which adopted and extended the above definition (Figure 2.1) emerged as the result of an evolutionary development of research, policy and practice in line with shifts in global development discourse from 1987 to 1997. Principal events have characterised this evolution in the decade mentioned, from the World Commission on Environment and Development’s “Brundtland Commission report” published in 1987 to the publishing of the White Paper on International Development “Eliminating World Poverty: A Challenge for the 21st Century” in 1997. The global shift toward focusing on human well-being and sustainability rather than economic growth lent theoretical impetus to the validity of the Sustainable Livelihoods Approach as a concept. As summarised by Solesbury (2003),

“The Sustainable Livelihoods Approach case is a remarkable story of research influencing policy...it derived from both theory and practice and importantly from the iteration of both the two made possible by the intimate networks connecting researchers and practitioners in the field”.

(25)
Since that time the approach has been reviewed and adapted to specific global situations. Indeed one of the tenets of the SLA framework is to acknowledge that there is always room for refinement of the approach to guard against determinism.

The Sustainable Livelihoods Approach is characterised by the asset pentagon which was developed to enable information about people’s assets to be presented visually and inform on their inter-relationships. The five points of the pentagon refer to human, social, physical, natural and financial capital whose basic definitions are presented below in Box 2.2.

Therefore how people live, the issues that shape their existence (social, economic and political environment) and the livelihood choices they make become important. The SLA approach attempts to establish a way of addressing poverty alleviation issues by understanding what people want, their scope of achieving it and to what extent they are able to do so within the society they live in. The ability to apply the SLA framework within different development scenarios has made the approach a popular tool of analysis in social science research, particularly in relation to identifying the adaptation of possible policy approaches once the nature of the problem has become more evident.

Box 2.2 Sustainable Livelihoods Asset Pentagon and definitions of Capital

1. Human Capital represents the skills, knowledge, ability to labour and good health that together enable people to pursue different livelihood strategies and achieve their livelihood objectives.

2. Social Capital represents the social resources upon which people draw in pursuit of their livelihood objectives.

3. Natural Capital is the term used for the natural resources from which resource flow and services useful for livelihoods are derived.

4. Physical Capital comprises the basic infrastructure and producer goods needed to support livelihoods.

5. Financial Capital denotes the financial resources that people use to achieve their livelihood objectives.

Source: Department for International Development (1999)
2.6 THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK OF RESEARCH

2.6.1 Why investigate livelihoods?

The current research assumes that to try to understand the ways in which tourism impacts on the lives of local Fijian village communities, it is necessary to obtain an all round view of the circumstances of the people involved. This entails not only undertaking research on the contextual realities of components in society that directly impact on the lives of the communities, but also obtaining the personal viewpoints of the inhabitants of the communities. Thus, information on household income and expenditure and access to different assets is deemed as significant as identifying perceptions on social, traditional and gender-based constraints within the context of community life. However, it is sometimes found that the capability of people to employ certain livelihood strategies may not necessarily coincide with individual perceptions of empowerment or personal life choices. Therein lies a principal strength of participatory research in terms of livelihood analysis in that
theoretical presumptions based on identified assets, livelihood assets, institutional realities and known vulnerabilities to internal and external shocks may become significantly reviewed in the light of people-centred surveys and lived-experience accounts.

2.6.2 Principles of livelihood analysis

The Department for International Development (Sustainable Livelihoods Guidance Sheets, 1999) established that the effective use of the Sustainable Livelihoods Approach is dependent on core concepts or principles that underlie the approach as a whole. This includes the following:

- efforts made to identifying and understanding the livelihood circumstances of marginalised groups
- The need for disaggregation into different target groups – not taking households as the sole unit of analysis
- The need to identify people’s strengths and resourcefulness
- The need to think about change over time within the context of sustainability
- The realisation that there is not set recipe to investigating livelihoods effectively. Different “maps may be used for different purposes”

2.6.3 Tools and perspectives of analysis

The tools and perspectives of analysis utilised in the current study were used to obtain as wide a range of information as possible. They included participatory assessment techniques among community households to obtain social and demographic data as well as data on vulnerability assessments and social analysis (kinship, gender, and customary tenure issues and stakeholder analysis). Both secondary data and participatory methods of analysis comprising individual and
household case studies within the village communities were implemented. The current research also acknowledges that social, economic, environmental and governance perspectives all contribute to an understanding of livelihoods and poverty, or in the context of Fiji, levels of hardship. The DFID draws attention to the fact that the different perspectives may well be complementary or overlapping in nature and that participatory approaches toward the gathering of information would be a useful method to understanding the relationship between the perspectives more clearly.

2.6.4 Implementing the SLA approach within the case study framework
The Sustainable Livelihoods framework presented a checklist of important issues that had to be considered and implemented into the current research design. Research on vulnerability aspects and institutional structures were largely carried out through secondary research. This is represented to some extent by Chapter Four which presents the contextual framework within which the primary research components (livelihood assets, livelihood strategies and livelihood outcomes are identified). The Sustainable Livelihoods Approach was deemed as the most appropriate research method for the current study because it seemed apparent after having conducted a substantial part of the literature review, that a holistic framework was required to best identify the different components that characterise village community life in Fiji within the context of tourism influences.

2.7 CONCLUSION
In an attempt to describe the links between tourism and poverty alleviation and the relevance of these two key areas in both development discourse and more particularly within the framework of this study, this chapter firstly analyses tourism
and poverty issues within the context of development. Secondly, the Sustainable Livelihoods Framework is identified as the most useful research method in relation to the current study due to the nature of its approach, its suitability and its flexibility in terms of application to the research case studies. Understanding the workings of poverty alleviation within the global development agenda is perhaps more obvious than trying to identify how tourism can assist with poverty alleviation. This is principally because tourism is assumed to be a money-making exercise rather than one concerned with human development. However, with the growing significance of tourism as a global industry and one that is habitually significant in developing countries, research into the different impacts of tourism on developing societies and how the impact can be fashioned in a positive manner in terms of overall development, has become increasingly important.

The challenge for the current research was to obtain evidence which would assist in identifying to what extent tourism can be considered as a vector for sustainable development for village communities in Fiji, thus implying the usefulness of tourism as a poverty alleviation tool within the Pacific island nation. Chapter Three will discuss the methodology and case studies used in this research, and the processes undergone to gather and analyse data collected during fieldwork carried out in Fiji during February 2007.
CHAPTER THREE

METHODOLOGY AND CASE STUDIES

‘La vraie science et la vrai étude de l’homme, c’est l’homme’
‘The true science and study of man is man’ – Pierre Charron
(1541-1603)

3.1 INTRODUCTION

3.1.1 General

This chapter outlines the research methodology and data collection methods utilised throughout the study. The description identifies three essential methodological components. The principal components were the two case studies carried out in the Nadroga province of Fiji. The other components comprised the series of informal in-depth interviews held in Suva, Nadroga and Nadi and substantial archival research which served to frame the context of the groundwork and deepen an understanding of the issues being investigated.

A brief justification in relation to the selection of the general study area is followed by a description of the methodology used and the types of primary research tools implemented by the researcher. The chapter concludes with mention of certain constraints experienced during the primary research process and general comments on fieldwork experiences.

3.2 AREA OF STUDY

3.2.1 Fiji Islands

Selecting the Fiji Islands (Figure 3.1) as a study area for the current research is due to reasons which are both theoretical and practical in nature. Fiji satisfies two pre-requisites for the study of tourism and poverty alleviation issues: firstly, since
tourism’s early and humble beginnings in Fiji in the 1960s, it has steadily developed to become the most significant sector of development in the country, particularly in the past 15 years in terms of direct and indirect effects on the local economy. Secondly, although generally not abject in nature, poverty in Fiji exists in varying degrees, and as with many developing countries, there are continued efforts in the country to find ways in which existing economic growth mechanisms can act as catalysts to alleviate different levels of human misery.

Figure 3.1 Map of the Fiji Islands

Source: Pacific Travel Guides (2007)

The macro-economic effects of tourism aside, there is little evidence of micro-level research having been conducted in the Fiji islands with regard to the industry’s effects on local village communities. Thus, practically speaking, Fiji provides an
available array of research possibilities in relation to examining the relationship between tourism developments and village livelihoods given the presence of many tourism resorts on the two main islands of the archipelago, and the physical existence of many Fijian villages located in close proximity to the resorts. The comparatively small size of the island nation further eased the ability of containing the area of research considering the time frame allocated for this particular study, while at the same time enabling the extraction of sufficient data for purposes of analysis.

3.2.2 Coral Coast, Nadroga/Navosa Province

As tourism in Fiji is currently concentrated in the western area of Viti Levu, the choice was made to undertake fieldwork research in a popular tourist destination within this area. The Coral Coast (Figure 3.2) as it is popularly known was thus selected as the focal study area within Fiji. Located largely within the Fijian province of Nadroga/Navosa which itself occupies 2,385 square kilometres of the south-west and central areas of Viti Levu, the Coral Coast is fringed by the towns of Sigatoka, Korotogo and Korolevu and covers the west to middle of the southern coastline of Viti Levu island stretching from Natadola Bay to the west until Namatakula Village in the east (Rowlands G, Comley J and Raines P, 2005). The province of Nadroga/Navosa includes six districts altogether and is governed by a Provincial Council. The area harbours small villages and settlements with an average population of between 100 to 300 people with the most densely populated zone being the town of Sigatoka which has around 8000 people (Rowlands et al (ibid) ).
In terms of development, access to the Coral Coast was only possible up until the early part of the twentieth century by boat until a gravel road was built during World War Two by the United States Army which had training camps near Sigatoka town. This is thought to be the first type of regular contact with foreigners experienced by people in the area. The second change was the development of the tourism industry in the area which began with the setting up of the Korolevu Beach Hotel in 1959 and the Reef and Fijian Hotel thereafter. The Naviti and Hyatt Regency (now the Warwick Fiji Resort & Spa) were established in the early 1970s. Tourism resorts have continued to open and flourish in the area throughout the 1980s and 1990s to date, resulting in the Coral Coast being a very popular tourism stretch which achieved the status of being the second most popular tourist stretch.
destination in Fiji in 2005 (Ministry of Tourism and GRM International Pty Ltd, 2007). The growth in tourism in the area has also facilitated related developments such as a new sports stadium and modern bridge across the Sigatoka River in recent years and the establishment of tourist attractions such as the Sigatoka sand dune area (declared Fiji's first National Park), the Tavuni Hill Fort located a few miles inland from Sigatoka, the Kula Bird Park located in a valley inland from the Outrigger Reef Resort and the Kalevu Cultural Facility built near the Shangri-La Fijian Resort.

3.3 METHODOLOGY

3.3.1 General

As mentioned in Chapter 1, the current study hinges on the premise that tourism has generally boosted the economy of Fiji in the past two decades. This has been evidenced in the production of statistical reports and research documents tabled principally by national public sector mechanisms in addition to independent studies mostly of an academic nature. Apart from purely financial and macro-economically sound evidence, other available statistics on the impact of tourism in Fiji have generally focused on its environmental and ecological impacts affecting the island nation and its natural environment.

The methodological reasoning for the current paper was thus developed within the framework of these pre-researched findings. The methodological strategy utilised in this study has therefore been one of deductive reasoning whereby the larger assumptions about the impact of tourism within the whole development scenario in Fiji is tested against evidence collected through micro-level research within structural and time-limiting parameters. The primary objective of the research has
thus been to investigate whether, and how tourism impacts directly on local people’s lives from their perspectives, that is, examining the trickle-down theory at the grass-roots level of society within Fiji.

3.3.2 Research Methodology Design

The theoretical research framework as discussed in Chapter 2 is based firstly on substantial secondary research principally on tourism and poverty related issues, and also on the relationship between tourism within the development studies context. Secondly, the primary research is designed around the Sustainable Livelihoods Approach (SLA) which, for purposes of this study, has been deemed the most appropriate means of obtaining the type of data to best construct an overall “livelihoods” picture of the two village communities that are studied.

Due to the nature of the holistic context of the SLA framework which is largely people centred, the primary research design incorporated a mixture of quantitative and qualitative methods which focused on the implementation of a multi-method technique, namely the carrying out of two case studies and informal interviews of stakeholders.

3.4 QUANTITATIVE RESEARCH

In terms of sample quantity and time-span involved, the larger part of the primary research comprised the collection of quantitative data. This was obtained from two different sources: firstly through the interviewing of 58 households from two different villages over a 2 week period. The data from the village surveys was collected via the administration of questionnaires which were structured in nature and devised to elicit mainly quantitative responses. The questions were specifically
designed to include variables which characterise the Livelihood Assets Pentagon considered within the Sustainable Livelihoods Framework and whose responses were expected to assist in the understanding of household Livelihood Strategies.

Secondly, shorter-length structured questionnaires were fielded out to three key stakeholders from whom basic socio-demographic details were extracted. The Information Technology Statistical Package for Social Science (SPSS) was later utilised to analyse the case-study questionnaires.

3.5 QUESTIONNAIRES

The questionnaires utilised in the village surveys comprised a total of over a hundred closed and open-ended questions covering the following data sets: socio-demographic, income and expenditure, religious, traditional, food, health, education, transport, information, financial, natural resources and lived experience information (see Appendix 1). All questions were administered in the Nadroga dialect by the interpreter in the presence of the researcher. This, as discussed earlier, presents a great reliance of the researcher on the interpreter during conduct of the interviews. All household interviews conducted in the villages were tape recorded with the consent of the participants. This provided a resource of data back-up material which would be required to re-qualify responses in the event of improperly recorded responses in the questionnaires. For purposes of this study and to protect the identity of the respondents, all interviewees remained anonymous.

The questionnaire survey undertaken at Namatakula village represents a convenience sample due to the nature of the traditional structure of the village which required that the village head pre-select households to be interviewed. While
this highlights a potential limitation to the sampling exercise, it is also convenient to be received willingly by households who are prepared to be interviewed at pre-allocated time slots. For Votualailai village, with whom the interpreter maintains strong kinship links access to households was comparatively easier and household samples were selected randomly.

The questionnaires intended for key stakeholders (Appendix 2) of the research were administered by the interviewees themselves. The questions which elicited quantitative responses were purely for basic socio-demographic indications in order to qualify the context of the qualitative questions contained in the larger part of the questionnaire.

3.6 QUALITATIVE RESEARCH

Although this research method did not comprise the bulk of the primary research activity, the different qualitative approaches utilised proved to be equally challenging in their planning, execution, and more particularly in terms of analysis of results. Qualitative data was obtained principally through focus group discussions and in-depth interviews conducted as part of the two case studies and also included interviews conducted with stakeholders in both Suva and Nadi.

With the focus of the research being people-centred in approach, qualitative data collected from the focus discussions and in-depth interviews did not only represent the personal views of those interviewed, but also served to place other issues in their historical, social and human contexts within the framework of factual realities that were retrieved through quantitative approaches. Although the bulk of the questionnaires discussed in the previous section are mainly designed to extract
quantitative data, there are also open-ended questions to capture the perspectives of interviewees on issues relating to life in village communities, the impact of tourism on lifestyles, general perceptions on poverty and well-being, and thoughts on how community livelihoods could be enhanced. All qualitative data are analysed in relation to qualifying quantitative responses captured by the questionnaires as well being analysed for emergent themes.

3.7 IN-DEPTH INTERVIEWS

In-depth interviews, lasting an average of an hour were carried out from among the range of households utilised in this study, goods and services stakeholders in the Nadroga area and tourism stakeholders. The identity of all interviewees remained anonymous for purposes of confidentiality. Most interviewees (12) consented to being tape recorded during interviews. Some respondents (3) wished not to be recorded and where this was the case, observation notes were taken.

Four in-depth interviews in total were carried out in Namatakula and Votualailai villages. The respondents were pre-selected as willing participants from households that were interviewed during the questionnaire survey. The principal criterion for the selection of suitable candidates for the village in-depth interviews was to choose persons who clearly manifested an obvious interest in the research and were generally more talkative and expressive than the average survey respondent. It was considered easier to engage this type of individual in an informal interview to be able to extract useful viewpoints. The in-depth village interviews were conducted by the interpreter in the presence of the researcher. These interviews were later translated and transcribed into the English language.
Six informal in-depth interviews were held with stakeholders in the Nadroga/Navosa province. Three of these were with individuals directly employed at tourism resorts, who hold hotel management positions and who were willing to be interviewed. Only one of these respondents agreed to be tape-recorded. The remaining three interviews were held with service providers in the area from the health, education and private sectors. The latter are indirectly linked to the tourism sector via the consumption of their services mainly by village communities along the Coral Coast area who are in turn reliant on the tourism industry as their main income source. The service providers were selected based on responses gathered from the household questionnaires and represented services that were utilised by a large number of households interviewed. The interviews were conducted by the researcher in the English language.

Three in-depth interviews were conducted in Suva and one interview conducted in Nadi. The Suva interviews comprised a public sector stakeholder employed in the field of Poverty Monitoring, a public sector stakeholder from the Ministry of Tourism and the third interviewee is a private sector tourism stakeholder. The interview in Nadi was held with the Marketing public sector arm of tourism within Fiji. All four urban centre interviews were conducted by the researcher in the English language, tape-recorded and duly transcribed.

3.8 FOCUS GROUP DISCUSSIONS

Focus group discussions were conducted in both Namatakula and Votualailai villages. Three minority groups were targeted for the discussions at the two villages:

- Women’s Focus Group
- Youth Focus Group
- Elderly Focus Group
A group of 13 women were interviewed at Namatakula village at the village hall. Their ages ranged from those in their early twenties to the eldest lady present aged 67 years. The ladies were either married, widowed or single. Thus the discussion covered a broad socio-demographic cross-section of women from the village. Four women in total were interviewed at Votualailai village. Three of them were in the 20-30 year age group and the fourth respondent reported being in her early 40s. Two ladies were married and two were single. Youth participants were deemed to be those between the ages of 15 years to 20 years of age. The elderly were those aged 60 years and over.

These social groupings were identified in order to assess perceptions of well-being and vulnerability within the context of village life from the viewpoint of socially marginalized groups. The responses from the focus group discussions are instrumental in providing data on coping strategies within households as well as perceptions of social and economic empowerment which are used to qualify the livelihood outcomes of the current study.

The group discussions ranged from audience groups of four to thirteen individuals. At the commencement of each village survey, permission was sought from the respective village heads to be allowed to interview groups of youth, women and elderly within the village community. In Namatakula, focus group discussions with groups of women, elderly and youth were conducted. In addition an impromptu focus discussion was held with a group of four female tourists who were participating in a kava drinking ceremony at the village hall. When approached they consented to being interviewed with open-ended questions mainly centred on their choice of Fiji as a holiday destination. In Votualailai, only a group of women and a
A group of elderly villagers were interviewed. It proved difficult to organise a discussion with the youth within the time frame of the research (see Limitations of Research).

The focus discussions were conducted by the interpreter in the Nadroga dialect for ease of communication with the village participants. The discussions were guided by open-ended questions relating to the role of the target group within the village, views on their well-being, the impact of tourism on their activities and village life, and factors that were important to them in the context of livelihoods in village communities. Most focus discussions lasted at least an hour. All discussions were tape recorded and held in private homes. The data from the focus discussions have been translated and transcribed into the English language for purposes of analysis.

3.9 OBSERVATIONS

Throughout the village surveys, observations were constantly noted in daily journals in relation to physical aspects of the research area, social and human relationships and apparent constraints in relation to the conduct of the research within the framework of the village community set up.

With regard to the household interviews, observations were taken in relation to the geographical placement of each house within the village plan (see 5.3.2) in addition to noting physical characteristics of the internal living quarters of the households in terms of assets and their visible condition. These observations assisted in lending further depth to information gathered from the questionnaires, focus group discussions and in-depth interviews.
3.10 ARCHIVAL RESEARCH

Statistical information for the current study was sought from national public sector sources such as the Bureau of Statistics, the Ministry of Tourism and the Ministry of Finance. Annual budget reports issued in the past 6 years by PricewaterhouseCoopers in Fiji were also utilised.

An extensive literature review covered information on topics dealing with issues of poverty, tourism and their respective links to development. Both international and Pacific island contexts were examined. Substantial documentation was also sourced through specific official websites on the Sustainable Livelihoods Approach and how the concept has evolved and been incorporated in recent research and pro-poor interventions worldwide with particular reference to developing countries. Data on socio-historical and geographical features of the Fiji islands were mainly sourced from the University of the South Pacific General Library Collection, internet searches and consultation of recent reference publications (Walsh, 2006).

3.11 CASE STUDY ONE: NAMATAKULA VILLAGE

Consisting originally of two villages that have joined together (Namatakula and Vucilevu villages) Namatakula village falls within the Tikina or district of Komave and according to a survey conducted in 2002 (Hale L and Robadue Jnr DD, 2002) had a population of 300 people. The village was selected as a case study site as it satisfied certain criteria necessary for the current research. Firstly, in terms of size the village consists of a total of 88 households which is considered to be comparatively large for a Fijian village. Thus it was possible to approach the community and request the possibility of interviewing a reasonable sample size. Secondly, the village is physically easy to access due to its location along the
Queens road, which is the main highway thoroughfare connecting the east and western parts of Fiji. From earlier visits to hotel resorts located near the village, such as the Warwick Fiji Resort and Spa and the Beachouse Resort, it was also apparent that many employees at these tourism developments were from Namatakula, thus implying a strong reliance on tourism for a significant proportion of village community households.

Prima facie the village appears fairly traditional in structure with symmetrically aligned houses typical of contemporary Fijian villages, and a large village green running through the middle of the village set up (Photograph 3A). The presence of Primary and Secondary feeder schools along the Queens road, as well as reasonably adequate infrastructure and services (health centre, shops) in the area suggest that village communities technically have reasonable access to these facilities.

Photograph 3A – Namatakula Village. Houses lining the rara (central village green)

Questionnaires were administered with 30 households in Namatakula via interviews conducted by the researcher with the assistance of the interpreter. All interviews
were tape recorded and conducted in the Nadroga dialect with the responses simultaneously translated into the English language for the benefit of the researcher.

3.12 CASE STUDY TWO: VOTUALAILAI VILLAGE

Votualailai village (Photograph 3B), or Vatu-o-lalai as it is properly named belongs to the Tikina Korolevu i Wai and was reported to have a population of 154 people in 2002 (Hale L and Robadue Jnr DD). The village was chosen as the second case study site as it presented similar criteria to Namatakula village in terms of location and reliance on tourism as a major employer. The only apparent difference is that the village borders a hotel resort, The Naviti, which is the principal employer of the village community. This presented implications in that the impact of tourism was possibly greater for Votualailai than for Namatakula, due to its physical proximity to a tourism development. In terms of size the village is much smaller than Namatakula with only 34 households.

Photograph 3B – Votualailai Village. Approach to the village from the Queens Highway.

Research access to the village was comparatively easier than experienced at Namatakula as the interpreter has strong kinship links to the traditional village head.
and was familiar with most of the household heads. While this eased the research procedure, it also presented a potential limitation to the study as it lent a potential bias to the outcome of the study (see 3.14).

Votualailai appears very modern as most of the households appear to be very urban looking concrete dwellings. Questionnaires were administered among 28 households which were interviewed by the researcher with the assistance of the interpreter. All interviews were recorded and were conducted in the Nadroga dialect with the responses simultaneously translated into the English language for the researcher’s benefit.

3.13 STUDY PERIOD

There was no preferred month to conduct the current research, other than the fact that the political crisis that occurred in Fiji in November and December 2006, together with the holiday period during December and early January 2007, implied that the earliest convenient phase for any type of socio-academic intervention was in February 2007.

The political events toward the end of 2006 brought an interesting dimension to the research equation in terms of impact on tourism. The immediate flow on effects on the tourism industry and the consequences on village community livelihoods have emphasised the significant role played by Fiji’s political climate within the local economy.

Most of the primary research was planned to take place from 11 to 25 February 2007 during which household surveys at Namatakula and Votualailai villages, in
addition to several in-depth stakeholder interviews in the Nadroga province were to be conducted. Other in-depth interviews at Fiji’s urban centres, Suva and Nadi, were conducted toward the end of March and in April 2007 in line with the availability of targeted stakeholders.

The fieldwork carried out during the study period does not intend to be part of a time-series or seasonality assessment in relation to the impact of tourism. The case studies purely represent a “snapshot” in time of villager’s perceptions. However, this does not preclude any consideration that similar studies could be conducted over an identified time-span to enable a proper impact assessment to be conducted and results compared.

3.14 LIMITATIONS OF STUDY

Although the study was deemed as generally successful by the research group in terms of satisfying most of the aims within the allocated research time frame, it was nevertheless beset by several constraints.

a) Ambitious planning schedule

It was apparent after the first few days of interviewing in the first village, Namatakula, that the original schedule of interviewing seven households a day for five days in the week as well as conducting three focus group discussions and a series of in-depth interviews was a very ambitious exercise reflected by the group’s fatigue and air of despondency in the initial stages of the study. In retrospect, it would have been more desirable to carry out fewer, but lengthier interviews per day over a longer study period. This
would have allowed a more manageable research programme and allowed
the research team more time to obtain information.

b) **Lack of knowledge of the Fijian language and Nadroga dialect**

The researcher is not fluently conversant in the principal dialect of Fiji
(Bauan) and is neither able to communicate in the Nadroga dialect. These
facts necessitated the assistance of an interpreter for the village community
interviews who was fluent in both dialects. Thus the household interviews
were all conducted in the Fijian language and responses were
simultaneously translated by the interpreter for the benefit of the researcher.
Focus group discussions however, were not translated simultaneously due to
the need to keep the conversation flowing within the context of a group
session.

c) **Reliance on interpreter research interpretations**

Due to the enormous reliance on the interpreter to carry out the household
interviews, focus group discussions and in-depth interviews, this implied a
reliance on the same interpreter to properly understand the aims and
objectives of the study and be able to conduct the research appropriately and
in the desired manner.

d) **Interpreter kinship ties**

The interpreter has kinship ties both in Namatakula as well as in Votualailai.
While this proved beneficial in terms of general access to the villages, it was
also a potential constraint in terms of influencing the bias of interviewee
responses. This relationship also became awkward in Votualailai village
where misunderstandings encountered between the interpreter and the Turaga ni Yavusa’s household whose kinship ties are very close, posed a potential threat to the continuity of the research. The study however was able to progress despite the interpersonal constraints.

e) Study sample

Due to the nature of the traditional and hierarchical structure of Fijian villages, it was necessary to advise the respective Turaga ni Koro or village heads of Namatakula and Votualailai villages of the research group’s aims in relation to the research surveys and in doing so seek appropriate approval. In Namatakula village leadership is held by two village heads. Permission was sought from one of the village heads who it is evident retains strong leaderships status in the village and who therefore actively selected specific households in the village to be interviewed. The sample type was thus pre-selected and represented one of convenience to both parties - to both the researcher and the host village.

In Votualailai village which was in the throes of leadership problems, with the dismissal of the existing village head the day the research commenced, there was no intervention by the existing Turaga ni Yavusa or Tribal head to influence the research group’s progress in interviewing village households. To assist the group however, a provisional list of village household heads was issued by the Turaga ni Yavusa’s household for reference purposes. Since the total number of households was below the intended sample size, the research group decided to cover as many households as possible within the allocated time frame of 5 days. The selection of households interviewed
every day was randomly chosen from those whose inhabitants happened to be available on the day. This proved to be a constraint as many household members were in paid employment during the day, often on shift work at the nearby hotel resort. This implied that the research group was obliged to re-schedule interviews and carry out much of the research after 5pm. In doing so fewer households were interviewed per day than originally intended.

3.15 CONCLUSION

This chapter essentially covers the research methodology adopted in relation to the primary research carried out for the study. A description of the different components comprising the research attempts to illustrate that the research design implemented a mixture of both quantitative and qualitative methods. While the research unfolded in unexpected ways during its different stages, this in itself was foreseen, thus the limitations mentioned are purely technical observations about the nature of the study and did not appear to hinder the essence of the research process itself.

Prior to covering the results of the above fieldwork in Chapters 5 and 6, the following chapter outlines a contextual framework of the principal factors that characterise Fiji in relation to the current study. These issues are discussed to enable a better understanding of the research results, their country specific significance and implications in terms of theoretical implications within the tourism and poverty alleviation scenario within the Pacific island nation.
CHAPTER FOUR

THE FIJI ISLANDS: A Contextual Framework

‘Remember the country and the age we live in... ’ - Jane Austen (1541-1603)

4.1 INTRODUCTION

4.1.1 General

The following sections seek to highlight the contextual framework within which the current research is being studied. A brief overview of Fiji’s geographical and socio-economic development status is followed by reflections on concepts and incidences of poverty as well as a general overview of tourism development within the island nation. The chapter also focuses on issues which have contributed to the whole development scenario within the Fijian cultural, political and geophysical landscape.

4.2 FIJI: AN OVERVIEW

4.2.1 Location

Located approximately in the middle of the Pacific Ocean, almost midway between the Equator and the South Pole at a longitude of 175˚E and latitude of 18˚S, Fiji’s Exclusive Economic Zone (EEZ) comprises over 330 islands of which about a third are inhabited. The largest island, Viti Levu, accounts for about 70% of Fiji’s population of around 850,000 (provisional population estimate as at 31 December 2006, Fiji Islands Bureau of Statistics, 2007). The other main islands are Vanua Levu, Taveuni, Kadavu, Gau, Koro and the Polynesian enclave of Rotuma located 390 km north-west of the archipelago.
4.2.2 Historical brief

The nation’s initial contact with the outside world has its origins in the 17th century when Abel Tasman reportedly first sighted the Fiji Group. Since that time, consecutive major events have influenced the nature of the nation’s history such as the arrival of early European tradesmen and Christian missionaries, the inflow of indentured Indian labourers following proclamation of Fiji as a British Colony in the 19th century, Independence in 1970, and the declaration of the country as a Republic some seventeen years later. Added to these historical milestones are the major political upheavals that have beset Fiji in the past twenty years, (see 4.6).

Fiji’s colonial past and the relatively significant retention of Fijian traditional influences (see 4.5) have produced a situation of duality in relation to various facets of everyday life. This is seen visibly in the current governance structure which attempts to serve the needs of a Westminster-based system as well as those of the Fijian Chiefly hierarchy. However, aside from institutional bodies, colonial influences have permeated the general fabric of Fijian society, not least in the fact that the country’s main working language is English followed by the Fijian, Hindi and Chinese languages. Another distinguishing feature about Fiji is its ethnic mix of people. Currently about half of the population of around 850,000 are indigenous Fijians while around 40-45 per cent are the descendents of two waves of Indian migrants – those that arrived as indentured labourers brought into Fiji by the British during the nineteenth century and those who arrived into the country in the early twentieth century seeking work as semi-skilled and skilled labourers. The rest of the population comprises a mixture of European, Chinese and other Pacific islanders.
Historically Fiji’s economy has been dominated by its sugar industry. In more recent times mining, fish, garment, agricultural and bottled water production have also contributed to foreign exchange earnings, while tourism has evolved as the central cornerstone for economic growth. As with sugar, tourism is concentrated largely in the western side of the main island, Viti Levu. The other industries are mainly located around the Suva area (ADB, 2003).

Characteristic of many developing countries, economic growth in Fiji has been beset by certain limiting realities. In spite of the list of resource sectors mentioned above, the country still has a comparatively narrow resource base which has relied heavily on sugar production for many years. However, in keeping with global trade demands spurred on by World Trade Organization guidelines and, more particularly ACP policies, the nation’s reliance on sugar has waned. Throughout the 1990s these international changes brought to the fore active domestic growth of the garment and tourism industries which both rapidly overshadowed sugar in terms of economic viability and potential. Tourism in particular, as previously mentioned has become the country’s major employer and foreign exchange earner.

With economic growth seen as a crucial catalyst for development, Fiji has undergone numerous changes in the past decade, visibly seen in the levels of private sector investments and increased levels of construction. However, in international development terms which calculates the Human Development Index (HDI) as a composite of longevity, educational attainment and standard of living, Fiji is currently ranked as having ‘medium human development’ with a HDI index of 0.752 (United Nations Development Programme, 2005). Although access to basic services and facilities in Fiji has improved steadily in the past decade, urbanisation
demands have made the provision of these services more and more difficult to meet in recent years. Political, economic and social changes have contributed to the fact that poverty, traditionally applicable in relative terms for Fiji’s poor, is threateningly approaching its abject definition for those caught up in the misfortunes of societal circumstances (see 4.3).

4.3 POVERTY IN FIJI: A PACIFIC ISLAND PERSPECTIVE

4.3.1 General

The following sections deal with definitions and measurements of poverty in Fiji, poverty trends since 1977 and approaches implemented with regard to poverty alleviation. In terms of the latter, Government policies will be focused on. Civil society interventions in relation to poverty alleviation have also been significant, most taking the form of aid via national and international NGOs and donor organisation. However a proper analysis of the different bodies, and their respective policies would be too lengthy for purposes of the current study.

4.3.2 Definitions and measurements of poverty in Fiji

The 1997 Fiji Government and United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) Fiji Poverty Report (1998) alludes to the fact that defining the meaning of poverty in Fiji directly influences how different estimates of poverty are made and thus the identification of different ‘poor’ people in society. The report states that absolute poverty “refers to where people lack the basics of life, such as food and shelter” while relative poverty “refers to where one group in the population has a much smaller share of income than most others”. The Asian Development Bank Poverty Discussion Paper (2003) takes the analysis further by stating that poverty in Fiji is generally (but not exclusively) one of relative poverty or hardship.
As with the earlier 1997 Fiji Poverty (ibid) report, this definition infers that poverty levels in Fiji are more a reflection of relative poverty situations rather than those of abject destitution, therefore poverty is equated to hardship. The assumption is that welfare levels have generally been satisfied, while there is still the existence of levels of “poverty of opportunities”. The notion of poverty among rural communities in Fiji adds an interesting slant to the scenario as it is can be defined and measured in terms of “social richness” as opposed to ascribing to concepts of monetary value. This is best portrayed in the relative importance given by indigenous Fijians to kinship ties. As discussed in Chapters Five and Six of this paper, family ties go beyond providing an economic safety net in Fijian society, and include values concerned about the essence of being and what is important in one’s life. Thus for some people, the level of cash income does not properly describe the quality of life in Fiji as much as having adequate food, shelter and most importantly, ‘na veiwekani’ or kinship ties. Satisfying these basic essentials is all that one requires in life – once satisfied, poverty does not exist.

4.3.3. Trends since 1977

Evaluations of poverty related trends in Fiji have really only been possible since the collection of relevant data which has enabled the compilation of poverty reports. One of the earliest results in Fiji were those that emerged in the 1977 Household Income and Expenditure Survey (HIES) which calculated poverty lines and associated data in relation to the distribution of poverty. The 1990-1991 HIES, which has since been deemed unreliable by the recently published report on the 2002-2003 HIES (Narsey W, 2006) indicated that all types of poverty lines considered (food poverty, basic needs poverty, subjective poverty and welfare
providers poverty), the proportion of poor people in the population in Fiji appears to have increased. Paradoxically and as mentioned in 4.2.2 there have been general improvements all round in Fiji’s HDI index which indicates that in international development terms the country has made headway in improving general well-being in the nation. However, according to the earlier mentioned Fiji Poverty Report (United Nations Development Programme, 1998), two trends have run counter to supposed developmental progress in Fiji since the 1970s.

The first trend relates to the non-distribution of economic benefits throughout the nation which has led to pockets of wealth for some and continuing poverty for others. Secondly, economic conditions have generally not assisted un-skilled workers and low-income households. Income differentials between urban and rural incomes had been kept in check during the 1970s and early 1980s thus stemming the rural to urban drift and making agriculture an attractive employment alternative. However the differential increased in the mid 1980s, not only between agricultural and non-agricultural workers but also between union and non-unionised employees and among salary and wage earners. The 2002-2003 HIES notes the magnitude of the total differential in average household incomes between rural and urban distributions. The report states that while the rural distribution of household income is generally more even than that of urban distribution, urban households are generally associated with better incomes than rural ones. The extent of the rural and urban divide in relation to income is far more significant than inter-ethnic differences. Incidences of poverty have been found to exist across different factions of society in Fiji and have not been localised in one specific geographical location or social or ethnic grouping.
The general indication therefore is that in terms of the general extent of poverty in Fiji, which has been measured over the years in terms of analysing different poverty lines, the benefits of growth do not appear to have trickled down substantially enough throughout society, principally it is thought, due to distribution weaknesses discussed in the following section. While there is still little data to properly measure the extent and spread of benefits to the grass roots levels of society, there have been significant increases in the level of demand for social welfare assistance in the country.

4.3.4 Poverty alleviation strategies

The 1997 Fiji Poverty Report (United Nations Development Programme, 1998) states that on examining the different manifestations of poverty within Fiji in terms of varying poverty line measurements, socio-economic and politically related issues and perceptions of the poor in society, it seems that the poor in Fiji remain so, largely due to “institutional barriers” that effectively disable people’s ability to fully participate in society i.e. allowing them access to the “cultural, social and economic possibilities of the society” (United Nations Development Programme, 1998: Ch 7). To this end, since Fiji’s Independence in 1970, successive government policies toward combating poverty have taken on both a developmental and welfare stance. The general goal has been to close the widening poverty gap in society through the distribution of basic needs such as access to education services, health facilities, infrastructure and housing. In general, much progress has been achieved in the past decade in terms of satisfying these goals, but some objectives such as the provision of adequate housing has proved a very difficult welfare goal. With the onslaught of rapid urbanisation and subsequent urban sprawl, the Housing Authority and its line Ministry have a major problem to address today, and in years to come. Fiji’s
housing problem has led to the significant spread of squatter settlements around the country, particularly in urban centres, thus perpetuating the cycle of poverty for many.

The series of government Development Plans covering the period 1971 until 1990 have introduced all sorts of policy measures in an effort to promote development in Fiji and eradicate inequalities in both rural and urban areas. The Strategic Development Plans since that time to date, the current one being that of 2007-2011, have emulated similar policies with the emphasis being more on the sustainability of policies and interventions. Primary on the list of poverty alleviation strategies has been the need to raise economic growth and increase income-earning opportunities for the poor. A review of the country’s taxation system since 1989 led to reforms being implemented over the years, which have included policies to assist the poor. The 2007 budget for example has raised the income tax threshold and introduced zero-rating of VAT on essential food items such as rice, flour and tea (PricewaterhouseCoopers, 2007).

Other poverty alleviation strategies have included the importance given by consecutive Fiji governments for the maintenance of “traditional systems” of support in society via the extended family safety net. The logic of this extends beyond concern about the social and cultural breakdown of this aspect of Fijian traditional society and is more connected with the fact that the disintegration of family ties which has for years taken care of family support issues, has led to more reliance on Family Support Allowance and thus more strain on the government social welfare department.
Reducing the disparities between rural and urban areas, involving women as equal partners in national, political, economic and social development in Fiji, encouraging the role of indigenous Fijians in education and in the formal sector and ensuring that health services are available to all in society, are also part of public sector aims at alleviating poverty.

The 2007-2011 Strategic Development Plan (Ministry of Finance and National Planning, 2006) emphasises the link between the eradication of poverty in Fiji in line with the Millennium Development Goal’s (MDGs) Primary objective (MDG 1) and in relation to that, increased access to education (MDG 2) and health (MDG 4, 5 and 6). The Plan also outlines three key priorities with regard to addressing poverty in Fiji in the next 4 years: implementing poverty alleviation programmes, rural and outer island development and housing programmes. These initiatives are to be addressed by a partnership agreement between Government and civil society organisations. Poverty alleviation and social welfare is the primary key sector addressed in the current interim administration’s development programme quoted in the 2007 Budget and has been allocated 26.2 M Fiji dollars comprising 1.53% of the current budgeted revenue for 2007 (PricewaterhouseCoopers, 2007).

4.4 TOURISM: DEVELOPMENT AND SIGNIFICANCE IN FIJI

4.4.1 Development of Tourism

If one is to adopt a fairly flexible definition of tourism, as discussed in Chapter 2, due to the multi-disciplinary nature of the concept, and assume that the term implies a social activity that brings about the movement of persons within or outside their country of normal residence (Sharpley and Telfer, 2004), then tourism in Fiji probably had its origins in the activities of the early settlers at the beginning of the
twentieth century. Hotels were erected both in the old Fiji capital of Levuka and later in Suva primarily to accommodate travelling businessmen and persons generally passing through for purposes of trade or transit.

Naturally the tourism industry’s development in Fiji has been aligned with global changes which have impacted on travel and socio-economic demands, and domestically influenced the emergence of Fiji’s own domestic airline services in the 1950s and 1960s followed by the provision of international links from the 1960s to date (Air Pacific, 2002). This drastically opened up international markets in relation to tourist arrivals. According to Rao (2004), the Checchi Report of 1961 which was funded jointly by the Pacific Area Travel Association (PATA) and the US Department of Commerce, laid the foundations for tourism development in Fiji. The report examined the potential for tourism in the South Pacific and made recommendations about a suitable tourism strategy for each country. It was only after Australia and New Zealand adopted some of the report’s recommendations thus increasing tourist arrivals into the country that the Fiji government decided to implement measures which would enhance tourism development in the country. A shift of policy towards tourism was reflected by the introduction of two sets of legislation; liberalised duty free shopping introduced in 1962 and the Hotel Aid Ordinance of 1964. These two moves reputedly boosted investment and made tourism in Fiji an attractive commodity for all stakeholders involved.

4.4.2 Boom in the 1990s and Challenges in the Millennium

The steady growth in the tourism sector in Fiji since the 1960s took on new proportions in the last decade of the twentieth century which saw the industry reach unprecedented heights in terms of tourist arrivals, investor activity and confidence
in the market. This was reflected by the increased level of construction of new

tourism developments near the Nadi area and along the Coral Coast on Viti Levu

island. The Fiji government very quickly realised both the comparative advantage

of tourism over an ailing sugar industry and the significance of the industry as an

important catalyst for economic growth. Public sector measures were thus

implemented to assist the development of the tourism sector through a series of pro-

growth tourism policies: active marketing, constructive airline agreements,

attractive investment packages for tourist development investors and promotion of

the education and training of locally sourced manpower to cope with the demands

of the newly emerged components of the tourism service sector (FTIB, 2007 cited

in Narayan, 2000).

However, for Fiji and its economy as a whole, but more particularly for the tourism

sector, the last seven years have been marred by political instability in the shape of
two government overthrows, a civilian-led coup d’état in May 2000 and a military-

led one in December 2006 (See 4.6). Fortunately, recovery, in terms of regaining

pre-2000 tourist arrival figures occurred relatively quickly during 2002-2003. This

was due to several factors. A major cause was due to international events at the

beginning of the millennium with particular reference to 9/11 (11th September 2001)

and the Bali bombings of October 2002 which gave Fiji an immediate comparative

advantage in terms of a safer destination option for tourists. Domestically there

occurred the dropping of international travel advisory bans which had been put in

place following the events of 2000, the resumption of key airline services on long-

haul routes and the government’s allocation of more capital to assist with the

implementation of a vigorous marketing campaign by the Fiji Islands Visitors

Bureau.
The Fiji government has also seen the need to strengthen linkages within the economy to ensure retention of the tourist dollar through increased participation in the local economy. This has included measures that encourage local farmers to sell their agricultural produce to hotels as well as encouragement of informal sector activities by local villagers. In addition, with wider awareness of the importance of protecting the natural environment of Pacific island nations, the government has worked with local stakeholders to encourage the setting up of sustainable tourism developments through rural strategies aimed at setting up eco-tourism resorts. To this effect in 2006, there were reportedly 31 licensed eco-tourism projects in Fiji, owned and operated by indigenous Fijians. (Ministry of Finance & National Planning, 2006).

Recovery following the events of December 2006 has been less obvious. Travel bans have been relaxed to a certain extent, and in the immediate aftermath of the coup the tourism industry did not cease to operate its usual services. However, the continued slump in overall tourist arrivals has had massive negative effects on the tourism industry in the country, which by virtue of its forward and backward linkages, have had far-reaching effects on all concerned within the local economy. Efforts to put in place a viable tourism recovery plan (whose time-frame as a consequence of the recent coup has been extended from 2014 to 2016) master-minded by the Tourism Action Group (TAG), are however dependent on several factors which can potentially “play havoc” (Ministry of Tourism, 2007) with decisions, such as coups and competitor destinations. The level of national investment for Fiji’s tourism recovery and development plans, manifested by the interim administration’s 2007 budgetary allocation to the sector, does not, for many
appear to reflect the comparative significance of the industry in Fiji’s overall economic scenario.

4.5 TRADITION AND CULTURE

4.5.1. General

This section has been included in the overall contextual framework of this study, specifically because notions and sentiments of tradition and culture pervade Fijian society today in varying degrees – more so in rural communities which are the subject case study of the current research.

4.5.2 Definitions and State

The Oxford Dictionary (Wehmeier S, 2004) defines culture as “both a way of life: the customs and beliefs, art and social organisation of a particular country or group…” and tradition as “a belief, custom or way of doing something that has existed for a long time among a particular group of people…” Both terms are utilised in close correlation, often loosely implying one and the same thing, to describe what is conceived by people to be something natural and almost innate that has been practised or has existed in their society since time memorial.

It is this sense of naturalness and association with timelessness about culture that has been contested vigorously by some academics such as Sienkiewicz (2000). The basic argument is that culture is not static and is more the result of notions, ideas and practices that have evolved over time and that keep changing in line with society’s needs and objectives: “Culture is not like a rock, which ostensibly can pass through many hands and remain unchanged, but it is rather like a story that is
tailored and embellished in the process of transmission...the process of cultural transmission is dynamic, creative” (Linnekin 1990, cited in Sienkiwicz, 2000).

In the case of Fiji, it is widely acknowledged that most of the current institutions including the country’s legal and political framework have grown out of her colonial past in terms of structure and philosophy. What is less well recognised in Fiji, according to Sienkiwicz (2000), is that notions and practices about values which existed in pre-Colonial times have evolved both as a result of confronting Western values and colonial power but in doing so, subconsciously accepting the precepts of Western, or at least British colonial logic. The primary examples given are the importance rendered to land by the Fijians, and the practice of Kerekere. That land was always important to Fijians is not contested – but that land became a point of value in terms of possession, control and a powerful symbol of identity was a notion promoted by the British. Kerekere, meaning ‘to request’ in the Fijian language, describes the action of borrowing from villagers or other Fijians without the expectation of reciprocity. That it is as an expression of kinship ethic is not disputed – interestingly however it has been noted by certain authors, “…that there is no evidence that this “famous custom” in Fijian society existed before about the 1860s” (Thomas 1992 cited in Sienkiwicz, 2000)

To what extent these viewpoints of cultural and traditional norms ring true in relation to contemporary life in Fiji is not the focus of this study, but what is relevant to note is that many practices which existed in early colonial days have since been modified (kava drinking practices for one). It must also be noted that prior to the arrival of the early missionaries, Fiji was an oral society. Therefore
obtaining reliable data with regard to identifying what was commonly practiced prior to the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, is virtually impossible.

4.5.3 Symbols of Fijian Culture and Tradition

Aside from the Fijian language, dance (*meke*), myths and legends, and other facets of life that are held to be culturally significant in Fiji, the two primary symbols of Fijian culture and tradition are reflected in the Fijian administration system, and secondly in the social chiefly hierarchy. Divided into fourteen provinces the provincial councils in Fiji administer communally owned land and also elect most of the representatives who sit in the Great Council of Chiefs (GCC) or *Bose Levu Vakaturaga*, who in turn are charged with choosing 14 of the 32 members of the Fijian Senate, the upper house of Parliament. All Chiefs belong to one of three Confederacies whose boundaries generally correspond to those of the provinces. Since the cession of Fiji to the British in 1874, the highest chiefly title of *Tui Viti* (King of Fiji) has been vacant, and has been replaced in part by the British Monarch who is recognised by the Great Council of Chiefs as the most senior chief in Fiji. Over the years the GCC’s advice has been sought over matters affecting Fijian people, and the body has been held in high esteem by all of Fiji’s communities. The current interim administration however have recently dismissed the Council for political reasons thus creating, probably for the first time in contemporary Fijian history, a direct challenge to the authority and existence of the Chiefly system in Fiji.
4.6 INTERNAL CONSTRAINTS: POLITICAL CRISES AND NATURAL DISASTERS

4.6.1 General

Due to its relatively small size and geographical isolation, Fiji is very vulnerable to both internal and external influences. Thus any change in global circumstances has potentially large effects on the island’s economy and thus well-being of its population. Recent examples have been the oil hikes, threats to international security around the world since 9/11 and the outbreak of SARS. Internal effects, which the country has more control over, have also had significant impacts on the nation.

The following sections seek only to discuss the main internal constraints that have impacted on Fiji in recent times, as these relate to domestic contextual issues that are relevant considerations within the framework of the current research.

4.6.2 Political instability

To date and since 1987, Fiji has experienced four coup d’états giving rise to the term “coup culture” utilised quite freely by political analysts. The reasons and effects of each political intervention are complex, controversial in nature and will not be entered into in this paper. However, suffice it to say that in terms of the nation’s economic growth and stability, and based on historical precedence, the country is still extremely vulnerable to the risk of further political mayhem, ensuing economic downturns and related social consequences.

It seems quite clear, judged by the two recent coups, that of May 2000, and lately at the end of December 2006, that Fiji is still in the throes of sorting out internal power struggles before being able to address what type of political system best
works for her nation. Some blame the country’s colonial past on perceived ethnic tensions and developmental problems – however, from early historical accounts, pre-Colonial Fiji was generally a war-faring nation and by no means a peaceful nor particularly safe haven to live in. Others consider recent political instability as relatively “natural” when compared to the war-ridden and often blood developmental path to democracy and relative peace, experienced by most Western nations. Reasons, justifications and logic aside, the political and economic effects felt by Fiji following the events of the two recent coups, have reminded the population of the painful lessons learned after the 1987 military coups. The effects of political instability clearly take years to recover from, from a individual, community and national level. Chapter Five will discuss further the ramifications of the recent coup in Fiji in terms of the impact on tourism and how this has affected the livelihoods of local communities.

4.6.3 Natural Disasters

Natural disasters, unlike political coups, are not planned by man. Not intentionally that is. However, recent global high-level meetings on climate change and the need for countries to consider serious measures to curb activities that impact negatively on global warming and the earth’s environment have indicated that many irregular climate conditions are actually caused as a result of man’s activities to date.

Most scientific reports on environmental and climatic issues in the Pacific refer to the fact that Pacific Island Countries (PICs) are vulnerable to natural hazards such as cyclones, volcanic eruptions, earthquakes, floods, tsunamis, landslides and droughts. The geophysical nature of most PICs and the changing socio-economic nature of Pacific island life (eg urbanisation) compound this vulnerability. A report
commissioned by the Australian Agency for International Development and jointly prepared by the USP, and SOPAC (South Pacific Applied Geoscience Commission, 2005) studied the economic impact of natural disasters. The paper states that the indirect effects of natural disasters in the Pacific are generally not assessed, i.e. macro-economic effects, secondary effects on livelihoods, income distribution and poverty in addition to environmental, social and psychological effects. The most common forms of assessment have been those of direct physical impacts and damage assessments.

In Fiji, flash floods are common in the wet season between November and April, while cyclones and storms occur periodically and often have very damaging effects. The most recently damaging cyclone was Ami which caused severe flooding in 2003. The agricultural sector, low lying areas and coastline areas of the Fiji island group are particularly vulnerable to disasters. The OECD (2003) report on development and climate change in Fiji discusses the vulnerability factors of climate change (Table 4.3).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resource</th>
<th>Certainty of Impact</th>
<th>Timing of impact</th>
<th>Importance of resource</th>
<th>Severity of impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coastal resources</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>Medium-low</td>
<td>Medium-low</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Medium-low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human health</td>
<td>Medium-low</td>
<td>Medium-low</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Medium-low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water resources</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Medium-low</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.1 shows that coastal resources are a significant concern due to the presence of human settlements and ecosystems located along coastal areas. The likelihood of impacts occurring along coastal areas are high and the resources affected are significant as is the probable severity impact. However the timing of the impact is rated by the study as medium, meaning that impacts are unlikely to be felt immediately.
Fiji’s policy commitments in relation to addressing the issue of climate change and vulnerability to natural disasters is contained in its recent Strategic Development Plans, the latest (2007-2011) stating that “a risk management approach underpins Government efforts in disaster risk reduction, with a strong emphasis on community self-reliance…the focus on community capacity building aims to reduce dependency and to achieve community resilience and sustainable development”. The Government stance is clearly one of response plans and recovery. Chapters Five and Six will further discuss the implications of natural disasters within the framework of the case studies researched in terms of vulnerability in regard to community livelihoods.

4.7 CONCLUSION

This chapter serves to present an overview of Fiji’s socio-economic, political and cultural issues as a background to better understanding the framework within which the results of the current research are discussed in the following chapters.

The preceding sections indicate that no one factor can be considered in isolation in terms of the overall economic and political situation in Fiji. Even geophysical realities about the country directly affect the limitations imposed on its development, especially seen by its limited economic resource base and its vulnerability to climate change and natural disasters.

Fiji’s political course, in particular, has an extremely important part to play in providing an enabling environment for future, stable development. With this contextual framework in mind, it is significant to note that the factors discussed in
this Chapter together create, whether positively or negatively, the institutional influences and enabling environment which contribute to shaping the lives of Fijian village communities in terms of their structure, decision-making processes and evolution. The next Chapter Five will describe some of the livelihood strategies employed by the two Fijian rural villages Namatakula and Votualailai, by analysing findings of the fieldwork conducted in February 2007.
CHAPTER FIVE

LIVELIHOOD STRATEGIES: Assessment of choices and perceptions within the framework of institutional influences and identified assets

“...poverty is not a certain small amount of goods, nor is it a relation between means and ends; above all it is a relation between people...” Sharpley and Telfer, (2004)

5.1 INTRODUCTION

5.1.1 General

Livelihood strategies describe the range of behavioural strategies and choices that people adopt to make a living. That is how access is gained to food, how income is earned, and the allocation of labour, land and resources and patterns of expenditure. It also describes the way in which people manage and preserve assets, how they respond to shocks and coping strategies implemented as a result.

This chapter seeks to examine the different components that play a part in influencing the livelihood strategies implemented by the households that were studied in Namatakula and Votualailai villages. A description of the significance of institutional influences is thus followed by details of household income and expenditure levels, household access to different sets of assets in the local community as well as household perceptions concerning their overall lifestyle and livelihood choices. The chapter concludes with general views on the impact of tourism on the lives of local villages expressed by local goods and services stakeholders who have a direct relationship with the village households.
5.2 INSTITUTIONAL INFLUENCES: Land, Church and Government

5.2.1 General

For many indigenous Fijians, and more so those that are located in traditional environments such as rural villages, existence is inextricably linked to the notion of “vanua, lotu and matanitu” directly translated as the land, church and government, or seen in another light, “the inseparable unity of vu and yalo (spiritual gods), chiefs, people, land and other resources” (Walsh, C 2006). Ravuvu (1983: 76) describes the Vanua as:

“The living soul or human manifestation of the physical environment which the members have since claimed to belong to them and to which they also belong. The land is the physical or geographical entity of the people, upon which their survival...as a group depends. Land is thus an extension of the self. Likewise the people are an extension of the land. Land becomes lifeless and useless without the people, and likewise the people are helpless and insecure without land to thrive upon”.

Traditional Fijian spiritual beliefs and practices, the adoption of Christianity and the respect for hierarchy and the decision-making bodies of the day (government) are the principal institutional influences that are seen to impact on the lifestyles of village communities in Fiji today. This point is reiterated by Walsh (2006):

“These beliefs are what has held and still holds traditional Fijian society together by “creating a continuum of time, place and people, by awarding rights to land and resources, by cementing social relations, by helping people face the feared, the unknown and the inevitable: by giving them each a known place in the ongoing scheme of things” (Walsh, C 2006)”.

5.2.2 Village community level perceptions

The disaggregation of the study samples conducted in both Namatakula and Votualailai villages sought to broaden the research beyond the principal unit of analysis (households) and included meetings held with groups of youth, women and
the elderly from the villages. This was deemed as useful in terms of identifying perceptions from marginalised sections of the village population. Views expressed during focus group meetings with the youth, women and elderly from both villages served to be useful in terms of defining perspectives toward institutional influences.

5.2.3 Perceptions of institutional influences among community social groups

5.2.3.1 Youth Focus group perspectives

Results were solely obtained for the youth in Namatakula village and not that of Votualailai due to time constraints. The group of four youths aged between 18 to 20 years unanimously felt that youths had an important part to play in village life in terms of assistance with daily chores and different roles of assistance during traditional village functions. Within the framework of these identified roles (for example, helping to clean the village and helping to serve yaqona during functions), the group interviewed felt that the most important aspects for youths in the village were their roles and responsibilities in the village and the need to live according to traditional village norms. The youth group recognised however that the younger generation were seen to be more timid and reluctant to participate in traditional roles due to the effects of modernisation.

5.2.3.2 Women Focus group perspectives

For the groups of women from both villages, the factors that were deemed important in their lives were the “vanua, lotu and matanitu”, reflected by the statement of one of the respondent’s from the Votualailai women’s focus group discussion.
“...for me the three most important things in my life are to strengthen my religious beliefs and to carry out my traditional functions and duties delegated by the government in the village...” (Votualailai women focus group discussion, February 2007)

There were sentiments of the need to be “obedient” to these three institutions. Other areas of life such as the need to maintain one’s well-being and diet and to live a healthy lifestyle and care for one’s household were related objectives but often deemed as secondary considerations. The sense of serving the “whole” or the “community” and living in accordance to village norms was again reflected by this particular social group.

5.2.3.3 Elderly Focus group perspectives

The two groups of elderly villagers who attended the focus discussions at Namatakula and Votualailai villages were aged between 60 to 84 years of age. These two groups reluctantly observed that certain traditional norms had either been diluted or had virtually disappeared from village life altogether. In particular this included respect toward elders and the weakening of kinship ties. It was strongly felt that the upholding of the vanua, church and traditional obligations was paramount as it formed the basis for the maintaining of strong kinship ties and upholding the values of the land and people.

5.3 PROFILE OF VILLAGE HOUSEHOLDS

5.3.1 General

The current section seeks to give a general profile of households in both Namatakula and Votualailai villages, This includes firstly a description of the
general layout of the villages, the state of housing structures and information on the socio-demographic aspects of the households.

For purposes of this study, the definition used by different Fiji censuses (Walsh, C 2006) is utilised in terms of defining households: “persons who usually eat together food prepared for them in the same kitchen and who together share the work and cost of providing the food”. Walsh further notes the utility of considering the household as a unit of analysis since it is an indicator of the ‘pressure on living space’, ‘changes in family composition’ and thus contributes to measurements of “well-being, relative affluence and poverty, social change and the effects of rural to urban migration”.

5.3.2 Location
5.3.2.1 Namatakula Village

Considered in contemporary village terms as fairly large in size, Namatakula is located about 100 km west of the Fiji capital of Suva and consists of a total of 88 households of which only 30 were interviewed as part of the current study, comprising a sample representation of approximately 34%. The village lies either side of the main highway (Queens Road) with most of the households located on the coastal side. The coastal side area is arranged with houses running parallel as well as perpendicular to the shoreline. A village green (rara) running through the middle of the village is flanked on one side by a large Methodist church and an equally spacious village hall (vale in soqo). Most houses are concrete in structure (28 out of the 30 interviewed) with at least three living areas, electricity, a piped water supply and flush toilets. Most households interviewed stated that the dwellings they lived in had existed in the village for over 20 years. Namatakula village originally
comprised of two separate villages, Namatakula and Vucilevu which have since combined. Household members however were seen to make the distinction about which village they belonged to.

5.3.2.2 Votualailai Village

Votualailai village, located approximately 15km west of Namatakula village is a comparatively small village consisting of a total of 34 households of which 28 (82%) were interviewed as part of the current study. The village lies along the Coral Coast shoreline. The houses are arranged perpendicular to the shoreline, with a small village green (rara) running through the middle of village. The two largest buildings in the village are the Methodist church and a comparatively large village hall (vale in soqo). An additional 6 houses are located about 500 metres away from the village off the main Queens Road highway. The village is headed by an appointed village headman or Turaga ni Koro as well as the hereditary Turaga in Yavusa or ‘tribal head’.

5.3.3 Household Socio-demographic Results for Namatakula and Votualailai

Table 5.1 Gender of Household Head

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>MALE</th>
<th>FEMALE</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Namatakula Village</td>
<td>24 (80%)</td>
<td>6 (20%)</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Votualailai Village</td>
<td>20 (71%)</td>
<td>8 (29%)</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Table 5.2 Marital Status of Household Heads

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>MARRIED</th>
<th>WIDOWED</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Namatakula Village</td>
<td>25 (83%)</td>
<td>5 (17%)</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Votualailai Village</td>
<td>21 (75%)</td>
<td>7 (25%)</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.3 Household Head Age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>31-50 years</th>
<th>51-60 years</th>
<th>Over 60 years old</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Namatakula Village</td>
<td>14 (47%)</td>
<td>8 (26.5%)</td>
<td>8 (26.5%)</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Votualailai Village</td>
<td>12 (43%)</td>
<td>12 (43%)</td>
<td>4 (14%)</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Table 5.4 Size of Households

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0-4 people</th>
<th>5-9 people</th>
<th>Over 10 people</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Namatakula Village</td>
<td>7 (23%)</td>
<td>18 (60%)</td>
<td>5 (17%)</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Votualailai Village</td>
<td>9 (32%)</td>
<td>17 (61%)</td>
<td>2 (7%)</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Fieldwork data from Namatakula and Votualailai household surveys, 11-22 February 2007

From the households interviewed in Namatakula and Votualailai villages the majority of household heads are married, male and fall within the 31-50 year age group (Tables 5.1, 5.3 and 5.3). The majority of households in both villages are large in size comprising family unit of five to nine members (Table 5.4).

5.4 HOUSEHOLD EMPLOYMENT AND CONSUMPTION LEVELS

5.4.1 General

Employment data and income and expenditure levels have traditionally been the most utilised means of measuring the economic well-being of individuals as well as establishing levels of poverty or hardship. While the sustainable livelihoods framework considers this information as a component in its overall livelihood analysis, it is nevertheless deemed as one of the most significant factors in terms of qualifying overall livelihood strategies employed by the households surveyed. This is particularly the case in relation to employment data, as both direct and indirect levels of employment that are linked or affected by tourism activities in both
Namatakula and Votualailai villages, give a direct indication of the impact, and thereby significance of tourism on community livelihoods.

This section firstly examines the employment status and types of employment of households interviewed in Namatakula and Votualailai villages as well as income levels and perceptions of household income sufficiency. Employment data was collected for household heads as well as overall household participation levels. Information was also obtained on those households involved in informal sector activities and the relative significance of informal activities on overall household income levels. Household expenditure levels are examined in relation to basic needs as well as the significant contributions allocated toward religious and traditional village obligations.

5.4.2 Results of Employment and Income level data for Namatakula and Votualailai villages

Table 5.5 Household Head Employment Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>NAMATAKULA</th>
<th>VOTUALAILAI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In paid employment</td>
<td>16 (53%)</td>
<td>10 (36%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Employed</td>
<td>4 (13%)</td>
<td>5 (18%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployed</td>
<td>2 (7%)</td>
<td>8 (28%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retired</td>
<td>8 (27%)</td>
<td>5 (18%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Fieldwork data from Namatakula and Votualailai household surveys, 11-22 February 2007

Table 5.6 Household Head Employer

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>NAMATAKULA</th>
<th>VOTUALAILAI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Warwick Hotel</td>
<td>8 (27%)</td>
<td>1 (4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naviti Hotel</td>
<td>1 (3%)</td>
<td>6 (21%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beachouse Resort</td>
<td>4 (13%)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mango Bay Resort</td>
<td>3 (10%)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>14 (47%)</td>
<td>21 (75%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Fieldwork data from Namatakula and Votualailai household surveys, 11-22 February 2007
Table 5.7 Household Head Income Levels

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income Level</th>
<th>NAMATAKULA</th>
<th>VOTUALAILAI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than $50/week</td>
<td>11 (37%)</td>
<td>15 (54%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$50-$100 a week</td>
<td>8 (27%)</td>
<td>4 (14%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$101-$150 a week</td>
<td>7 (23%)</td>
<td>3 (11%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$151-200 a week</td>
<td>2 (6.5%)</td>
<td>4 (14%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than $200/week</td>
<td>2 (6.5%)</td>
<td>2 (7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Fieldwork data from Namatakula and Votualailai household surveys, 11-22 February 2007

Table 5.8 Households involved in Informal Sector Activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>NAMATAKULA</th>
<th>VOTUALAILAI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Involved in informal</td>
<td>16 (53%)</td>
<td>15 (54%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sector Activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not involved in Informal</td>
<td>14 (47%)</td>
<td>13 (46%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sector Activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Fieldwork data from Namatakula and Votualailai household surveys, 11-22 February 2007

5.4.3 Review of results for employment and income level data for Namatakula and Votualailai villages

In Namatakula over 50 per cent of household heads interviewed were in paid employment with relatively few (7%) unemployed, while in Votualailai over 50 per cent were of household heads were in both paid and self-employment with a larger 29 per cent reportedly unemployed. (Table 5.5). In Namatakula over 50 per cent of household heads were employed in tourism related activities with the remainder engaged in farming activities or other categories (electricians, plumbers, shopkeepers, mechanics). Out of those employed in tourism related activities 50% were employed at the Warwick Fiji Resort & Spa, while the remainder were engaged in activities with the Naviti Hotel, The Beachouse resort and the recently established “flashpacker” Mango Bay resort (Table 5.6). When taking into account the employment activities of other household members apart from household heads, the percentage of households engaged in tourism related employment rose to 100 per cent. There were found to be a total of 50 household members from all 30
houses interviewed engaged in tourism related activities. The majority of these employees (35 out of 50) were engaged in food and beverage and housekeeping duties at the respective hotels. The percentage of household members employed in management positions at the hotels was found to be relatively very low (2%). For Votualailai village from the household heads in paid employment only 7 (25%) were employed in tourism related activities with the remaining 21 (75%) household heads self-employed as farmers, or employed as electricians, shopkeepers, white collar employees at Sigatoka, or reportedly unemployed or retired. Out of those employed in tourism related activities, the majority (6 out of 7 employees) were employed at the Naviti resort, with the remaining employee engaged in activities at the Warwick Fiji Resort & Spa (Table 5.6). Taking into account the employment activities of other household members engaged in tourism related employment from those sampled at Votualailai (non-household heads), 20 households were found to be involved in tourism activities (71%). The study showed that 42 individuals from all 28 houses interviewed were engaged in tourism related activities. The majority of these employees (22 out of 42 employees) were engaged in food and beverage and housekeeping duties at the respective hotels. The percentage of those in management positions at the hotels was found to be relatively low (7%).

In terms of income levels, in Namatakula village, the majority of household heads interviewed fell into the ‘less than $50 per week’ and ‘$50-$100 per week’ income categories (Table 5.7). Only 7 per cent of household heads were reported to fall within the higher income bracket of ‘more than $200 a week’. When interviewed only 30 per cent of the total number of households interviewed felt their income levels were sufficient to cover household expenses while the remainder deemed their income levels as partly sufficient (23%) or not at all sufficient (47%).
Six discusses further the overall household income levels in relation to assessments on household income security levels. Over 50 per cent of households interviewed were involved in informal activities in order to supplement their overall household income levels (Table 5.9). Informal activities included running household canteens, selling barbecued meals on the village roadside, as well as the sale of root crops, fruits and seafood (subject to supply) to selling yaqona, cigarettes, juice and ice-blocks. Over 90 per cent of households participating in informal activities deemed the income earned from these activities as very significant in relation to overall household income levels.

For Votualailai village, more than half the household heads interviewed (54%) have an income of ‘less than $50 per week’ (54%) (Table 5.7). However, when interviewed 68 per cent of the total number of households interviewed stated that their income levels were sufficient to cover household expenses while 11% deemed their income levels as partly sufficient and 21 per cent indicated that it was not at all sufficient. These results reflect that overall household income levels were also supported substantially by household members other than those of the heads of households, whose income levels alone were generally low.

Informal activities ranged from running household canteens, conducting village and horse-riding tours as well as providing entertainment, selling local handicrafts, yaqona, cigarettes, and lunches to hotel employees (meat pies and desserts). As with the analysis for Namatakula village, the overall household income levels are discussed in Chapter Six. 54 per cent of households interviewed were involved in informal activities (Table 5.8). All the households participating in informal
activities stated that the income earned from these activities are very significant in relation to overall household income levels.

### 5.4.4 Results of expenditure and subsistence living for Namatakula and Votualailai villages

Table 5.9. Actual household expenditure levels and degree of subsistence reliance (Namatakula and Votualailai village surveys)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hhold ID</th>
<th>Namatakula expenditure levels per week (FJ$)</th>
<th>Household subsistence participation</th>
<th>Votualailai expenditure levels per week (FJD)</th>
<th>Household subsistence participation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>208.06</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>111.07</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>91.39</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>78.98</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>131.02</td>
<td></td>
<td>268.19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>125.96</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>148.58</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>127.60</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>58.85</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>270.25</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>125.58</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>132.22</td>
<td></td>
<td>263.14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>200.68</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>132.49</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>146.44</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>180.67</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>119.60</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>101.19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>143.65</td>
<td></td>
<td>63.26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>97.79</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>121.86</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>71.66</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>153.23</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>74.40</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>82.64</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>60.42</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>93.39</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>184.09</td>
<td></td>
<td>111.07</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>80.15</td>
<td></td>
<td>118.38</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>124.64</td>
<td></td>
<td>61.42</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>131.18</td>
<td></td>
<td>1284.04</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>135.10</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>86.48</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>157.88</td>
<td></td>
<td>111.38</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>96.87</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>101.46</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>100.76</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>90.72</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>94.23</td>
<td></td>
<td>116.92</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>97.36</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>142.49</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>176.27</td>
<td></td>
<td>109.47</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>157.32</td>
<td></td>
<td>64.51</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>63.27</td>
<td></td>
<td>164.88</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>70.83</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>162.87</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


*X denotes those households participating substantially in subsistence activities*
5.4.5 Review of results of expenditure and subsistence living for Namatakula and Votualailai villages

As indicated in Table 5.9, household expenditure levels in Namatakula ranged from a lower end figure of $60 per week to a high end of $270 per week with a mean rate of $128 per week per household. The table also includes those households that indicated that 75 per cent of food sources was derived from land and sea resources as part of their overall survival. In Namatakula 63 per cent of households surveyed participate regularly in subsistence activities. Subsistence living is included in this section as it is deemed as a significant part of household livelihoods and is taken to imply that those items would otherwise be purchased thus incurring added expenditure to the overall household budget.

Household expenditure levels in Votualailai range from a lower end figure of $59 per week to a high end of $1284 per week – the latter household is an unusual case as there are two large families living in the household with one of the families running a successful business operating in the area. The mean household expenditure rate excluding the exceptional household case above is $121 per week per household (Table 5.9). Subsistence reliance in Votualailai also plays an important role in overall livelihoods with 43 per cent of households surveyed regularly participating in subsistence activities.

5.4.6 Results of basic needs and religious and traditional obligations for Namatakula and Votualailai villages

Data gathered from the household questionnaires showed that a significant part of overall household expenditure was spent by households on basic needs. In Namatakula village, expenditure on basic needs (cost of shelter, food, clothes and fuel) comprised more than 50 per cent of total household expenses for 80 per cent
of households surveyed. In Votualailai village, data showed that expenditure on basic needs comprised more than 50 per cent of total household expenses for 86 per cent of all households surveyed.

In terms of access to physical capital, rural villages, such as Namatakula and Votualailai are located on tribal land and as such villagers are able to build their homes without incurring costs for land purchases, thus rendering them ‘shelter secure’. This is not so for their urban counterparts. Water is also freely available and most houses have access to electricity which is normally billed monthly while fuel can take the form of gas, firewood but more commonly kerosene. Food expenses include groceries for basic items such as sugar, flour and bread but also substantially include items from the land and sea. Thus to a certain extent, households in Namatakula and Votualailai are show that they are able to satisfy basic needs, and therefore basic welfare levels.

From in-depth interviews at the two villages as well as the focus group discussions conducted it is apparent that apart from basic expenses, households contribute substantially toward religious dues (both annual and weekly) and traditional obligations. Around 57 per cent of households interviewed at Namatakula village reported that between 10 per cent to 25 per cent of their overall household budget was allocated to covering religious obligations while 77 per cent of households maintained they spent anything up to 10 per cent of total household expenses on traditional obligations. The majority of households interviewed stated they “managed OK” with both religious (60% respondents) and traditional (57% respondents) payments although a significant proportion (40%) of respondents found religious obligations quite steep and a burden on overall expenditure. The
majority of households in Namatakula reported observing the Methodist faith (60%).

In Votualailai it was observed that household contributions toward religious dues (both annual and weekly) as well as traditional obligations were also significant. About 46 per cent of the households interviewed reported that between 10 per cent to 25 per cent of their overall household budget was allocated to covering religious obligations while 57 per cent of the households maintained they spent anything up to 10 per cent of total household expenses on traditional obligations. Most households indicated they “managed OK” with both religious (71% of respondents) and traditional payments (50% of respondents) although a significant proportion (50%) found traditional obligations a burden on overall expenditure. A large proportion of the households surveyed (86%) reported observing the Methodist faith.

5.4.7 Review of basic needs and religious and traditional obligations results for Namatakula and Votualailai villages

Expenditure data on household basic needs and religious and traditional obligations illustrate firstly the proportionately large amount of the household budget devoted to basic needs expenses for households surveyed in both villages, and in line with that, the equally significant amount allocated by households in both villages toward both religious and traditional obligations. From discussions with members of the two village community households surveyed it was apparent that religious and traditional obligations were viewed almost in the same light as ‘basic needs’ as financial expenses incurred were mandatory, in the face of strong community disapproval if not met.
Different religious faiths were represented in the households surveyed with Methodism being the most predominant. The other predominant faith was Catholicism followed by observers of the Assemblies of God Church, Seventh Day Adventists and a couple of Pentecostal faiths. The two Methodist churches built in both villagers is a reflection of the predominance of the faith and the significance religion plays in village life as discussed earlier (5.2.2). Similarly, the other largest communal building in both villagers is the village hall or *vale ni soqo* in which all community meetings occur including traditional ceremonies and festivities. This building likewise reflects the importance of the observance of traditional functions and meetings. From expenditure data from the household surveys it was apparent that religious obligations were obtained as an annual tithe per household (ranging from $250 - $500 per household annually). In addition households contributed to the church weekly during Sunday services – an amount usually representing 10 per cent of weekly wages. Traditional obligations however could take the form of either assistance in kind through land resources (crops or livestock) or individual financial contributions.

**5.5 LIVELIHOOD ASSET PORTFOLIO**

*5.5.1 General*

The Sustainable Livelihoods Asset Framework (Figure 2.1) refers to human, social, physical, natural and financial capital and describes a holistic means of informing on how people live through identifying assets that they have access to and which therefore potentially influence their lives and livelihood choices. The basis of this livelihoods asset framework is utilised in the following sections to identify whether the results obtained from Namatakula and Votualailai villages (obtained from household responses and perceptions) inform on the different access the villagers have to various assets.
5.5.2 Namatakula

Namatakula village being located off the main Queens highway in Viti Levu and relatively closely located to several hotels along the Coral Coast area, is fortunate to have relatively easy access to basic infrastructure and facilities along the highway. This includes access to potable water, electricity, transport, health facilities and educational establishments. The closest town to the village is Sigatoka which is located about 40 km away and is readily accessible by bus or other transport services in the area. All the households were satisfied with electricity, transport and communication (telephone) services available and accessible to them. There was a 33 per cent dissatisfaction with water services because of the low water pressure in some parts of the village.

About 90 per cent were satisfied with the educational services provided while 10 per cent indicated that they were unhappy with facility levels in some of the local schools and levels of teaching in some schools in the area. Seventy seven per cent of all respondents stated they were satisfied with medical services in the area – the majority attended the government funded Koroloveu Health centre at Korolevu and the remainder visited private doctors in Sigatoka town. Ninety per cent of households stated that family members were seldom sick with all of them admitting to using Fijian traditional medicine as cures for ailments common in the village (fever, flu, diarrhoea and body aches).

In terms of access to natural resources, 97 per cent of all households interviewed had access to land and sea resources and 70 per cent of those households relied significantly (50%-75%) on natural resources for food. Ninety-seven per cent of
households stated that they still tended plantations (no data was collected on the frequency of this activity). However a large percentage (53%) of households did not possess livestock. Eighty-three per cent of all households still went fishing. In terms of grocery shopping, the majority of households shopped at Shop ‘N’ Save and R.B. Patel supermarkets in Sigatoka as they were considered cheaper and more conveniently located than other shopping options.

With regard to access to information, a significant number of households listened to the radio daily (46%) or sometimes read the newspaper. Only few houses were able to view television programmes because there was bad reception in the village area. However most households had TV screens for purposes of playing DVDs. A large percentage (90%) of households felt that having access to computers was necessary. About 67 per cent of all households interviewed had access to computers mainly through school or work activities.

In terms of access to financial activities, 83 per cent of all households claimed they had savings schemes (bank accounts) and only 17 per cent had existing loans (bank or Fiji National Provident Fund loans). The issue of social capital, best represented in the village context by kinship ties or ‘na vaiwekani’ is perhaps the strongest social glue that holds village life together. Family relationships are of paramount importance to the whole fabric of village community life and appear to be the means by which issues are discussed, problems shared and disputes resolved within the village. All the households at Namatakula stated that kinship ties were very important to them.
5.5.3 Votualailai

As with Namatakula village, Votualailia is also located on the Queens highway and is next door to the Naviti Hotel. This village not only has access to basic infrastructure and facilities within the area, but shares the majority of these services and facilities with the hotel. This is particularly the case with regard to the supply of potable water to the village. Access to electricity, transport, health facilities and educational establishments is also available. Respondents from all 28 households indicated an almost full or total satisfaction with water, electricity, transport and communication (telephone) and health services at the village. There was a 14 per cent dissatisfaction with educational services in the area, which still means that the majority were happy with available education services More than 80 per cent of the households stated that family members were seldom sick with all households admitting to using Fijian traditional medicine as cures for common ailments.

About 80 per cent of all households had access to land and sea resources and 64 per cent of those households relied significantly (50%-75%) on natural resources for food. Seventy-nine per cent of households stated that they still tended plantations (as with Namatakula village no data was collected on the frequency of this activity). A large percentage (75%) of households possessed livestock while 75 per cent of households still went fishing. In terms of grocery shopping, the majority of households as with Namatakula, shopped at Shop and Save Supermarket and R.B.Patel in Sigatoka as they were considered cheaper establishments.

With regard to access to information, a significant number of households listened to the radio daily (54%) or sometimes read the newspaper (46%). A significant number of houses were able to view television programmes daily (54%). A large
percentage of households (96%) felt that having access to computers was necessary and a good thing. Sixty-one per cent of all households interviewed had access to computers mainly through school or work activities.

In terms of access to financial activities, 96 per cent of all households claimed they had savings schemes (bank accounts) and 32 per cent had existing loans (bank or Fiji National Provident Fund loans). As with Namatakula kinship ties were deemed by all households at Votualailai as extremely important for the proper working and harmony of village life.

These findings are consistent with information on kinship ties in Fiji found in contemporary literature (Ratuva, 2002) which states that within the traditional Fijian set up, levels of kinship relationships extend from the nuclear family to the largest social unit. The different levels of social groupings or units act as contexts for defining individual and group identity. Ratuva further states, “Apart from their relationship with land, the kinship links are means by which traditional exchange and ceremonial goods flow”. (Ratuva, 2002).

5.6 LIVELIHOOD STRATEGIES: Perceptions and Choices

5.6.1 General

From the profile of households at both Namatakula and Votualailai villages, information obtained from household production and consumption levels and perceptions in relation to access to assets within the Coral coast area, it is possible to gain an insight into the factors which influence the livelihood strategies of the two village communities. It is also important to remember that livelihood choices are made within the framework of institutional influences as discussed earlier.
To what extent these influences are seen or felt to facilitate or hinder decisions is largely subjective. From an observer’s perspective it is all too easy to be critical of lifestyles that appear to be constrained by village norms because it is not what the outsider is accustomed to. However, what are perhaps significant indicators as to what extent livelihood strategies are personal decisions or forced choices is qualified to some degree through the opinions expressed by the villagers themselves.

In seeking to assess livelihood strategies, several perceptions can be identified in regard to what is deemed necessary or important by Namatakula and Votualailai residents. A number of key themes emerged from the focus group discussions held with women, youth and the elderly in addition to the in-depth interviews held with village household members. Apart from these perceived key views, are the ranges of deciding factors which form the basis of household livelihood decisions for both village communities. This section firstly presents a qualitative analysis of key points arising from the group’s discussions and in-depth meetings mentioned earlier followed by a discussion of important factors which are deemed to play a significant role in the lives of the villagers studied.

5.6.2 Emergent themes

5.6.2.1 Traditional roles

A commonly held notion among all groups and individuals interviewed from the two villages is that village members were (or certainly should be) inherently aware of the specific role they were expected to play within the context of village life. Thus in terms of communally based village life, the notion of ‘one’s place in
society’ is significant and appears to be the social ‘benchmark’ against which all other duties or obligations are prioritised. Although the preservation of the self and of the immediate family unit is still considered important, the overriding sense of obligation toward serving the good of the ‘whole’ i.e. the village, is an integral part of one’s existence, and raison d’être in terms of community life.

5.6.2.2 Kinship ties

Linked to these sentiments of obedience and near ‘reverence’ to serving the community, is the importance lent to kinship ties. The only criticism passed by the villagers in relation to kinship links was that they appear to be weakening as time progresses and there are fears are that this will create less unity in the village as a whole.

5.6.2.3 The impact of tourism on village life

Both Namatakula and Votualailai are significantly involved with the tourism industry in terms of the number of village households whose members are directly employed by hotels along the Coral Coast area. Thus the direct employment impacts of tourism on village lives is widely acknowledged by the households and individuals interviewed. Additional comments however, include acknowledgement of the significant links between employment activities within the village and the tourism market. These activities are mostly informal in nature (flower arrangements for hotels, provision of food for hotel employees and the selling of local handicrafts to tourists) and significantly contribute to overall household incomes. Other positive impacts of tourism were noted by Votualailai residents who remarked on the skills that have been learnt by hotel employees with regard to levels of cleanliness and presentation. This has influenced their individual lives in the village.
by empowering them with additional skills and knowledge related to their housekeeping, food and beverage and banqueting skills.

Apart from the impact of direct employment, households also acknowledge the assistance in kind in terms of village infrastructure and facilities that have been provided by the hotels. This is more noticeable in Votualailai village since the landowners of the land on which the Naviti hotel rests hail from Votualailai. Thus, apart from the lease monies received by the landowning units, the hotel has significantly contributed to the building of many village houses, the church, the village hall, the seawall and the offering of yearly scholarships to worthy students.

The negative effects of tourism are also stated by different individuals. They cover aspects dealing with social and youth problems in the two villages which are thought to be partially the influence or ‘culture shock’ of tourism influences. Respect for the elderly and for some traditional practices and village norms appear to be disappearing according to some sources interviewed. The changes in lifestyle brought about by the switch from an agrarian lifestyle to that of tourism employment has created for many, disinterest and laziness in relation to maintenance of crop plantations and fishing activities.

5.6.2.4 Contentment

There were sentiments of general contentment in relation to current livelihoods expressed across the sections of groups interviewed. Most respondents interviewed were generally pleased with their lives although many mentioned that tourism employment salary levels were not sufficient, even though they were coping satisfactorily. It is important to note that this is largely due to reliance on
subsistence level production to support livelihoods. When asked whether their households ever faced poverty or hardship situations, 63 per cent of households examined in Namatakula stated that they sometimes underwent hardship (*buladredre*) and 10 per cent felt they faced situations of poverty on occasions (*dravudravua*). In Votualailai 57 per cent of households examined felt that they sometimes faced hardships while 43 per cent felt that they faced neither hardship nor poverty. The following are several perceptions in relation to definitions of the terms ‘hardship’ and ‘poverty’ as expressed by members of both the villages studied.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Hardship (<em>Buladredre</em>)</strong></th>
<th><strong>Poverty (<em>Dravudravua</em>)</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Weak kinship ties</td>
<td>Laziness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lacking in religious faith</td>
<td>Those who are weak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life with too many obligations</td>
<td>When your heart is without love</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor planning</td>
<td>Life in the old days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selfishness</td>
<td>No source of employment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduced working hours</td>
<td>Not able to support the family</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.6.2.5 *Coping Strategies*

Perhaps the most obvious manifestations of coping strategies in both villages examined is firstly the traditional trait of ‘*kerekere*’ (as discussed in 4.5.2) whereby households basically ask or ‘beg’ for help from fellow neighbours or kin. Although a large proportion of households still admit practising *kerekere*, some households interviewed steadfastly refused for their family members to ever ask for help, as they felt that this propagated the mentality of “hand-outs”. Secondly, village households also admitted resorting to borrowing on credit (*dinau*) from local village ‘canteens’ or shops. This practice usually occurs when households run out of smaller food items such as flour, sugar or tea.
The reliance on subsistence production in terms of household livelihoods, and the conducting of informal activities to supplement household income levels can also be considered as ways in which village households have strived to cope with sustaining their livelihoods. The group of women interviewed in both villages stated that within the context of their role as family carers, it was their responsibility to solve problems of shortages or related problems in relation to food, payment of bills or other expenses due. Despite the ready availability of food resources in the village, food is still the most discretionary item in terms of household expenditure during hard times. Some households claim to live on cassava (root crop) and lemon leaf tea (drau ni moli) to make ends meet, while one low-income household member stated that she sometimes skipped two meals a day so that her children could eat 3 meals a day and enable her to cover their school fees and payments for household cooking fuel.

5.6.3 Key Factors

The previous sections have discussed different livelihood perspectives held by village households from both Namatakula and Votualailai as well as livelihood strategies that they have adopted in order to best cope with their lives in the village. Within this context one can underline a few key factors in order to highlight the principal issues that play an important role in the overall livelihood scenario: firstly the Livelihoods Framework whose components (already discussed) define the principal influences that impact on the livelihoods, and the vulnerability, of village households. Secondly are the Principal Strategies that are employed by village households as the most common means of sustaining livelihoods. Two of the strategies are directly income generating i.e. tourism employment and informal
sector activities, while the third, the subsistence sector is significant in terms of assuring food security and thus livelihoods (and sometimes income security if produce is sold). The importance of the subsistence factor within the village livelihoods equation will be discussed further in Chapter Six.

Livelihoods Framework
1. Communal and traditional structure of rural villages
2. Access to infrastructure, goods and services in local area
3. Perceived risks: natural disasters, national political instability, international security threats (SARS, Terrorism)

Principal Livelihood Strategies
1. Tourism industry as main employment option
2. Significance of the subsistence sector
3. Informal sector activities

5.7 GOODS AND SERVICES STAKEHOLDERS

5.7.1 General

Although the main focus of the current research centred on the village households at Namatakula and Votualailai since the study involves the impact of tourism on their livelihoods, the households were indeed the principal, but not the sole unit of analyses throughout the research process.

Thus, apart from gaining information from households and focus group discussions in both villages, key stakeholders in the Coral Coast area were also interviewed or fielded questionnaires. The stakeholders were identified in terms of their relationship either directly or indirectly with the lives of the local villagers. Some stakeholders were inked to the tourism industry while others played a part in the overall livelihoods of the village households. This section therefore analyses key
issues which arose following in-depth interviews with a Secondary School stakeholder, a Management employee at one of the hotels in the area and a Supermarket Manager from Sigatoka. Responses from questionnaires given to the General Manager of one of the hotels in the area, a well-known furniture retailer in Sigatoka and a medical officer from the local medical centre are also analysed.

5.7.2 Qualitative analysis of Stakeholder Perspectives: Emergent Themes

The stakeholders interviewed were from diverse sectors within the local Coral Coast community. Their common link was indeed their individual relationships with local communities in the area. The information obtained in the research sought to find out more about this relationship and whether links could also be established between the stakeholders and the local tourism industry, whether directly or indirectly. Three key emergent themes arose from the findings.

5.7.2.1 Perspectives on poverty

Since the essence of the current research centres on whether tourism in Fiji can be considered a useful development tool in terms of poverty alleviation, particularly with regard to local communities, stakeholders were asked to define ‘poverty’ in the context of local communities in Fiji.

All stakeholders felt that ‘poverty’ of ‘dravudravua’ in its abject sense did not exist or at least, should not exist, in village communities along the Coral Coast.

“...a poor person in the village is a lazy person because there is available land to work on so you can set up a farm and plant and sell produce and live off the produce. But if you are lazy and ignorant you deserve to be poor...” (Tourism industry stakeholder, Coral Coast Hotel, February 2007)
Some did not think it existed at all in rural areas in Fiji as people had access to land and either sea or river resources. The urban poor were cited as being worse off than the rural poor as they had little access to natural resources.

The state of hardship or ‘buladredre’ in the village community context was cited as representing the inability by villagers to meet a certain level of commitments and financial obligations. In that sense people who faced hardships often probably lacked essential planning skills.

5.7.2.2 Tourism and community livelihoods

The stakeholders were full aware of the direct employment relationship between hotels in the area and local village employees and the benefits to both parties involved. This was an expected response from the hotel Management stakeholders in particular who also shared their awareness of the related social problems in the villages which they felt were partially caused by tourism induced lifestyle changes in the lives of local village communities (change of dress, social behaviour and consumption of alcohol).

The supermarket manager from Sigatoka emphasised the extent of reliance on the tourism industry of business stakeholder throughout the length of the Coral Coast area including Sigatoka town and neighbouring rural areas (Photograph 5A). The “Triangular Relationship” was cited as best describing the relationship between the main livelihood stakeholders in the area.
Essentially, shops relied on farmers and customers from the villages for business, and villagers and farmers in turn relied on tourism establishments for their livelihoods. According to this stakeholder the livelihoods of the “entire Coral Coast community” relied on tourism. Consequently when tourism did not do well, everyone suffered. Similar sentiments were echoed by the manager of the furniture retail outlet at Sigatoka. Since the national crisis in December 2006, both stakeholders pointed out that their businesses had really suffered due to the indirect link with the tourism industry. A large proportion of their shop customers were hotel employees some of who has been given reduced working hours and therefore reduced pay packets. The flow-on effects from the tourism industry according to these two stakeholders was substantial.

The education and health service providers were generally aware of the employment impact of tourism in the area. No major social issues were mentioned
aside from comments by the health officer that tourism might be partially responsible for social and attitudinal changes in the younger generations which had led to associated risks and exposure to sexually transmitted diseases and lifestyle choices. Trends such as this were of course attributed to many factors in society apart from those of tourism, such as the effects brought about by modernisation, the media, changing parental values and norms and so forth.

5.7.2.3 Tourism and the role of the stakeholder

For the education and health stakeholders their roles were stated as one of providing specific services to people. The extent of their involvement with local communities was by virtue of the fact that their establishments were situated along the Coral Coast corridor thus implying that they dealt mostly with the inhabitants of local villages. As such there was no direct association with the tourism industry.

The two commercial stakeholders from Sigatoka were very reliant on local customers and thus saw tourism as the key to the success and survival of their respective businesses. They felt that their role was to ensure that they could provide services which best served the needs of the local market. Local customers were acknowledged as being very price sensitive and therefore goods were tailored to be as attractive as possible for this key market.

The two hotel managers felt directly involved with local communities and felt that the relationship between hotels and local workers was mutually beneficial. It was convenient from the hotels’ perspective to have access to available human resources located close to the hotels. One of the managers felt that the encouragement of
informal sector activities such as local handicrafts, basket making and weaving were ways in which local employees could be further empowered economically.

5.8 CONCLUSION

This chapter serves to present an overview of the factors that influence key lifestyle decisions and livelihood strategies implemented by the households in Namatakula and Votualailai villages. The preceding sections indicate that a holistic approach is required in terms of assessing the issues involved. The implementation of the sustainable livelihoods approach in this study enabled the examination of different components of village livelihoods in terms of core influences (institutional factors), access to different assets and the main types of strategies implemented by households in order to sustain basic livelihoods.

The identification of the principal livelihood strategies adopted by the households in Namatakula and Votualailai villages illustrates, in part, the significance of the tourism sector in terms of the village community. In not so positive light, it also highlights the dependence on the industry as the main source of employment in the Coral Coast area. Subsistence and informal sector strategies are also engaged in by many households in the two villages, which not only show the importance of these two livelihood strategies but also underline the fact that many households ‘multi-task’ in terms of income-generating and livelihood supporting mechanisms. This is a common feature in low-income earning groups in both rural and urban areas, whereby access to different sources of income serves as a livelihood safety-net in terms of spreading risks across various livelihood options within the framework of community life.
CHAPTER SIX

LIVELIHOOD OUTCOMES

"Annual income twenty pounds, annual expenditure nineteen, ninety six, result happiness. Annual income twenty pounds, annual expenditure twenty pounds ought and six, result misery.”

(Charles Dickens, 1850)

6.1 INTRODUCTION

6.1.1 General

Livelihood outcomes are the objectives people seek to achieve through the implementation of certain livelihood strategies. Examining such outcomes can be potentially complex and can vary according to time, context and individual. In this study, the information gained lent some insight into what was deemed important in the lives of the households in the two communities.

The key livelihood outcomes that households in Namatakula and Votualailai identify as important are the following:

1. Sufficient household income levels to cover basic needs
2. Sufficient food supplies
3. Maintenance of kinship ties and traditional values
4. Good health
5. Education of children
6. Satisfaction of religious and traditional obligations

This chapter seeks to examine these key livelihood outcomes. The household income and food security statuses are first discussed followed by the natural resources base at the villages which is strongly linked to the observance of subsistence level survival. Community perceptions on kinship ties, health, education and traditional and religious obligations are discussed in relation to perceptions of
well-being, empowerment and notions of vulnerability. The chapter will conclude with views held by national tourism and poverty stakeholders.

6.2 HOUSEHOLD INCOME SECURITY

6.2.1 Definition

For purposes of this study the definition utilised in an earlier study by Kurusiga, Kado and Qoloni (2006) is utilised. Household income security is defined as the income security status per household which is derived from the ratio of total household income compared to the household income security threshold. The income security threshold is an indication of the minimum income required to sustain basic living expenses deemed in this study to include those covering water, food, shelter, clothes, electricity and fuel for cooking (the study (ibid) did not include clothes as a component of basic expenses).

6.2.2 Household Income and Expenditure for Rural Households in Fiji

The report on the 2002-2003 Household Income and Expenditure Survey (Narsey, 2006), was deemed useful for the current research in terms of comparing income and expenditure trends for rural village households identified in the report with those apparent in the current research for the villages in question. In terms of the findings in this Chapter, a few relevant elements from the report in relation to the 2002-2003 rural household data are noted in Box 6.1.

In terms of expenditure data, the 2006 report highlights that rural Fijian households spent 36 per cent of their total household income on food, whereas expenditure on housing, education, medical and transport costs are less than in urban areas. These households reportedly “gave away a very large percentage of their total income annually”. Although there is no description of the allocation of this amount (as was
seen in Chapter Five) a significant proportion of village household income appears to be allocated toward traditional and religious obligations.

Box 6.1  Rural Fijian Household data from 2002-2003 HIES

- The percentage of rural households was 53% of the total population of which Fijian households comprised the majority (61%).
- Incomes for all rural groups were deemed as below the national average by 17% with rural Fijian household income per Adult Equivalent Unit deemed as below the national average by 16%.
- A higher percentage of rural Fijian households (49%) reported working for money as opposed to 46% of urban households.
- Given the large percentage of rural Fijian households in cash earning activities a large proportion still reported engaging in subsistence activities (57%).
- Of income type for rural households, the largest proportion of incomes was reported as being gained from casual wages (casual workers generally belong to the lower paid group but employment is often insecure as it often lacks the usual benefits such as holiday pay, sick leave, accident compensation or even FNPF payments by employers).


Taking these factors into consideration, the 2006 report highlights that rural Fijian households in 2002-2003 were characteristically large, which is consistent with the findings of this study. The study also observed that most households engaged in cash earning activities (see Chapter Five). This section will seek to illustrate, through income and socio-demographic data of the village households, to what extent the households are income secure in relation to the national poverty line, and whether, as proved by the 2002-2003 HIES, subsistence activities still play a significant role in sustaining livelihoods. Income and expenditure data from the study will illustrate how many households in the villages are able to sustain livelihoods through their cash earning activities.

6.2.3 Income Security Status

The objective of calculating the income security statuses of the households is firstly to identify how individual households appear to be faring in relation to established national basic needs poverty lines for rural villages. The approach is poverty linked
using raw household income data and socio-demographic information. A parallel is also drawn to compare the results obtained from this assessment against a straightforward household income and expenditure assessment. The first example utilises income data inputs for each household to establish its results whereas the second assessment uses actual household income and expenditure inputs to establish if the households are technically able to meet all their expense obligations with current household income levels.

Apart from being a welfare type assessment, the income security statuses of the households are also utilised to establish the importance of tourism employment in relation to household income security. The significance of the subsistence component of household livelihoods and informal sector activities for overall household income levels is also noted. To establish the income security status per household, it was necessary to establish an income security threshold (IST) applicable for the period of the research fieldwork (February 2007). Thus, a relevant IST was established based on the 2002 revised Fiji Bureau of Statistics HIES basic needs poverty line (Asian Development Bank, 2003) for rural village households of $104.85. This figure was adjusted by adding inflation for the years 2003-2006 utilising Bryant Tokelau’s formula (Bryant, 1990). The following assumptions and calculations were utilised to establish the household income security threshold:

1. An updated basic needs poverty line for rural village households was devised by adding annual inflation for the years 2003-2006 to the 2002 HIES of $104.85. For 2007 the revised figure was thus calculated as $121.48.

2. The revised figure for 2007 is assumed for an average Fiji household which is denoted as being composed of 5 people over the age of 15 years as
established by studies on National Food Basket calculations. For purposes of this study the World Bank (WB) definition of adult equivalent units is utilised:

\[
\text{Adult Equivalent Units} = (0.5 \times c + 0.75 \times a + 0.25)
\]

(\text{where } a = \text{adults and } c = \text{children})

Thus an average household of 5 adults = 4 adult equivalent units (AEU).

The adjusted basic needs poverty line per AEU is thus $30.79 (established by taking the basic need poverty line per household ($121.48) and dividing the figure by the average number of adult equivalent units per household (4)).

The Household Income Security Threshold is composed of the basic needs poverty line per adult equivalent unit established for purposes of this study, multiplied by the actual adult equivalent units per household.

Box 6.2 Income Security Threshold Formula

| Household Income Security Threshold (IST) = |
| $30.79 \times \text{established adult equivalent units per household} |

The income security status of a household is calculated as the ratio of actual household income (AHI) compared to the established household income security threshold (IST). If the ratio is equal to or more than the value of 1, the household is deemed income secure. If the ratio is less than 1, the household is deemed income insecure. For Namatakula village (Table 6.1), the results firstly establish that of the 30 households interviewed 77 per cent (23) are income secure while the remaining 23 per cent (7) are income insecure. For Votualailai village (Table 6.2), results indicate that 89 per cent (25) households are income secure while the remaining 11 per cent (3) are income insecure.
Table 6.1 Household income security data for Namatakula village

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hhold ID</th>
<th>Poverty Line Per AEU (FJ$)</th>
<th>Actual AEU per Hhold</th>
<th>Income Security Threshold (FJ$)</th>
<th>Actual Household Income Security (FJ$) per Hhold</th>
<th>Income per week (FJ$)</th>
<th>Ratio IST/AHI</th>
<th>Ratio AHI/IST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>30.37</td>
<td>8.75</td>
<td>265.74</td>
<td>370.00</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>30.37</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>129.07</td>
<td>110.00</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>30.37</td>
<td>7.25</td>
<td>220.18</td>
<td>302.00</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>30.37</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>129.07</td>
<td>150.00</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>30.37</td>
<td>6.25</td>
<td>189.81</td>
<td>230.00</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>30.37</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>242.96</td>
<td>368.50</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>30.37</td>
<td>6.25</td>
<td>189.1</td>
<td>167.50</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>30.37</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>151.85</td>
<td>186.00</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>30.37</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>151.85</td>
<td>120.00</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>30.37</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>129.07</td>
<td>400.00</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>30.37</td>
<td>6.25</td>
<td>189.81</td>
<td>209.00</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>30.37</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>83.52</td>
<td>210.00</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>30.37</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>136.67</td>
<td>284.00</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>30.37</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>45.56</td>
<td>152.00</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>30.37</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>106.30</td>
<td>245.00</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>30.37</td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td>144.26</td>
<td>320.00</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>30.37</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>136.67</td>
<td>159.00</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>30.37</td>
<td>7.75</td>
<td>235.37</td>
<td>190.00</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>30.37</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>129.07</td>
<td>150.00</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>30.37</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>83.52</td>
<td>170.00</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>30.37</td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td>144.26</td>
<td>80.00</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>30.37</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>68.33</td>
<td>360.00</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>30.37</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>121.48</td>
<td>185.00</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>30.37</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>45.56</td>
<td>252.60</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>30.37</td>
<td>5.25</td>
<td>159.44</td>
<td>170.00</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>30.37</td>
<td>5.25</td>
<td>159.44</td>
<td>482.00</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>30.37</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>113.89</td>
<td>320.00</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>30.37</td>
<td>8.25</td>
<td>250.55</td>
<td>155.00</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>30.37</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>113.89</td>
<td>75.00</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>30.37</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>98.70</td>
<td>399.64</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Fieldwork data from Namatakula household survey, 11-15 February 2007

NB: The World Bank formula for calculating Adult Equivalent Units (AEU) is adopted: 
\[ AEU = (0.5 \times c) + (0.75 \times a) + 0.25 \] [where \( c \) = children and \( a \) = number of adults]
Table 6.2 Household income security data for Votualailai village

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hhold ID</th>
<th>Poverty Line per AEU (FJ$)</th>
<th>Actual Income per Hhold (FJ$)</th>
<th>Income Security Threshold(FJ$)</th>
<th>Actual Household Income per week (FJ$)</th>
<th>Income Security Ratio IST/AHI</th>
<th>AHI/IST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>30.37</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>91.11</td>
<td>19.61</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>30.37</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>242.96</td>
<td>405.00</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>30.37</td>
<td>5.75</td>
<td>174.63</td>
<td>690.00</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>30.37</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>30.37</td>
<td>115.38</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>30.37</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>45.56</td>
<td>80.00</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>30.37</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>182.22</td>
<td>374.00</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>30.37</td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td>144.26</td>
<td>660.00</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>30.37</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>113.89</td>
<td>69.23</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>30.37</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>136.67</td>
<td>334.00</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>30.37</td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td>144.26</td>
<td>492.30</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>30.37</td>
<td>5.25</td>
<td>159.44</td>
<td>350.00</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>30.37</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>91.11</td>
<td>200.00</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>30.37</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>136.67</td>
<td>390.00</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>30.37</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>53.15</td>
<td>85.00</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>30.37</td>
<td>6.75</td>
<td>205.00</td>
<td>275.00</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>30.37</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>129.07</td>
<td>295.00</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>30.37</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>113.89</td>
<td>179.61</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>30.37</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>121.48</td>
<td>23.07</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>30.37</td>
<td>9.25</td>
<td>280.92</td>
<td>1,642.30</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>30.37</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>91.11</td>
<td>285.55</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>30.37</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>129.07</td>
<td>250.00</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>30.37</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>68.33</td>
<td>89.23</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>30.37</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>75.93</td>
<td>296.95</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>30.37</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>98.70</td>
<td>180.00</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>30.37</td>
<td>5.75</td>
<td>174.63</td>
<td>350.00</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>30.37</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>106.30</td>
<td>650.00</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>30.37</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>136.67</td>
<td>185.00</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>30.37</td>
<td>5.50</td>
<td>167.04</td>
<td>801.60</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Fieldwork data from Votualailai household survey, 11-15 February 2007

6.2.4 Income and expenditure calculations for Namatakula and Votualailai households

Further analyses were drawn using actual income and expenditure figures to find out the percentage of households that are able to cover expenses under their current income levels. Both the income security and income and expenditure exercises in this study rely heavily on the accuracy of information given by respondents. It is therefore likely that a measure of over or under reporting of income and expenditure levels by household respondents occurred. With reference to previous research
work (Kurusiga, Kado and Qoloni, 2006), the tendency of non-accurate reporting in terms of household income and expenditure data, is often due to the fact that the respondent does not associate indirect income and expenditure sources as part of the overall equation. This includes receipt of remittances from relatives abroad, rent received from properties owned in urban centres, or gifts given for traditional obligations.

Income and expenditure calculations are stated as a ratio of actual household income compared with actual household expenditure. An income security ratio equal to greater than 1 denotes an income and expenditure secure household, that is one that is living within its means whereas a ratio less than 0 denote those households not able to cover household expenses with current household income levels.

The results in Table 6.3 show that 87 per cent (26) of the households in Namatakula are income secure while the remaining 13 per cent (4) households are income insecure. Parallel observations were also made with regard to the number of households which relied substantially on land and sea resources. A significant proportion (63%) of households appears to rely on natural resources to supplement their livelihoods.

Results for Votualailai (Table 6.4) show 86 per cent (24) out of the households were income secure, while 14 per cent (4) are income insecure. Less than half (43%) of the households rely on land and sea resources.
Table 6.3  Household income & expenditure security data for Namatakula village

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hhold ID</th>
<th>Actual Household Income (FJ$) per week</th>
<th>Actual Household Expenditure per week (FJ$)</th>
<th>AHI/AHE Ratio</th>
<th>Households with 75% of food intake obtained from land and sea Resources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>370.00</td>
<td>208.06</td>
<td>1.78</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>110.00</td>
<td>91.39</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>302.00</td>
<td>131.02</td>
<td>2.30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>150.00</td>
<td>125.96</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>230.00</td>
<td>127.60</td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>368.50</td>
<td>270.25</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>167.50</td>
<td>132.22</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>186.00</td>
<td>200.68</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>120.00</td>
<td>146.44</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>400.00</td>
<td>119.60</td>
<td>3.34</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>209.00</td>
<td>143.65</td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>210.00</td>
<td>97.79</td>
<td>2.15</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>284.00</td>
<td>71.66</td>
<td>3.96</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>152.00</td>
<td>74.40</td>
<td>2.04</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>245.00</td>
<td>60.42</td>
<td>4.05</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>320.00</td>
<td>184.09</td>
<td>1.74</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>159.00</td>
<td>80.15</td>
<td>1.98</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>190.00</td>
<td>124.64</td>
<td>1.52</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>150.00</td>
<td>131.18</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>57.50</td>
<td>135.10</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>80.00</td>
<td>157.88</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>360.00</td>
<td>96.87</td>
<td>3.72</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>185.00</td>
<td>100.76</td>
<td>1.84</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>252.60</td>
<td>94.23</td>
<td>2.68</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>170.00</td>
<td>97.36</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>482.00</td>
<td>176.27</td>
<td>2.73</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>320.00</td>
<td>157.32</td>
<td>2.03</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>155.00</td>
<td>63.27</td>
<td>2.45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>75.00</td>
<td>70.83</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>399.64</td>
<td>162.87</td>
<td>2.45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Fieldwork data from Namatakula household survey, 11-15 February 2007

* X denotes households relying significantly on land and sea resources (This makes up over 75%+ of overall household food intake)*
Table 6.4 Household income & expenditure security data for Votualailai village

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hhold ID</th>
<th>Actual Household Income per week (FJ$)</th>
<th>Actual Household Expenditure per week (FJ$)</th>
<th>Income Security Ratio with 75% of food intake obtained from land and sea Resources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>19.61</td>
<td>111.07</td>
<td>0.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>405.00</td>
<td>78.98</td>
<td>5.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>690.00</td>
<td>268.19</td>
<td>2.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>115.38</td>
<td>148.58</td>
<td>0.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>80.00</td>
<td>58.85</td>
<td>1.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>374.00</td>
<td>125.58</td>
<td>2.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>660.00</td>
<td>263.14</td>
<td>2.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>343.23</td>
<td>132.49</td>
<td>2.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>334.00</td>
<td>180.67</td>
<td>1.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>492.30</td>
<td>101.19</td>
<td>4.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>350.00</td>
<td>63.26</td>
<td>5.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>200.00</td>
<td>121.86</td>
<td>1.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>390.00</td>
<td>153.23</td>
<td>2.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>85.00</td>
<td>82.64</td>
<td>1.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>275.00</td>
<td>93.39</td>
<td>2.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>295.00</td>
<td>111.07</td>
<td>2.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>179.61</td>
<td>118.38</td>
<td>1.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>23.07</td>
<td>61.42</td>
<td>0.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>1,642.30</td>
<td>1,284.04</td>
<td>1.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>285.52</td>
<td>86.48</td>
<td>3.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>250.00</td>
<td>111.38</td>
<td>2.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>89.23</td>
<td>101.46</td>
<td>0.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>500.00</td>
<td>90.72</td>
<td>5.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>180.00</td>
<td>116.92</td>
<td>1.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>350.00</td>
<td>142.49</td>
<td>2.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>650.00</td>
<td>109.47</td>
<td>5.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>185.00</td>
<td>64.51</td>
<td>2.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>801.60</td>
<td>164.88</td>
<td>4.86</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Fieldwork data from Votualailai household survey, 18-2 February 2007

6.2.5 Household income and socio-demographic factors

A comparison of both sets of income-related results for the Namatakula village households indicate that with reported income levels, most households appear income secure from both a basic needs and an income and expenditure perspective.

From the Income and Expenditure assessment results of the four Namatakula households deemed income insecure (Household IDs 8, 9, 20 and 21) were reviewed to try and identify what factors characterised their plight in light of the fact that they reported relying substantially on land and sea resources. It is noted that households
8 and 9 fall just below the security threshold, while households 20 and 21 clearly have low income levels and high rates of household expenditure. A review of data for all four households at Namatakula is revealed in Box 6.3.

Box 6.3 Income insecure households at Namatakula Village

| HH 8: This household reported 2 members in paid employment earning $186 per week to support a family of 8 members. The family does not participate in informal sector activities. |
| HH 9: One family member is in paid employment to support the livelihoods of 7 family members. Total household earnings per week amount to $120 (informal sector activities comprise around 20% of this overall household income figure). Religious and traditional obligations represented 34% of the overall weekly budget. |
| HH 20: This family of 4 members reported one family member in paid employment and one in self-employment, earning a combined weekly income of $57.50. The self-employed household member works as a shopkeeper but wage levels have been reduced substantially since the political crisis of December 2006. |
| HH 21: This family of 7 members has one breadwinner in the family who is in paid employment and earns $80 per week. The family does not participate in informal sector activities. |

From the above review of household income levels and socio-demographic information (Box 6.3), it appears that several factors contribute to the relative ‘hardship’ levels of the four income insecure households at Namatakula:

1. High number of inhabitants per household
2. Low-paid employment
3. Heavy religious and traditional financial obligations
4. Non-participation in other income-earning activities (informal sector)
5. Reduced business activity as a result of recent political crisis.

A review of results for the Votualailai income and expenditure assessment also indicated that 4 households (IDs 1, 4, 18, and 22) were income insecure. Unlike the case of the insecure households identified at Namatakula, only one of the
Votualailai households deemed insecure also relied substantially on land and sea resources.

Box 6.4 Income insecure households at Votualailai Village

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HH 1:</th>
<th>This household reported 1 member in paid employment earning $19.61 per week to support a family of 3 members. This weekly income figure includes current weekly earnings from informal activities.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HH 4:</td>
<td>This family comprises 1 retired family member who derives rental income of $115.38 from a property located across from the Naviti hotel. This family member does not participate in any other income generating activity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HH 18:</td>
<td>This family of 6 members reported one family member earning the household income derived from a retirement pension amounting to $23 per week. Family members did not participate in informal sector activities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HH 22:</td>
<td>This family of 3 members has one breadwinner in the family who is in paid employment and earns $89 per week of which informal sector activities contributes $20 per week.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The above review of household income levels and socio-demographic information (Box 6.4) indicates the following factors may contribute to the relative ‘hardship’ levels of the four income insecure households at Votualailai:

1. Low-paid employment
2. Non-participation in other income-earning activities (informal sector)
3. Reliance on retirement pension as income source

This study shows that it is evident from analysing employment, income level and socio-demographic data that the common denominator characterising the households is the high percentage of household members employed in the tourism industry. Most tourism employees in both villages are involved in relatively low-paid hotel activities (the principal tourism activity is in the housekeeping and food and beverage field with a very low percentage of members involved in management positions). The households also have large families with members of employable age thus assuring combined income levels that render the households as fairly
income secure. This financial security is noticeably assisted by the high incidence of homes involved in subsistence activities. Another factor is that some families receive remittances from family members abroad, more so in the case of Namatakula village which is renowned for ‘producing’ some of Fiji’s best rugby professionals who are engaged in lucrative contracts with overseas clubs. Remittances are either sent as regular payments or to assist families when they are obliged to contribute to traditional family obligations such as the death or marriage of a family member. In terms of other forms of assistance to overall household livelihoods, several families (around 15% of households in Namatakula village) reported receiving all their clothes from relatives overseas which meant that for household expenditure data, a value for clothes, deemed as a basic need is not included.

6.2.6 Impact of tourism related employment on income security of households

In light of the significance of tourism employment in both villages, the follow section examines this relationship more closely. Taking into account the first of the three livelihood strategies identified in Chapter Five, “Tourism as the main employment option”, this section seeks to examine the extent to which households at Namatakula and Votualailai villages rely on tourism employment to maintain income security levels and sustain overall livelihoods.

The impact of direct tourism employment and related activities on village household income security levels was assessed by removing the tourism related income component from total household income. For some households this resulted in the removal of total income. These households are deemed to have total (100%) reliance on income derived from tourism related employment activities. Although
informal activity figures were still maintained in this assessment, it should be noted that most of the activities would also theoretically be affected by a decline in tourism employment activities. A large proportion of informal activities conducted by the households sampled in Namatakula and Votualailai villages (60% and 67% respectively), involve sales of items to residents of the two villages in question. Thus an impact on the household incomes of potential customers would clearly affect their purchasing capacity and a subsequent reduction in sales of informal activity items (for example the sale of *yaqona*, cigarettes and confectionary items).

The results shown in Table 6.5 indicate that removing tourism related income earnings from Namatakula village household income data will render 87 per cent (26) of the households income insecure, as compared to 23 per cent (7) households reported to be insecure with current levels of tourism related income. Among the 26 income insecure households 37 per cent (11) are likely to suffer greatly due to their total reliance on tourism related activities as their income source. The results shown in Table 6.6 indicate that removing tourism related income earnings from Votualailai village household income data will render 68 per cent (19) of the households income insecure, as compared to 11% (3) households reported to be insecure with current levels of tourism related income. Among the 19 income insecure households, 39 per cent are likely to suffer greatly due to their total reliance on tourism related activities as their income sources.

Several issues can be noted from a review of the results from Tables 6.5 and 6.6. Firstly, study overwhelmingly shows that the majority of households sampled at both Namatakula and Votualailai villages rely on tourism sector employment activities to maintain income security levels. Taking away the tourism component
from the income assessment would have a disastrous effect on household income levels and would therefore place most households below estimates for the current rural village basic needs poverty line.

Table 6.5 Household income security and tourism vulnerability data for Namatakula village

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hhold ID</th>
<th>Poverty Line per AEU (FJ$)</th>
<th>Actual AEU Per Hhold</th>
<th>Income Security Threshold (FJ$) IST</th>
<th>Actual Household Income per week (FJ$) AHI</th>
<th>Income Security Ratio AHI/IST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>30.37</td>
<td>8.75</td>
<td>265.74</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>30.37</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>129.07</td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>30.37</td>
<td>7.25</td>
<td>220.18</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>30.37</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>129.07</td>
<td>50.00</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>30.37</td>
<td>6.25</td>
<td>189.81</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>30.37</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>242.96</td>
<td>250.00</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>30.37</td>
<td>6.25</td>
<td>189.81</td>
<td>30.00</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>30.37</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>151.85</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>30.37</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>151.85</td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>30.37</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>129.07</td>
<td>200.00</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>30.37</td>
<td>6.25</td>
<td>189.81</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>30.37</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>83.52</td>
<td>130.00</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>30.37</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>136.67</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>30.37</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>45.56</td>
<td>27.00</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>30.37</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>106.30</td>
<td>58.00</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>30.37</td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td>144.26</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>30.37</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>136.67</td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>30.37</td>
<td>7.75</td>
<td>235.37</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>30.37</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>129.07</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>30.37</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>83.52</td>
<td>135.00</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>30.37</td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td>144.26</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>30.37</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>68.33</td>
<td>50.00</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>30.37</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>121.48</td>
<td>55.00</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>30.37</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>45.56</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>30.37</td>
<td>5.25</td>
<td>159.44</td>
<td>95.00</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>30.37</td>
<td>5.25</td>
<td>159.44</td>
<td>129.00</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>30.37</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>113.89</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>30.37</td>
<td>8.25</td>
<td>250.55</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>30.37</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>113.89</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>30.37</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>98.70</td>
<td>55.00</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Fieldwork data from Namatakula household survey, 11-15 February 2007
Table 6.6 Household income security and tourism vulnerability data for Votualailai village

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hhold ID</th>
<th>Poverty Line per AEU (FJ$)</th>
<th>Actual Income per Hhold AEU</th>
<th>Income Security Threshold (FJ$) IST</th>
<th>Actual Household Income per week (FJ$) AHI</th>
<th>Income Security Ratio AHI/IST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>30.37</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>91.11</td>
<td>9.23</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>30.37</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>242.96</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>30.37</td>
<td>5.75</td>
<td>174.63</td>
<td>250.00</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>30.37</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>30.37</td>
<td>115.38</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>30.37</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>45.56</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>30.37</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>182.22</td>
<td>120.00</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>30.37</td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td>144.26</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>30.37</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>113.89</td>
<td>69.23</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>30.37</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>136.67</td>
<td>75.00</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>30.37</td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td>144.26</td>
<td>92.30</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>30.37</td>
<td>5.25</td>
<td>159.44</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>30.37</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>91.11</td>
<td>54.00</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>30.37</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>136.67</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>30.37</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>53.15</td>
<td>85.00</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>30.37</td>
<td>6.75</td>
<td>205.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>30.37</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>129.07</td>
<td>39.00</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>30.37</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>113.89</td>
<td>179.61</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>30.37</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>121.48</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>30.37</td>
<td>9.25</td>
<td>280.92</td>
<td>1,500.00</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>30.37</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>91.11</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>30.37</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>129.07</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>30.37</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>68.33</td>
<td>89.23</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>30.37</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>75.93</td>
<td>196.95</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>30.37</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>98.70</td>
<td>180.00</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>30.37</td>
<td>5.75</td>
<td>174.63</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>30.37</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>106.30</td>
<td>150.00</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>30.37</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>136.67</td>
<td>35.00</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>30.37</td>
<td>5.50</td>
<td>167.04</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Fieldwork data from Votualailai household survey, 18-22 February 2007

A second observation is that while lacking tourism employment income would render many households in both villages income insecure, a significant proportion of households rely on land and sea resources for food sources (Tables 5.2 and 5.4). The assumption is that the reliance on natural resources would probably increase or certainly be maintained, in times of cash income related hardships, thus ensuring that people have access to natural sources of food.
The third point concerns the vulnerability of households that would be affected should all tourism related income be removed. It is significant to note that with current levels of household income levels, income insecurity in both villages is relatively low despite some hotel employed household members reportedly on reduced working hours. That is, even with a measure of insecurity due to reduced working hours and thus income levels, that is exposure to a degree of vulnerability, a large proportion of households still appear to be income secure. Exact figures of those households affected by reduced working hours at tourism resorts were difficult to obtain as survey respondents were often not those directly affected by the reduction in working hours.

Respondents from the focus group discussions conducted at both villages mentioned that in the days before hotels existed, villagers resorted to selling coconuts, root crops and prawns from the nearby river at the village roadside. With the lack of comparative employment options in the Coral Coast area, selling land and sea produce still appears to be an immediate income generating option apart from the running of small businesses (shops, transport hire services or village canteens) or alternative employment options at the nearby towns of Korolevu, Korotogo or Sigatoka.

### 6.3 HOUSEHOLD FOOD SECURITY

**6.3.1 Definition**

The food security definition adopted for this research is that employed by the Food and Agricultural Organisation (FAO), the World Health Organisation (WHO) and the World Bank.
“Food security exists when all people at all times have both the physical and economic access to safe and nutritious food, according to their preference, to maintain a health and active life” (FAO & WHO 1992)

Food security as a concept has its origins in the mid 1970s during discussions about international shortages in food and the ensuing global food crises. The international focus was initially to try to cope with levels of actual food supplies and assuring the stability in food pricing mechanisms – particularly on basic food items. International negotiations led to the World Food Conference of 1974 and a set of guidelines and arrangements were formalised leading to the promotion of food security and processes of dialogue within the field. Areas in the world which were deemed particularly vulnerable became the focus of programmes and policies in relation to the assurance of food security. By the mid 1990s food security had become a widely recognised term and its importance was acknowledged worldwide from an individual to a global level. The emphasis from the 1990s has further developed to include considerations about the nutritional content of food as incidences of malnutrition in poverty stricken areas of the world have become more and more evident. Thus the definition of food security has also come to encompass maintaining a food safety net and ensuring nutritional balance for an active and healthy existence. Food security was thus a component deemed important and part of overall consideration for ‘human security’ mentioned in the 1994 UNDP Human Development Report.

6.3.2 Food security in Fiji

With fertile soil, a low population to land ratio (although this is fast changing with growing urbanisation particularly with reference to areas such as the Marshall islands) and access to sea resources, the Pacific island populations including Fiji have been fortunate in terms of available food supply. This essentially characterises
why incidences of abject poverty, of which hunger is a principle manifestation, does not exist in the Pacific islands. Food security therefore has not traditionally been an area of concern in terms of supply as in normal times food is plentiful. It is only in times of crisis due to natural disasters such as cyclones, that measures have to be implemented to ensure food is made available to those in need.

Food security has been a concern in Fiji despite there being an abundant food supply. According to the Government of Fiji and UNDP Fiji Poverty Report in 1997, 33 per cent of the population were living in relative poverty and 10 per cent of households were not able to afford a basic diet. This latter measurement implied that those households did not have economic access to a basic food basket. Access to food can also be measured in terms of access to land enabling the planting of food and raising of livestock as well as access to sea resources for fishing activities and the collection of shellfish.

Institutional influences on food security including both government economic policies and political events have characterised the nature of its development. During the 1980s inward looking protectionist policies aimed to achieve food security through domestic production and import substitution wherever possible. However since the 1990s a move toward export oriented growth led to the formulation of an export-led agricultural policy which was identified as encouraging income generating activities and at the same time ensuring food security. The ability to maintain both supply and quality of export products has been very challenging as most farmers in Fiji are smallholders. People in Fiji have access to food essentially by having the economic means to purchase natural resources or groceries (largely imported) or through subsistence agriculture (land
and/or sea resources). Although assessments of accessibility do not take into consideration how healthy the units of analysis are (individuals or households) which would require an examination of the nutritional content of food supplies acquired over a determined period, in addition to the recorded health status of individuals (for example, individual weight and blood tests can be conducted), the notion of assuring food security by having adequate physical and economic access to the minimum nutritional basket of food is the focus of this study.

6.3.3. Measuring Food Security Status

In this study establishing the food security status of village households is held to be in relation to basic needs and economic access. This is achieved by comparing the household disposable income against the food security threshold (FST) (Box 6.5). At the national level various mechanisms exist to enable the measurement of food security including the food balance sheet which gives an indication on the daily per capita food available and the minimum wage which indicates economic access to a minimum basket of food. Other surveys indicate the quantity and quality of diets. Measuring food security is not an easy task as different units of analysis can be utilised and different indicators emphasised. It can potentially be an arduous and painstaking task in terms of data gathering and analysis. For purposes of this study, it was necessary to utilise a means of measuring household food security using methods that were inexpensive and that could be conducted within the allocated time-frame of the research. Thus, measurement took into consideration economic access in terms of a household’s ability to spend money on the minimum requirement of food in relation to other basic needs and physical access in terms of noting which sources the villages derived their food intake from. That is to what extent they relied on land and sea resources and on grocery purchases from food
outlets. This minimum requirement of food per week per household was calculated using items of food listed in the National Fiji Food Basket initially established in 1977 by the Fiji Food and Nutrition Committee. The food basket list exists in two versions, one deemed as a Fijian low cost diet for a family of five people and the other being an Indo-Fijian low cost diet for a family of five. The basket is perceived as valid for both rural and urban households.

For purposes of this study it was necessary to re-cost the food basket items at prices relevant to the period of research (February 2007). The items were costed at two different shopping outlets in Sigatoka town and average prices taken, as well as Sigatoka market, which is where most of the households claimed carrying out their weekly grocery shopping (Table 6.7). The household food security threshold is thus calculated from the cost of the basic food basket and the average cost of other basic needs on a weekly basis. As with calculations of income security, basic needs are those covering costs of water, shelter, clothes, electricity and fuel for cooking. In terms of household food security status, a ratio greater than the value of 1 indicates food security, and that below the value of 1 indicates the converse, food insecurity.

The Fiji food basket is costed for an average Fijian household of 5 individuals or 4 Adult Equivalent Units. For purposes of this study the World Bank (WB) definition of adult equivalent units is utilised:

\[
\text{Adult Equivalent Units} = (0.5 \cdot c + 0.75 \cdot a + 0.25) \\
\text{(where } a = \text{adults and } c = \text{children})
\]

The established food basket cost ($83.62) is divided by 4 Adult Equivalent Units to indicate the basic nutritious food needs per Adult Equivalent Unit per week ($20.91). This figure is multiplied by the actual Adult Equivalent Units per household to obtain the actual food basket needs per household and then added to
the cost of individual household basic needs to establish the household food security threshold. The household food security threshold is then compared to actual household income as a ratio to establish the food security status per household.

Box 6.5 Food Security Threshold Formula

| Household Food Security Threshold (FST) = |
| $20.91 \times \text{established adult equivalent units per household} |

Table 6.7 Fijian Low Cost Diet for a Family of Five for a Week

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Quantity required per week</th>
<th>2007</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sharps</td>
<td>2.8kg</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sugar</td>
<td>1 kg</td>
<td>0.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rice</td>
<td>4.1kg</td>
<td>5.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flour</td>
<td>2.1kg</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bread</td>
<td>1kg</td>
<td>1.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noodles</td>
<td>2 pkts</td>
<td>0.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F/Cr Milk</td>
<td>1 kg</td>
<td>9.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tinned Meat</td>
<td>2 tins</td>
<td>5.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tinned Fish</td>
<td>3 tins</td>
<td>4.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mutton</td>
<td>1.8 kg</td>
<td>11.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fresh fish</td>
<td>1 kg</td>
<td>6.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eggs (55g = 1egg)</td>
<td>110g</td>
<td>0.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baigan</td>
<td>2.1kg</td>
<td>2.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beans</td>
<td>500g</td>
<td>2.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue peas</td>
<td>700g</td>
<td>0.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tubua</td>
<td>2 kg</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bele</td>
<td>1kg</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rourou</td>
<td>1.5kg</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese cabbage</td>
<td>500g</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dhal</td>
<td>1.1kg</td>
<td>1.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pumpkin</td>
<td>1.1kg</td>
<td>1.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carrots</td>
<td>500g</td>
<td>1.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coconut</td>
<td>8=904g</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cassava</td>
<td>17kg</td>
<td>10.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curry Powder</td>
<td>170g</td>
<td>1.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooking Oil</td>
<td>1000ml</td>
<td>3.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Butter</td>
<td>125g</td>
<td>0.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tea</td>
<td>200g</td>
<td>1.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>83.62</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Food items are those established by Fiji Food and Nutrition Committee. Prices listed are as costed at Sigatoka Town in February 2007.

6.3.4 Food Security Status

The study shows that from an economic and physical access perspective, 83 per cent (25) of households in Namatakula are food secure while 17 per cent are food
insecure. A slightly higher proportion (93%) of the households in Votualailai (Table 6.9) are food secure while only 7 per cent are food insecure.

Table 6.8  Household food security data for Namatakula village

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hhold</th>
<th>Actual AEU</th>
<th>Actual Food Basket needs per Hhold</th>
<th>Basic Food needs per Hhold</th>
<th>Food Security Income per week (FJD)</th>
<th>Hhold Security Status per Hhold</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>8.75</td>
<td>182.96</td>
<td>27.30</td>
<td>210.26</td>
<td>370.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>88.87</td>
<td>16.38</td>
<td>105.25</td>
<td>110.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>7.25</td>
<td>151.60</td>
<td>26.16</td>
<td>177.76</td>
<td>302.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>88.87</td>
<td>49.23</td>
<td>138.10</td>
<td>150.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>6.25</td>
<td>130.69</td>
<td>11.97</td>
<td>142.66</td>
<td>230.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>167.28</td>
<td>69.69</td>
<td>236.97</td>
<td>368.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>6.25</td>
<td>130.69</td>
<td>8.36</td>
<td>139.05</td>
<td>167.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>104.55</td>
<td>28.48</td>
<td>133.03</td>
<td>186.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>104.55</td>
<td>28.99</td>
<td>133.54</td>
<td>120.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>88.87</td>
<td>14.23</td>
<td>103.10</td>
<td>400.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>6.25</td>
<td>130.69</td>
<td>19.22</td>
<td>149.91</td>
<td>209.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>57.50</td>
<td>17.06</td>
<td>74.56</td>
<td>210.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>94.10</td>
<td>10.73</td>
<td>104.83</td>
<td>284.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>31.37</td>
<td>19.83</td>
<td>51.20</td>
<td>152.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>73.19</td>
<td>11.58</td>
<td>84.77</td>
<td>245.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td>99.32</td>
<td>21.45</td>
<td>120.77</td>
<td>320.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>94.10</td>
<td>19.14</td>
<td>113.24</td>
<td>159.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>7.75</td>
<td>162.05</td>
<td>26.53</td>
<td>188.58</td>
<td>190.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>88.87</td>
<td>25.19</td>
<td>114.06</td>
<td>150.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>57.50</td>
<td>27.00</td>
<td>84.50</td>
<td>57.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td>99.32</td>
<td>18.85</td>
<td>118.17</td>
<td>80.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>47.05</td>
<td>18.91</td>
<td>65.96</td>
<td>360.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>83.64</td>
<td>14.31</td>
<td>97.95</td>
<td>185.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>31.37</td>
<td>22.78</td>
<td>54.15</td>
<td>252.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>5.25</td>
<td>109.78</td>
<td>21.31</td>
<td>131.09</td>
<td>170.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>5.25</td>
<td>109.78</td>
<td>39.22</td>
<td>149.00</td>
<td>482.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>78.41</td>
<td>18.46</td>
<td>96.87</td>
<td>320.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>8.25</td>
<td>172.51</td>
<td>11.31</td>
<td>183.82</td>
<td>155.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>78.41</td>
<td>12.85</td>
<td>91.26</td>
<td>75.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>67.96</td>
<td>66.00</td>
<td>133.96</td>
<td>399.64</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Fieldwork data from Namatakula household survey, 11-15 February 2007
Table 6.9  Household food security data for Votualailai village

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hhold ID</th>
<th>Actual AEU per Hhold</th>
<th>Actual Food Basket Per Hhold</th>
<th>Basic Food Needs per Hhold</th>
<th>Security Threshold FST</th>
<th>Food Security Income per week (FJ$)</th>
<th>Food Security Status Hhold per Hhold</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>62.73</td>
<td>14.86</td>
<td>77.59</td>
<td>19.61</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>167.28</td>
<td>19.50</td>
<td>186.78</td>
<td>405.00</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.75</td>
<td>120.23</td>
<td>36.28</td>
<td>156.51</td>
<td>690.00</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>20.91</td>
<td>18.84</td>
<td>39.75</td>
<td>115.38</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>31.37</td>
<td>14.54</td>
<td>45.91</td>
<td>80.00</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>125.46</td>
<td>18.69</td>
<td>144.15</td>
<td>374.00</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td>99.32</td>
<td>18.68</td>
<td>118.00</td>
<td>660.00</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>78.41</td>
<td>12.42</td>
<td>90.83</td>
<td>343.23</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>94.10</td>
<td>21.73</td>
<td>115.83</td>
<td>334.00</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td>99.32</td>
<td>14.23</td>
<td>113.55</td>
<td>492.30</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>5.25</td>
<td>109.78</td>
<td>15.38</td>
<td>125.16</td>
<td>350.00</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>62.73</td>
<td>27.50</td>
<td>90.23</td>
<td>200.00</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>94.10</td>
<td>15.23</td>
<td>109.33</td>
<td>390.00</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>36.59</td>
<td>16.15</td>
<td>52.74</td>
<td>85.00</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>6.75</td>
<td>141.14</td>
<td>16.61</td>
<td>157.75</td>
<td>275.00</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>88.87</td>
<td>12.92</td>
<td>101.79</td>
<td>295.00</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>78.41</td>
<td>13.23</td>
<td>91.64</td>
<td>179.61</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>83.64</td>
<td>11.77</td>
<td>95.41</td>
<td>23.07</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>9.25</td>
<td>193.42</td>
<td>33.69</td>
<td>227.11</td>
<td>1,642.30</td>
<td>7.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>62.73</td>
<td>10.61</td>
<td>73.34</td>
<td>285.52</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>88.87</td>
<td>10.78</td>
<td>99.65</td>
<td>250.00</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>47.05</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>54.05</td>
<td>89.23</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>52.28</td>
<td>12.92</td>
<td>65.20</td>
<td>500.00</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>67.96</td>
<td>17.31</td>
<td>85.27</td>
<td>180.00</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>5.75</td>
<td>120.23</td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>140.23</td>
<td>350.00</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>73.19</td>
<td>21.23</td>
<td>94.42</td>
<td>650.00</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>94.10</td>
<td>18.00</td>
<td>112.10</td>
<td>185.00</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>5.50</td>
<td>115.01</td>
<td>20.77</td>
<td>135.78</td>
<td>801.60</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Fieldwork data from Votualailai household survey, 18-22 February

6.3.5 Impact of tourism related employment on food security of households

This section seeks to examine the extent to which households in the study area rely on tourism employment to maintain food security levels and sustain overall livelihoods. The impact of tourism employment on the food security status of village households was considered to be the impact of tourism on the household’s economic access to the minimum household food basket requirements. This was assessed by creating a hypothetical scenario by removing tourism related income
components from household income calculations. For some households this had the
effect of removing total household income altogether. These households are deemed
as having total (100%) reliance on income derived from tourism related
employment activities.

6.3.6 Food security and tourism vulnerability status

The study shows in Table 6.10 that removing tourism related income earnings from
Namatakula household income data results in 83 per cent (25) of the households
becoming food insecure, as compared to 17 per cent (5) households reported to be
insecure with current levels of tourism related income. Among the 25 food insecure
households, 11 households are deemed likely to suffer greatly due to their
substantial total reliance on tourism related activities.

Table 6.11 shows that removing tourism related income earnings from Votualailai
household income data will render 68 per cent (9) households food insecure, as
compared to 7 per cent (2) households reported to be insecure with current levels of
tourism related income. Among the 19 income insecure households, 11 households
are likely to suffer greatly from food insecurity due to their substantial (100%)
reliance on tourism related activities.

6.3.7 Review of results

A review of the results from tables 6.9 and 6.10. reveal several factors. Firstly, the
figures show that the majority of households sampled rely on tourism sector
employment activities to maintain food security levels. Taking away the tourism
component from the income assessment would have a significant effect on the
overall food security status of village households. It is however noted that this
analysis compares actual cash income levels with basic nutritional food basket requirements per household and does not factor in the subsistence component of livelihoods per household.

Table 6.10 Household food security and tourism vulnerability data for Namatakula village

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hhold ID</th>
<th>Actual AEU per Hhold</th>
<th>Actual Food Basket needs Per Hhold</th>
<th>Basic Food Needs Per Hhold</th>
<th>Food Security Threshold FST</th>
<th>Hhold Income per week (FJ$)</th>
<th>Food Security Status per Hhold</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>8.75</td>
<td>182.96</td>
<td>27.30</td>
<td>210.26</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>88.87</td>
<td>16.38</td>
<td>105.25</td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>7.25</td>
<td>151.60</td>
<td>26.16</td>
<td>177.76</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>88.87</td>
<td>49.23</td>
<td>138.10</td>
<td>50.00</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>6.25</td>
<td>130.69</td>
<td>11.97</td>
<td>142.66</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>167.28</td>
<td>69.69</td>
<td>236.97</td>
<td>250.00</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>6.25</td>
<td>130.69</td>
<td>8.36</td>
<td>139.05</td>
<td>30.00</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>104.55</td>
<td>28.48</td>
<td>133.03</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>104.55</td>
<td>28.99</td>
<td>133.54</td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>88.87</td>
<td>14.23</td>
<td>103.10</td>
<td>200.00</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>6.25</td>
<td>130.69</td>
<td>19.22</td>
<td>149.91</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>57.50</td>
<td>17.06</td>
<td>74.56</td>
<td>130.00</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>94.10</td>
<td>10.73</td>
<td>104.83</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>31.37</td>
<td>19.83</td>
<td>51.20</td>
<td>27.00</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>73.19</td>
<td>11.58</td>
<td>84.77</td>
<td>58.00</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td>99.32</td>
<td>21.45</td>
<td>120.77</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>94.10</td>
<td>19.14</td>
<td>113.24</td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>7.75</td>
<td>162.05</td>
<td>26.53</td>
<td>188.58</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>88.87</td>
<td>25.19</td>
<td>114.06</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>57.50</td>
<td>27.00</td>
<td>84.50</td>
<td>135.00</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td>99.32</td>
<td>18.85</td>
<td>118.17</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>47.05</td>
<td>18.91</td>
<td>65.96</td>
<td>50.00</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>83.64</td>
<td>14.31</td>
<td>97.95</td>
<td>55.00</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>31.37</td>
<td>22.78</td>
<td>54.15</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>5.25</td>
<td>109.78</td>
<td>21.31</td>
<td>131.09</td>
<td>95.00</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>5.25</td>
<td>109.78</td>
<td>39.22</td>
<td>149.00</td>
<td>129.00</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>78.41</td>
<td>18.46</td>
<td>96.87</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>8.25</td>
<td>172.51</td>
<td>11.31</td>
<td>183.82</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>78.41</td>
<td>12.85</td>
<td>91.26</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>67.96</td>
<td>66.00</td>
<td>133.96</td>
<td>55.00</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Fieldwork data from Namatakula household survey, 11-15 February 2007
Table 6.11  Household food security and tourism vulnerability data for Votualailia village

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hhold ID</th>
<th>Actual AEU per Hhold</th>
<th>Actual Food Basket needs per Hhold</th>
<th>Basic Food Needs per Hhold</th>
<th>Food Security Threshold (FJ$)</th>
<th>Hhold Income per week (FJ$)</th>
<th>Food Security Status per Hhold</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>62.73</td>
<td>14.86</td>
<td>77.59</td>
<td>9.23</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>167.28</td>
<td>19.50</td>
<td>186.78</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.75</td>
<td>120.23</td>
<td>36.28</td>
<td>156.51</td>
<td>250.00</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>20.91</td>
<td>18.84</td>
<td>39.75</td>
<td>115.38</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>31.37</td>
<td>14.54</td>
<td>45.91</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>125.46</td>
<td>18.69</td>
<td>144.15</td>
<td>120.00</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td>99.32</td>
<td>18.68</td>
<td>118.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>78.41</td>
<td>12.42</td>
<td>90.83</td>
<td>69.23</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>94.10</td>
<td>21.73</td>
<td>115.83</td>
<td>75.00</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td>99.32</td>
<td>14.23</td>
<td>113.55</td>
<td>92.30</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>5.25</td>
<td>109.78</td>
<td>15.38</td>
<td>125.16</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>62.73</td>
<td>27.50</td>
<td>90.23</td>
<td>54.00</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>94.10</td>
<td>15.23</td>
<td>109.33</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>36.59</td>
<td>16.15</td>
<td>52.74</td>
<td>85.00</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>6.75</td>
<td>141.14</td>
<td>16.61</td>
<td>157.75</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>88.87</td>
<td>12.92</td>
<td>101.79</td>
<td>39.00</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>78.41</td>
<td>13.23</td>
<td>91.64</td>
<td>179.61</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>83.64</td>
<td>11.77</td>
<td>95.41</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>9.25</td>
<td>193.42</td>
<td>33.69</td>
<td>227.11</td>
<td>1,500.00</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>62.73</td>
<td>10.61</td>
<td>73.34</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>88.87</td>
<td>10.78</td>
<td>99.65</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>47.05</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>54.05</td>
<td>89.23</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>52.28</td>
<td>12.92</td>
<td>65.20</td>
<td>196.95</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>67.96</td>
<td>17.31</td>
<td>85.27</td>
<td>180.00</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>5.75</td>
<td>120.23</td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>140.23</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>73.19</td>
<td>21.23</td>
<td>94.42</td>
<td>300.00</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>94.10</td>
<td>18.00</td>
<td>112.10</td>
<td>35.00</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>5.50</td>
<td>115.01</td>
<td>20.77</td>
<td>135.78</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Fieldwork data from Votualailai household survey, 18-22 February 2007

The study noted earlier (Table 6.3) that some households from Namatakula rely significantly (reportedly more than 75 per cent of food intake) on land and sea resources for consumption needs. Comparing households identified above, with incidences of those identified as food insecure the study shows that 47 per cent of the households are both food insecure and income insecure (with the subtraction of the tourism income component) even though there is substantial reliance on natural
resources. This indicates that a significant characteristic of food insecurity is through reduced access to grocery items due to insufficient income levels.

It can be concluded that in times of a reduction in cash income levels most households will become food insecure in relation to economic access measures, but not in relation to physical access to land and sea sources. If the subsistence component of livelihoods was quantified and included in household income calculations, the level of food insecurity would be lower than that identified in current household results. In terms of variance, household food insecure figures for Namatakula would be adjusted to a range of 11-25 households deemed insecure while the variance for Votualailai would be 10-19 households. Therefore with reduced cash income levels, some technically food insecure households will be better off if physical access to land and sea sources is calculated in food security calculations.

6.3.8 Coping strategies: emergent themes from focus group discussions

The focus group discussions held with the women’s groups in both villages produced the following results in terms of identified coping strategies in relation to household food security.

1. Requesting

This form of coping strategy known commonly as “kerekere” or requesting (Chapter Four, 4.5.2) of items (more commonly food items) from kith or kin, is widely practiced by household members when running short of basic food and drink items such as sugar, tea or milk. There is little social stigma attached to this gesture as kerekere is viewed as a long-standing traditional trait that is testimony to the strong kinship ties within village communities.
2. Informal sector activities

Among the village households that participate in informal activities (see Chapter Five, 5.4.3), the level of cash income earned per week is cited as helping with the payment of grocery bills, school fees and utility bills. Some women claimed that hardships in coping with livelihoods prompted them to start income generating activities while others stated that the reason for their informal activity came from identifying consumer needs within the village.

3. Prioritising children’s meals

Skipping meals or living on cassava (root crop) and drau ni moli (lemon leaf tea) were identified as ways of coping with food shortages. This sentiment was prevalent for only a couple of households that had many young children or those headed by single parents.

4. Credit arrangements

Establishing lines of credit or dinau at local village “canteens” or home-operated shops is a common strategy employed by households in terms of coping with shortages in foodstuffs and other household necessities.

5. Entrusting children to other family members

For some large households with low cash income flows, it was perceived more practical and affordable to send offspring to close family members residing in urban centres such as Suva or Nadi. Education was the principal reason given for such decisions although clearly having ‘one less mouth to feed’ eased the burden of household income and food security. This gesture was also seen as complying with the traditional custom of vaka menemene whereby a close family member brings up
the offspring of another member as their own. Commonly practised by biological grandparents of the offspring, this responsibility is also taken up by other relatives such as aunts, uncles or cousins of the involved party.

6.4 NATURAL RESOURCE BASE SUSTAINABILITY AND VILLAGE LIVELIHOODS

6.4.1 General

“Coastal areas are of vital importance to Fiji’s society and its national development. Most of the urban centres and a vast majority of villages are located on the shore, along with much of the population, agriculture, industry and commerce. Income from tourism and fisheries is directly tied to the condition and productivity of critical ecosystems and shoreline features such as coral reefs, beaches, seagrass beds and mangroves”.

Source: (Hale L and Robadue Jnr DD, 2002)

The above excerpt illustrates the significance accorded to the sustainability of natural resources in Fiji, a stance reflected by a whole panoply of reports that have emerged within the past decade on natural resources, their significance, management, development and placing within various Fiji Government Strategic Development Plans. Fiji is a Small Island Developing State and as such its economic and related political functions and outcomes are dictated largely by its geographic location and natural stock of land and sea resources. For this reason, much emphasis has surrounded an enormous amount of research and problem solving in regard to promoting the sustainability of the island’s natural resource base.

Coastal resources in particular are deemed an important basis for stability and sustained growth in Fiji. Within the framework of the current research, this section will briefly examine the importance of natural resources in coastal areas such the
Coral Coast stretch of Nadroga/Navosa, in terms of their importance in the livelihoods of coastal traditional village life and in relation to their overall conservation.

6.4.2 Traditional economy

It has been estimated that around 90 per cent of the total Fiji population can be considered as ‘coastal dwellers’ (Leslie and Ratokalou, 2001) as most urban centres and a large number of villages are located along shorelines. Thus coastal areas support population, agricultural, industrial and commercial activities alike. In this sense all economic activities have a part to play in ensuring the proper management and sustainability of coastal resources. Coastal resources are particularly important for traditional livelihoods as illustrated in this study showing that a large proportion of households participate in subsistence activities to support livelihoods (Table 6.12). Access to land and sea resources not only assures a basis for food security levels but also contributes to income security through the sale of either land or sea produce.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YES</th>
<th>29 (97%)</th>
<th>22 (79%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NO</td>
<td>1 (3%)</td>
<td>6 (21%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.4.3 Fishing activities

Most of Fiji’s coastal villages rely on subsistence fishing for a large part of their livelihood strategy. This provides villagers with a ready source of food, again assuring food security levels and a substantial nutritional intake of protein. The findings from this study (Table 6.13) illustrate the number of households which still
participate in fishing activities as part of livelihood strategies thus positively contributing to overall food security levels. Almost a decade ago results from the Ministry of Agriculture, Fisheries and Forests data (MAFF 1999) indicated that 17,800 metric tonnes of finfish and non-fin fish were caught and consumed by subsistence fisherman. This volume represented twice that reported for artisanal fishery.

Table 6.13 Number of households from Namatakula and Votualailai villages participating in subsistence fishing activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Namatakula</th>
<th>Votualailai</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>25 (83%)</td>
<td>21 (75%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO</td>
<td>5 (17%)</td>
<td>7 (25%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mangrove areas also provide a significant area of access for food sources for coastal village communities, as mangrove ecosystems support a range of different marine life such as crabs, prawns, fish and molluscs. Mangrove areas also provide firewood and harbour several types of flora that are used for traditional Fijian medicinal purposes. All households in Namatakula and Votualailai villages utilised Fijian medicinal plant extracts to cure common ailments such as colds and fever.

Coral reefs, of which the Coral Coast has the longest stretch of fringing reef, serve as a coastal protection mechanism as well as a critical habitat for products used by the local population. Both subsistence and artisanal fishing activities have throughout the years caused a reduction of certain fish and other marine species. Traditional knowledge concerning over-fishing problems is well grounded in villages and the households were all aware of the need to implement traditional restrictions or tabu on sea areas suffering from depletion of marine stocks. Both
villages were observing traditional *tabu* (with timeframes of 5 years) on selected traditional fishing (*qoliqoli*) areas.

6.4.4 Agriculture

Subsistence agriculture is still practised widely all over Fiji. This study shows that farming activities in the two villages are based on variations of staple root crop planting (dalo, cassava, sweet potatoes and yams), tree crops (bananas, breadfruit, mangoes, pawpaws and other fruit trees) and vegetables. The study observed that the system of communal farming activities or *solesolevaki* was fast declining and was one way of ensuring the sustainability of farming practices in the village. As with sea resources, agricultural resources complement household food security needs as well as providing income generating possibilities in the sale of these items at the village community locations, or at local markets. Table 6.14 shows the number of households still actively involved in agricultural activities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>NAMATAKULA</th>
<th>VOTUALAILAI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>29 (97%)</td>
<td>22 (79%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO</td>
<td>1 (3%)</td>
<td>6 (21%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.4.5 Threats to natural resources in Coastal areas

The apparent significance of maintaining access to land and sea resources is evident for both Namatakula and Votualailai villages, however it is important to note some of the recent issues that have arisen in the past decade concerning threats to the natural resource base. Integrated Coastal Management programmes (ICM) and Marine Protected Area initiatives (MPA) have been implemented along the Coral
Coast area in the past few years including the area around the two villages, in line with concern for the conservation of coastal resources.

6.4.5.1 Overfishing

Overfishing has been a major concern for coastal areas such as the Coral Coast. The households in the study were well aware of the dangers of over-fishing and as stated in 6.4.3 were aware of the implementation of traditional non-fishing zones or tabu as well as MPA programmes. The selling of undersized fish and crustaceans from mangroves, including the cutting of mangrove areas were activities carried out by villages along the Coral Coast in the past few years, including those in the study. Dying coral is a problem encountered by some villages along the coast. The main causes are considered to be saltation from upland erosion, sale of coral, flooding and freshwater input (Fiji National Workshop on Integrated Coastal Management). The use of traditional fish poisons is also a cause. Ceasing to use this method of fishing was mentioned several times by village households as being a way of preventing the dying of some intertidal species and ensuring the sustainability of fishing stocks in the coastal marine areas.

6.4.5.2 Coastal erosion and pollution

Coastal erosion seems to be one of the main concerns for villages along the Coral Coast such as those in the study. Both villages claimed that coastal erosion was a problem especially during storm surges. The storms literally had the effect of damaging existing sea walls, washing away homes and caused much damage to the erosion of the shoreline. Pollution was also a factor concerning community residents of the villages. Although Namatakula and Votualailai reported the hotels currently assisting in rubbish collection services, some households complained that
villagers still disposed their rubbish along the coastline assuming the tide would wash it away. Similarly some rubbish and sewage disposal was claimed as still being disposed of by hotels which was a major cause of pollution in their coastal waters.

6.4.5.2 Agricultural activities

Inappropriate land use practices have led to soil erosion and land degradation in some coastal areas in Fiji (burning of cane and planting on marginal hills and steep areas). Logging is still carried out upstream into the interior Navosa highlands and is thought to be a major cause of soil erosion. Some households in the study claimed that they mostly implemented shifting agriculture and crop rotation as a means of conserving the village plantations. Women as well as men participate in planting activities although many women stated during the focus group meetings that full time employment activities outside the village meant less time spent tending crops. Some women reported having stopped tending crops altogether for the above reason. This task was instead undertaken by other (usually younger) family members to enable the household to maintain its access to land resources.

6.4.6 The impact of tourism on natural resources

Although the direct impact of tourism on income security and food security levels appears generally positive in relation to the villages understudied, evidence in recent years (Levett and McNally, 2003) has shown that at the aggregate level tourism related development has damaged environmental carrying capacities. There have been reported damages to coastal ecosystems (coral reefs and mangroves) and the production of non-biodegradable solid waste. Studies have focused on the Coral Coast areas in recent years as it has the largest concentration of tourism
developments (Morton and Raj 1980, Pitman, Chung and Smith 2001 and Levett and McNally 2003). Although programmes and initiatives to address some of the identified coastal environmental problems have been addressed as a result of these types of studies carried out thus far, there is still “the need for further work to fill gaps and complete the picture” (Levett and McNally, 2003).

The study also addresses responses from the tourism industry that includes the management staff at two of the major hotel resorts in the Coral coast research area that are directly involved with the employment of Namatakula and Votualailai villagers. Questions directed to them were in relation to the involvement of tourism developments in addressing the conservation of the local environment.

For purposes of this study the respondents are referred to as Manager X and Manager Y for purposes of confidentiality. According to Manager X, one of the positive effects that tourism developments had on local communities included improved infrastructure such as the water supply. Also cited was the case of shared facilities such as waste management. The Manager also noted that in some instances tourism developments held awareness and update workshops with village elders and landowners on environmental issues such as addressing matters concerning traditional fishing waters (qoliqoli), fishing restrictions (tabu), soil erosion and forestry practices which may impact negatively on the area.

Manager Y, stated that the hotel generally encouraged nearby villagers and landowners to return to tending land again and planting crops and vegetables. It had also introduced a policy whereby it would favour purchasing produce from nearby villages. The above Manager also stated that the sea area in front of the hotel had
been made into a marine reserve with coral planting being instituted. The throwing of garbage in the seafront had been eradicated and the sewerage systems which had previously flowed into the sea had been halted.

In view of the perspectives from both tourism Management stakeholders, it is essential that tourism developments continue to be cognisant of the need to protect the very assets that tourists come to visit Fiji for. Fortunately, as stated by Levett and McNally (2003), “Fiji’s environment still looks beautiful and for the most part healthy and unspoilt”.

6.5 HOUSEHOLD PERCEPTIONS: WELL-BEING, VULNERABILITY AND EMPOWERMENT

6.5.1 General

Apart from being directed questions to elicit quantitative responses about their livelihood functions, the study also obtained questions in relation to household perceptions on the current lifestyles and respective levels of satisfaction. The study was therefore able to review community perspectives on well-being, vulnerability and empowerment. Essentially, in terms of overall livelihoods, the framework and strategies identified in Chapter Five (5.6.3) together with the main livelihood outcomes examined in this Chapter assist in qualifying the responses to the three key human states of being identified above.

6.5.2 Well-being

The study concluded that welfare levels (including satisfaction of the basic needs of an individual such as the provision of shelter, water, food, clothes and fuel) are generally satisfied. Thus concern shifts from seeking to assess basic levels of
survival, to examining the degree to which individuals are able to improve their livelihoods, or levels of well-being.

Three key areas are identified as contributing significantly to household well-being in the villages. These are household economic status, household health status and access to sufficient levels of nutritious food. It was earlier observed (6.2.3) that the majority of households in both villages were income secure from both a basic needs and an income and expenditure perspective. Technically, in terms of cash income levels most of the households are financially capable of sustaining the well-being of its occupants.

Table 6.15 Perceptions of household income sufficiency

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Households</th>
<th>Sufficient</th>
<th>Partly Sufficient</th>
<th>Not Sufficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Namatakula</td>
<td>9 (30%)</td>
<td>7 (23%)</td>
<td>14 (47%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Votualailai</td>
<td>19 (68%)</td>
<td>3 (11%)</td>
<td>6 (21%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The above table (Table 6.15) shows that in Namatakula village only 30 per cent (9) households perceive their household incomes as being sufficient while the remaining 70 per cent stating that income levels were partly or not sufficient. Votualailai perceptions were more consistent with the income security status of households as 68 per cent (19) agree that income levels are sufficient. The varying results relating to Namatakula households can be attributed to a variety of reasons. First, is the likelihood that households either over-reported income earnings or under-reported expenditure levels. Secondly, the study observed that while there was acknowledgement that hotels provided employment opportunities for village households it was also felt that income-levels from tourism related work remained
low (that is poor pay) with long working hours. Thus in proving that although income levels may be proved adequate through an income security analysis, this assessment might have little correlation to a respondent’s perspective.

While the health status of household individuals was not quantitatively assessed, households were asked how often members fell sick, where they went to for medical consultations or treatment and whether they were satisfied with the health services rendered. The results for the two villages are illustrated in Tables 6.16 and 6.17.

Table 6.16  Frequency of household members falling sick

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Households</th>
<th>Seldom</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Frequently</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Namatakula</td>
<td>27 (90%)</td>
<td>1 (3%)</td>
<td>2 (7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Votualailai</td>
<td>24 (86%)</td>
<td>4 (14%)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.17  Medical facility consulted

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Households</th>
<th>Korolevu Health Centre</th>
<th>Private doctor at Sigatoka</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Namatakula</td>
<td>23 (77%)</td>
<td>6 (20%)</td>
<td>1 (3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Votualailai</td>
<td>22 (79%)</td>
<td>6 (21%)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.16 indicates that household members were rarely ill. Respondents from both villages stated they were generally satisfied with medical services in the area. As seen in Table 6.17 the majority of the households attended the government funded Koroloveu Health centre while a small proportion visited private doctors in Sigatoka town and other medical facilities. All households reported utilising traditional Fijian herbal remedies for common ailments.
A medical practitioner working in the Nadroga/Navosa area stated that there were an increasing number of ailments in village communities resulting from lifestyle changes. These include changing eating habits, influenced to a large extent by involvement with the tourism industry, as the industry exposed individuals to a totally different social framework.

In some villages in the area there were high incidences of social problems within marriages due to household members’ involvement with the tourism industry and the social habits associated with it. The level of sexually transmitted diseases had increased in some village communities as well as levels of teenage pregnancies. The practitioner felt that there was the need to continue promoting awareness workshops at the local community level on basic health issues: sexual behaviour and sexually transmitted diseases, family planning clinics, well-women clinics, basic concepts of household health and hygiene, and so forth.

In terms of access to sufficient levels of nutritious food, household results for food security statuses, revealed earlier (6.3.4) show that the majority of households are food secure. Apart from having sufficient income levels to sustain basic food intake requirements, households also utilise land and sea resources as part of their livelihood strategies.

6.5.3 Vulnerability

Levels or perceptions of vulnerability in relation to households at both villages are closely linked to notions of the sustainability of household livelihoods, since the concept of ‘sustainable livelihoods’ implies the ability to sustain livelihoods in the
face of shocks and stresses. There are limits to this notion as any extreme shock or stress would render even the most stable of livelihoods unsustainable, despite the degree of resilience of the party concerned.

Two main features in terms of household livelihoods can be examined in relation to vulnerability. The first is the income and food security statuses. Under current levels of reduced working hours, households from both villages employed by the tourism sector, are income and food secure. This indicates that under certain levels of vulnerability caused by internal shocks (political crisis of December 2006) households are still able to sustain livelihoods. The scenario presented earlier (Tables 6.5, 6.6, 6.9 and 6.10) which removed the tourism component of livelihood income levels, rendered the majority of households insecure in terms of income and food security. While this extreme situation would create a potentially large problem for household livelihoods, it must be noted that subsistence activities act as a livelihood safety net for the communities studied.

The second feature in terms of the vulnerability of household livelihoods is the exposure of households to natural disasters (Table 6.18). In Namataku village, 80 per cent (24) of households had experienced some level of damage caused either by the last tidal wave to hit the area in 2002, or by cyclones, the latest being Cyclone Ami. In Votualailai 61 per cent (17) of households experienced damage to property as a result of the last tidal wave. In summary, due to their coastal location both villages are particularly vulnerable to incidences of sea flooding. Therefore, natural disasters remain a major potential threat to household livelihoods at both villages. However, statistically, and based on historical evidence, the likelihood of natural disasters happening frequently (for example annually) is relatively low.
Table 6.18  Households affected by natural disasters

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Households</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Namatakula</td>
<td>24 (80%)</td>
<td>6 (20%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Votualailai</td>
<td>17 (61%)</td>
<td>11 (39%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.5.4 Empowerment

6.5.4.1 General

The concept of empowerment carries with it the notion of having the power or confidence to have control over one’s life or situation. While respondents in both village surveys were not directly asked how “empowered” they felt in terms of their livelihoods, the results obtained from in-depth village interviews and focus group discussions illustrated empowerment related perceptions held by villagers in regard to different livelihood aspects. The following sections describe sentiments held by those interviewed.

6.5.4.2 Employment and financial security

It was observed that the women employed by nearby hotels considered themselves fortunate to have regular income levels. Several women admitted that as they were the main breadwinners in the family and “held the purse-strings” it was up to them to solve household problems. This clearly indicates that tourism employment empowers women financially and this had a direct effect on their social status and household responsibilities within the village. Most employed women had existing bank accounts and some had other finance related facilities such as Fiji National Provident Fund (FNPF) savings and life insurance policies.
6.5.4.3 Social network

The strongest source of social capital relevant to most Fijian rural villages is derived from the strong kinship ties that bind the fabric of village life together. Youth, elderly, women and men alike attested to the fact that kinship or *na veiwekani* was one of the most significant features of village life and permeated almost every aspect of their livelihoods. Despite obvious social changes brought on by the effects of modernisation and participation in the cash economy via employment in the tourism industry, the general sense of communalism is still very much observed. The fact that one can never be ‘alone and stranded’ without food and shelter is one of the reasons villagers would rather face livelihood hardships in the village than in urban environments like Suva or Nadi. Thus, kinship bonds are a natural form of social security. It accords villagers in Namatakula and Votualailai a great measure of empowerment in the sense that whatever choice they make in life, there will always be a social safety net to protect them.

Exposure to tourism related activities through direct employment by nearby hotels or through village based entertainment and tour-guided activities have exposed the communities to tourists from different cultures. The aspect of working within the tourism environment with fellow peers and meeting and greeting hotel guests, has served to expose the two communities to a different social framework altogether. This has resulted in many workers gaining confidence and being able to participate in a modern service oriented industry while still being able to live in the village. Some women from one of the communities stated that they had learned different aspect of cleanliness and hygiene from their housekeeping employment activities at the nearby hotel and this had empowered them to utilise the knowledge gained in their own households.
6.5.4.4 Education

The two communities expressed that education was the key to escaping the vicious cycle of hardship and increasing levels of personal empowerment.

Table 6.19 Number of households at Namatakula and Votualailai seeking further education for children

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>NAMATAKULA</th>
<th>VOTUALAILAI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FURTHER STUDIES</td>
<td>23 (77%)</td>
<td>20 (71%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTHER</td>
<td>7 (23%)</td>
<td>8 (29%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The majority of households sought higher education (Table 6.19) for their children rather than other options including entering the tourism industry. The reasons for the above response ranged from causes related to low income levels and poor prospects of promotion to vague negative notions such as “we don’t want them to go through what we have been through”. Despite the above household aspirations, household data indicated that young household members aged 18 years and over, were however still largely employed in hotel activities. Incidences of children pursuing tertiary education were relatively low. It is unclear to what extent this trend is to do with low parental income levels, poor careers advice or personal choices by young household members.

6.5.4.5 Notions of disempowerment

Along with perceptions of empowerment are also the factors which cause villagers to feel disempowered in regard to their livelihoods in the village context. Two principal aspects are relevant in this regard. Firstly, is that of the hierarchical structure of village life. In Fijian villages with the presence of strong leadership, such as Namatakula, the roles played by all village members is particular and
generally non-contestable. Even if contestable, the complaint has to be passed through the normal channels of village protocol before being heard by the appropriate authorities. Village hierarchy is deeply respected and is the voice that is heard in terms of overall decisions about the village community. The onset of more individualistic thinking which has arisen in some village households conflicts with the basis of community living and causes frustration in terms of wanting to progress individually. This leaves certain individuals feeling disempowered in relation to restrictions on self-expression and autonomous actions within the community set-up. The second type of disempowerment is felt in relation to religious and traditional financial obligations in the two village communities. Although obliged to meet necessary payments, household members often felt burdened by such expectations which had to be met in line with village expectations, and traditional and cultural norms.

6.6 TOURISM AND POVERTY STAKEHOLDER OPINIONS

6.6.1 General

In this final section data obtained from stakeholders in the tourism private and public sector as well as a civil servant involved with poverty alleviation and social welfare issues will be reviewed to establish their perspectives of the tourism and rural village livelihoods relationship. The stakeholders were essentially asked about their views on poverty and tourism in Fiji, whether they saw a link between the two and their perceptions of the impact of tourism on village community livelihoods. The four key emergent points discussed below are identified following interviews with the stakeholders:
6.6.2 Emergent Issues from Stakeholder Interviews

1. The concept of poverty in rural villages

All stakeholders stated that poverty in Fiji was largely that of relative poverty and was more linked to the urban poor than the so called ‘rural poor’ who normally have access to both land and sea resources. One stakeholder identified poverty in the Fiji context “as being about accessibility to traditional obligations and landlessness”.

2. The link between tourism and community livelihoods

The study showed that the relationship between tourism and local communities ought to be a mutually beneficial one. In the past this relationship used to hinge on outright donations from the industry to local communities but the emphasis now focuses more on encouraging communities to generate projects and enhance their own education opportunities. It was noted that significant links have included employment creation generated by tourism development, increased agricultural supply to hotels and the empowerment of local villagers to start their own business initiatives. The monies received from land leases is also cited as important although the hierarchical structure of rural villages has dictated how these benefits are distributed within the village. Some stakeholders stated that more could be done in respect of addressing the distributive issues such as setting aside a portion of the lease monies received to be later used for religious and traditional obligations. This would ease the financial burden on individual households.

3. Ways to enhance the tourism-rural village community relationship

Stakeholders emphasised the need to place local communities at the heart of community and tourism development agreements. This approach would effectively
be the implementation of an initial concept approach rather than a “band aid” one which attempts a quick fix solution to problems arising out of ill-thought out agreements. One stakeholder felt that certain direct issues could be addressed through the encouragement of informal sector activities carried out by local villagers as well as the formalisation of programmes which link tourism developments to the villages themselves. Tourist preferences have changed in recent years from wanting sun, sea and sand to that of exploring cultural sites and viewing local flora and fauna. Thus tourism developments needed to be aware that the development of these types of activities was necessary to keep in line with tourist trends. Local villagers could assist in providing these support activities. It was felt that tourism developments could do more in developing local tourism-related village based activities by assisting in refining the business product such as setting up proper shopping infrastructure for village handicraft shops.

4. Whose responsibility?

All stakeholders felt that the responsibility to ensure that tourism acted as a poverty alleviation tool in terms of rural village livelihoods rested on the following factors:

- Good village leadership.
- More positive interaction between policy making bodies involved in tourism development issues: Ministry for Tourism, Ministry for Finance, Fijian Affairs Board, Native Land Trust Board and the Fiji Island Trade and Investment Bureau.
- Review of distribution of lease money benefits within the village.
- Proper counselling and training of local village employees.
Implementation of an initial stages approach and maintaining a balance between economic developmental concerns and environmental concerns since land and sea resources support many local livelihoods.

More investment by government on monitoring local community initiatives which assist in servicing a growing and changing tourism market.

The education and empowerment of local villagers to assist in promoting the concept of ‘helping oneself’ and discouraging a hand-out mentality.

Sustainable development was identified as the overall objective in terms of implementing tourism within the poverty alleviation framework for rural villages in Fiji. The means of achieving this objective is through shared responsibility not only by private and public sector mechanisms but by the villagers themselves as echoed by one of the tourism stakeholder’s closing comments:

“I think it’s about a partnership that involves everybody. At the end of the day it is the people that count. The government can have the best plans, the hotels can adopt different initiatives...but if the people do not wish to act that’s it... everyone needs to join hands”

6.7 CONCLUSION

This chapter seeks to identify the main livelihood outcomes from both a basic needs assessment perspective and in relation to the influence of tourism on livelihoods. Results indicate that most households from the samples examined in both villagers are not only income and food secure, but also have reasonably good access to goods and services within the local area. It is also apparent that as the majority of households rely on the tourism sector to maintain basic well-being, tourism is by far the most significant influence on current village livelihoods.
Environmental and native land lease issues are two principal matters which need to be addressed from the outset in the planning stages of tourism benefits. It can also be concluded from all the discussions held that there is general acknowledgement of a ‘people first’ approach in terms of the tourism-community livelihoods equation. This sentiment is reiterated by some of the stakeholders who felt that while tourism’s primary objective is to make profits and not act as a charity organisation, one had to look after people to ensure long-terms benefits. The following final chapter seeks to review the objectives and hypotheses initially laid out in this study against the findings discussed in this and the preceding chapter.
CHAPTER SEVEN

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

“It is not the consciousness of men that determines their being, but, on the contrary, their social being that determines their consciousness.” (Karl Marx, 1818-1883)

7.1 INTRODUCTION

7.1.1 General

This final chapter firstly seeks to discuss the findings examined in Chapters Five and Six before arriving at some conclusions and recommendations regarding the study. This comparative analysis will assist in evaluating the overall impact of tourism on the two village communities from a livelihoods perspective. The effectiveness of the Sustainable Livelihoods Approach as an analytical tool utilised in this study will also be examined. The Chapter will conclude with general reflections on recommendations and implications of the study on future research possibilities.

7.2 IMPACT OF TOURISM ON VILLAGE LIVELIHOOD STRATEGIES AND OUTCOMES

In seeking to satisfy the objectives stated in Chapter 1.3, it was clear from the outset of the research that in order to analyse information regarding the livelihoods of the two village communities in question, it was necessary to obtain as much relevant information as possible on factors that were considered a significant part of people’s general livelihood. Thus, the data gathering processes, in the form of household interviews, person to person in-depth discussions and focus group discussions were structured in a manner that encouraged the collection of broad-based information on basic lifestyle issues ranging from questions on employment and income, food
sources, satisfaction levels on issues such as education and water facilities and personal accounts on coping strategies during adverse times.

From the range of ‘lifestyle’ data obtained from the fieldwork, which is discussed at length in Chapter Five, it was possible to identify three key livelihood strategies implemented by the village households. The livelihood strategies firstly illustrate the importance of tourism employment on village livelihoods, secondly the importance of access to land and sea resources and thirdly, the significance of informal sector activities in terms of supplementing family income levels. Chapter Six takes the ‘well-being analysis’ further by quantitatively analysing the income security and food security statuses of households against adjusted national poverty lines. The impact of tourism on both types of statuses is also examined, proving beyond doubt that without tourism employment, the immediate impact on the livelihoods of village households is both significant and adverse. From interviews carried out in Sigatoka, the nearest urban centre in the Coral Coast vicinity, it appears that commercial life in the area is indeed highly dependent on the buoyancy of the tourism industry. The impact of tourism on the livelihoods of village communities is as clearly also significant on the livelihoods of farmers, shopkeepers, retailers and market vendors in the area. As stated by a retailer interviewed in Sigatoka “Tourism has a triangular relationship in the Coral Coast”. The retailer was alluding to the relationship between tourism, the village communities and the farmers in the area.

In addition to identifying the income and food security statuses of households, Chapter Six examines less tangible impacts as a result of direct and indirect employment through tourism related work were also identified. The positive
impacts include increased levels of empowerment particularly in relation to the status of women working in the industry. Considering the nature of village communal life in Fiji which is essentially male-dominated and relies heavily on the delegation of tasks and role playing, the involvement of women in employment at nearby hotels was considered by many households interviewed as both a blessing and a substantial social challenge to many family lives. On a wider level, it was recognised among the various tourism employees interviewed at the village, that being exposed to tourists and working in the industry had broadened their perspectives on different aspects of life, such as dress, language, different types of food and drink and even levels of hygiene and care. Negative effects thought to be partially caused by exposure to the tourism industry (it was also noted that television and films also had an impact in this regard) were also cited by village household members, such as the social impact on the youth in terms of alcohol, drug abuse, sexual promiscuity and social attitudes that were considered more “western” than Fijian, and hence did not fit well in terms of village community life.

In summary, the study has managed to respond effectively to the general objectives initially sought. The livelihood strategies and outcomes of the village communities were examined holistically and in a manner which allowed the influence of tourism to be considered within the equation.

### 7.3 IMPACT OF TOURISM ON COMMUNITY LIFE

It is assumed that village communities along the Coral Coast experience levels of hardship rather than poverty due to reasonable access to land and sea resources. This hypothesis is borne out of welfare logic which assumes that the most basic necessity apart from shelter and water is access to food. It is assumed that as the
villages have access to land and sea resources, the communities should generally not suffer from lack of food sources and thus should not suffer from hunger and malnutrition, two of the most blatant manifestations of abject poverty. The results of the study indeed proved that not only were the households statistically food secure in terms of physical and economic access, but most of the households felt they did not experience abject poverty. When interviewed, the majority of households in Namatakula (63%) felt they experienced hardship at times while over a quarter (27%) stated that they experienced neither hardship nor poverty. In Votualailai while the majority (57%) felt that they experienced hardship occasionally, none felt that they were poor and almost half (43%) felt that neither category applied. It was indeed perceived that despite lack of financial resources on some occasions, it was still possible to ‘live off the land’. Access to land and sea, effectively thus represents an important livelihood safety net for most households interviewed in the two communities.

Chapters Five and Six allude significantly to the participation by all village households in both religious and traditional obligations. The significance of both sets of obligations are reflected in the percentage of weekly household income dedicated toward meeting the financial obligations associated with church donations or traditional functions. In the focus group discussions with the youth, the elderly and women of the villages, it was clear that despite the relatively onerous contributions made toward the church and village customary functions, the sense of duty to finance such expenses was perceived as very important and necessary in the overall village context. Thus the hypothesis that traditional customs and obligations are still observed by the village communities is indeed very much the case.
The study shows that tourism has enabled communities to remain in their villages while affording them different levels of empowerment, through direct and indirect employment activities. In-depth household interviews and focus group discussions with women from the two villages, indicated that there is a general sense of recognition among households that employment at nearby hotels has allowed villagers to obtain cash income levels while maintaining their lifestyles in the village. Other employment options in the area which could afford the same types of employment related conditions do not exist at the moment. Alternative employment options would otherwise have to be sought in urban areas such as Sigatoka, Suva or Nadi. This would mean leaving the village community and the breaking of kinship ties, which for many households is an undesirable choice.

7.4 IMPACT OF TOURISM ON RURAL VILLAGES

The research indicates all round (whether from an income security, food security or access to facilities and opportunities perspective) that the village community households rely enormously on the tourism industry for the sustainability of their livelihoods. This result is consistent despite it being noted that the effects of tourism on livelihoods have also produced some negative effects on the cultural and social life of villagers, evident from discussions with the youth, women and elderly groups as well as informal conversations with other village members. Tourism alone however is not perceived to be the cause of all social ills. The changes between the ‘old traditional ways’ and modern thinking, the advent of television and access to movies have all had their part to play in influencing changes in village society.
In summary, the current research has been successful as an investigative exercise in seeking to examine the effects of tourism on rural village communities such as those of Namatakula and Votualailai.

7.5 EVALUATING THE IMPACT OF TOURISM ON VILLAGE LIVELIHOODS: EFFECTIVENESS OF THE SUSTAINABLE LIVELIHOODS APPROACH

The reliability of the methodological approach incorporated in the research is fundamental to the effectiveness of evaluating livelihoods. If the theoretical framework and tools of analysis were not able to properly facilitate the gathering, compilation and proper analysis of data, then the authenticity of the study results would have been brought into question, regardless of how ‘exciting’ the data sets obtained appear to be. It is important therefore that information gained throughout the research process is analysed in a relevant manner which properly relates to the objectives of the study at hand.

As mentioned in Chapter Two, the study opted to implement the Sustainable Livelihoods framework as a theoretical and analytical guide for conducting the research. In most documented cases, this particular research approach has been utilised by organisations not only on a purely investigative basis but also with the intention of implementing some type of intervention for the benefit of the targeted community or communities. Thus the approach not only assists in identifying livelihood issues from a theoretical perspective but can also be utilised to formulate interventionist strategies if and where deemed necessary. In this study, the Sustainable Livelihoods Approach was utilised as an effective means of looking at village community livelihoods in a structured yet holistic manner in order to find out ways in which tourism impacted on village livelihoods. In doing so the study
sought to find out whether tourism assisted in alleviating poverty in the villages. It was observed for example during the data gathering process that there were many aspects to Fijian village life that one had to take into account apart from the directly relevant sources of information – such as the hierarchical framework in the village, the allocated roles of different village members, the importance lent to religious and traditional functions and the value accorded to kinship ties over monetary value. These observations also had a place within the sustainable livelihoods framework such as the consideration of kinship ties as part of social capital, or levels of empowerment as a product of livelihood outcomes. However, while the objective of utilising the Sustainable Livelihoods Approach in this study was not for interventionist purposes, one can imagine that the data could be utilised or analysed further in terms of implementing particular developmental projects or action plans.

Having illustrated in this study that the broadness of the Sustainable Livelihoods framework is an ideal way to analyse diverse data in as structured and flexible a manner possible, the challenge has been to identify whether the process has actually resulted in responding to the study research problem in an effective manner. While Chapters Five and Six identify strategies and outcomes and the relative importance of tourism in the whole scenario, the principal question is: “Has the Sustainable Livelihoods Approach helped in identifying whether tourism in the Coral Coast has contributed to alleviating poverty in the village communities surveyed?”.

The study has already found that the village households have access to basic needs (shelter, clothes, fuel, food and water), land and sea resources and generally have reasonable access to facilities, goods and services. While some households have stated that they occasionally experience hardships or the inability to meet certain
financial commitments, a very low percentage (10% in Namatakula and none in Votualailai) admit suffering from poverty. The notion of poverty is thus, at the time of research, not applicable. The overriding question was whether tourism had contributed to ensuring that the village households satisfied their basic needs and had enabled them to adopt the identified livelihood strategies in order to maintain current livelihood outcomes. As illustrated in Chapter Six, removing tourism derived income levels from the analysis of household income and food security levels would have a potentially devastating effect on household livelihoods and render the households insecure in terms of overall cash income levels and in terms of having sufficient economic access for the purchase of basic food items. These are only two but nevertheless stark illustrations of the important role played by tourism in the lives of community livelihoods. With the knowledge gained from focus group interviews with the elderly village folk of what life was like before tourism developments emerged in the area, it is clear that current levels of household income and the development of village infrastructure and facilities has only evolved as a result of community involvement in the tourism industry.

Thus in summary, the Sustainable Livelihoods Approach has been a very effective, holistic means of analysing livelihoods in the two Coral Coast villages. Its implementation has produced results which indicate that the local tourism industry has enabled the two communities in question to move out of a purely subsistence level of livelihoods to one in which they are part of the Fiji cash economy and thereby have increased access to opportunities and choices in life.
7.6 IMPLICATIONS OF RESEARCH AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Perhaps the most obvious implication of the current study is that while it has been a generally held view that tourism in Fiji has largely contributed to the development of local communities, the research has managed to substantiate this hypothesis through the quantitative analysis of raw data. Thus the study shows that tourism developments in the Coral Coast area in Fiji generally assist in the economic development of village communities primarily through direct and indirect employment opportunities and the subsequent financial empowerment this has afforded village residents.

Other implications of the research necessitate understanding broader development concepts within the context of the study. Namely, the type of tourism in the area studied and other tourism related impacts in the area, some of which may appear more negative than positive. Sharpley and Telfer (2004) state that to properly understand the impact of tourism in a country, and more so on communities, one has to properly understand the nature of the tourism industry within the area studied. As this is a potentially complex task due the various factors linked to the sector there is probably no definitive way that this can be answered. Tourism can have a very broad definition encompassing people, states, movement, places, time and money considerations. However for purposes of this study, it is perhaps more relevant to analyse tourism within the framework of its relationship with community development issues. In this regard, implications of the impact of tourism in the Coral Coast can be looked at from the perspective of examining whether the resorts linked to the lives of the two communities are essentially based on the traditional mass tourism or small-scale type development. One has to also determine the cohesiveness of the structures and workings of other stakeholders involved with the
industry and the surrounding community in terms of encouraging community development and its principal objective: sustainable tourism development.

As mentioned in Chapter One there was a rapid growth of mass tourism worldwide following the Second World War which involved fairly uncontrolled expansion of tourism and influences on communities that were largely exogenous to the destination (thus not taking into account their social development or welfare). This trend was followed by concerns voiced by protagonists of the “Limits to Growth” school who sought alternative approaches to tourism structures that caused “unbridled economic growth” (Sharpley and Telfer, 2004). There were criticisms that traditional mass tourism developments only perpetuated the dependency relationship between the host destinations and foreign developed nations who largely dictated the structure and flow of tourists and tourism goods and services to and from the destination. The period from the 1970s to the 1990s was, in tourism research terms, “the impacts of tourism” era. The quest by scholars and advocacy groups alike was for alternative concepts of tourism development which could eventually be incorporated into national development plans. The keyword has become “sustainability”. In terms of an alternative approach to tourism this term has been referred to under various labels including “responsible”, “soft”, “appropriate” or “green” tourism where the notion has essentially been equated with the achievement of two principal goals: involving host communities in the tourism decision-making process thereby empowering people involved in the industry to have some say in an area which shapes their lives, and secondly ensuring that host communities have full involvement in the benefits of tourism. As discussed earlier in Chapter 2.3.3 (Scheyvens, 1999) the signs and benefits of tourism have been suggested as being the economic, psychological, social and political forms of
empowerment. Sharpley and Telfer (2004) state that while these objectives are generally sound theoretically, not only is the implementation of the concepts relatively difficult, not least due to the complex layers of stakeholders, partners and communication processes that exist in any given tourism industry, but also due to the fact that it is impossible to prescribe a single type of sustainable tourism development approach that is applicable and suitable worldwide.

Turning to the case of the Coral Coast area in this study, the two main hotels, The Warwick Resort and Spa and The Naviti hotel both located on the Queens Road highway were identified as employing most of the household members surveyed. These two developments are owned by the Warwick International hotel chain and technically speaking are establishments which would fit into the more traditional, mass tourism type venture with the main attractions being sun, sea and sand and its marketing largely, but not exclusively, aimed at tourist group bookings. The Naviti in particular is well-known for its attractive all-inclusive package which is another feature criticised by ‘Limits to Growth’ sympathisers who see this type of package as retaining tourists within the vicinity of the tourism development thereby discouraging informal sector activity growth within the area.

From a critical development perspective therefore, these types of hotels would be considered theoretically detrimental to the sustainable economic growth of the host communities due to an over reliance on exogenous influences which promote the interests of external tour operators and investors rather than national actors and stakeholders. However, a few key points need to be noted in this regard. Firstly, in the case of the two village communities, and as substantiated by this study, the two hotels in question have largely created beneficial economic impacts on the village
communities through direct, indirect and induced employment in both formal and informal capacities. Secondly, it is becoming widely acknowledged at the policy level in Fiji, as evidenced by coverage contained within the recent Tourism Development Plan 2007-2016, that sustainable tourism plans need to be addressed within the context of more community involvement within the industry at the decision-making and local tourism enterprise levels. This is in regard to protection of the island’s natural assets and in relation to the need for all stakeholders to collaborate on a general developmental path which will incorporate tourism growth plans. The bottom line in terms of sustainable tourism development in Fiji appears to be: Fiji needs to take one step at a time and be realistic about the means it has to manage with, the scope within which it can make that happen (in terms of time, money and people) and certain acknowledgements about how tourism can be planned in the best way for the country. That is, Fiji can move along the sustainable tourism development path taking into account its own specific history, culture, traditions and economic and political characteristics. What is good or has worked for other developing countries around the world may not necessarily be beneficial for the Fiji situation. Thus it is probably not advisable in the Fiji context to be concerned with what may be deemed theoretically virtuous or desirable in terms of sustainable goals. Sustainability ought to imply, what is practically workable in the long term for Fiji’s specific situation.

Changes in the current relationship between the two hotels and the villages examined are bound to occur with the changing nature of tourism and the social changes of the rural communities in the area. Thus it may be envisaged that with cultural community attitudes toward employment within the industry in terms of increased exposure to entrepreneurship, money and management skills, possibilities
of local residents running tourism ventures may encourage more equitable
distribution of tourism benefits among local host communities. This has already
been practised by some local residents within Fiji in recent years, although the
establishments that have actually lasted and remain operational are few and far
between. Again, the principal reasons for failure are due to insufficient knowledge
in business management, lack of access to external marketing options, lack of
proper infrastructure and transport services, insufficient funding, and very often a
lack of proper understanding as to the standards and expectations of tourists. It has
to be recognised that the notion of harmonising the traditional, community based
structure of Fijian village life with western-based values propagated by commercial
ventures such as international hotel chains, involves a challenging mix of different
levels of social thinking and operation.

In summary therefore, the implications of the impact of the hotels on the village
communities in this study are generally that tourism has an overall beneficial
influence on the two village communities in development terms within the area.
However, it is also essential that the hotels and other tourism stakeholders in the
area and at government level continue to look at ways to improve the tourism and
community development relationship within the long term context of sustainable (as
in workable and lasting) tourism development. In Fiji this is a fairly challenging task
with the country’s geographical isolation and vulnerability to both internal and
external shocks.

7.7 FURTHER RESEARCH AREAS
This study has highlighted certain key areas which merit further research. Firstly, a
more extensive study of the livelihood impact on communities across Fiji would
indicate whether or not the results of this study are consistent on a national basis. The research should also be carried out over a longer period of time to incorporate a time-series component to the research and thus a measure of impact in terms of change over time. Apart from taking into account changes in the seasonality of the tourism industry (high and low seasons) the study would also reflect changes in the agricultural sector in terms of the sowing and harvesting of produce and the relative participation of community members in relation to subsistence activities. Four areas in particular would be of particular interest for further scrutiny:

- Subsistence activities
- The role of women in the tourism industry in Fiji
- Tourism employment issues
- Community development issues

The study of subsistence activities in village communities is still a fairly un-researched area in terms of quantitative data gathering and quantifying, not least due to the complexity of the recording process necessitated to properly assess the situation. However, considering the importance of the activity as a livelihood strategy in village communities, it would be important to examine this area of village life more closely.

It was evident from the current study that the number of women employed at hotels is quite substantial. It was also noted that the role of women in the village has consequently changed in terms of their relationship with their families and their levels of empowerment within the family and the greater community setting. Far from being detrimental to their status in society, most of the women interviewed felt that in affording them access to cash income levels, tourism assisted them in their ability to manage their households and supplement family livelihoods significantly.
A more in-depth study with female tourism employees would greatly assist in clarifying some of the social gender-based issues or changes that have characterised the relationship between Fijian women and the tourism industry in Fiji.

Sharpley and Telfer (2004) maintain that “to date very little research exists” in the area of tourism employment and its consequences on the economies and cultures of developing economies. Much of what has been written to date is largely based on findings in developed countries, is based on assumptions rather than empirical evidence and is generally pessimistic in nature as it very often relates to the “servile nature and low remuneration of tourism employment” (Sharpley and Telfer, 2004). Due to the numerous backward and forward linkages created by tourism, there are a number of employment opportunities created in both formal and informal sectors in addition to the three main categories of employment generated in both cases (direct, indirect and induced). Thus in the case of Fiji it would be useful to conduct empirical-based research on the types of tourist employment created as a result of tourism activities in different areas. The last key area, community development issues, would cover a holistic examination of the different components of community issues that are considered significant in terms of general development. This could potentially cover many aspects of community livelihoods and is hoped to include new areas for consideration on village life that would be deemed essential for development from the community perspective. By conducting this much broader livelihoods impact study, it is hoped that the data would better inform on the perceptions of local communities in Fiji in terms of their overall aspirations and goals within the development scenario, and particularly with regard to how tourism is seen to fit within this framework.
7.8 CHAPTER CONCLUSION

This chapter concludes the study with a review of the main objectives set at the outset of the research, the research problem and key hypotheses. It also seeks to discuss the findings of the research in terms of arriving at general conclusions on the impact of tourism on village livelihoods. The impact of tourism in Fiji is lastly reviewed within a theoretical and development context. This study hopes to be a useful starting point in relation to holistically examining the impact of tourism on the livelihoods of local communities. A broader based research would extend the capabilities of this analysis and more importantly provide more information to those directly and indirectly concerned by the sustainable development of tourism in Fiji.
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M.A. Supervised Research Project Questionnaire

Milicent Kado  
Centre for Development Studies  
Pacific Institute of Advanced Studies in Development and Governance  
University of the South Pacific  
Lauca Campus  
Suva – FIJI  
Semester 1, 2007

Objectives of Research
The research is part of a 2 week study to be carried out within the communities of Namatakula and Votualailai. The responses to this questionnaire will assist the student understand more about the relationship between tourism and the livelihoods of the people from the two communities.

Confidentiality
Your responses will remain confidential to the student. Your individual answers will not be identifiable once the information is analysed.

PART A

Household ID No.________________

Place of origin of Household Head

_______________________________

SECTION 1 – SOCIO-DEMOGRAPHIC

1) Gender of household head  
   1. MALE  
   2. FEMALE

2) Age of household head  
   1. 20 – 30 yrs  
   2. 31 – 50 yrs  
   3. 51 – 60 yrs  
   4. > 60 yrs

3) Marital status of household head  
   1. Single  
   2. Married  
   3. Living together  
   4. Divorced  
   5. Widowed

4) Total number of people in the household ___________ (actual)  
   1. Persons > 21 yrs ____________________  
   2. No. of children < 15 yrs ___________  
   3. No. children > 15 yrs _______________
SECTION 2(A) - INCOME & EMPLOYMENT

5) Household head employment status  1. In paid employment □  2. Self-employed □  3. Unemployed □

6) Household head occupation ________________________ (to be collated & coded)

7) Household Head employer ________________________ (to be collated & coded)

8) Household head income per week ___________________ (actual)
   1. <$50 a week □  2. $50-$100 □  3. $101-$150 □  4. $151-$200 □  5. > $200 □

9) No. of household members working in paid employment ______

10) Occupation of household members employed (other than household head)
    a) ____________________________
    b) ____________________________
    c) ____________________________

11) Wages per week of other household members employed
    i. ____________________________
    ii. ____________________________
    iii. ____________________________

12) Amount contributed to household by employed members
    i. ____________________________
    ii. ____________________________
    iii. ____________________________

13) How sufficient is your household income to cover your living expenses ?

14) Are there any other sources of income besides those you have already mentioned ?
    1. YES □  2. NO □  3. Don’t know □
15) If YES, What is it / are they?

16) How often do you receive this / these source(s) of income?______________________

17) How much does your household usually make from this/these source(s)__________

18) How significant is this/are these extra activities to your household?
   1. Important □  2. Very important □  3. Not important □  4. Don’t know □

19) IF INFORMAL ACTIVITY: Why has this/ these activity(ies) been chosen in particular?

SECTION( 2B) - EXPENDITURE

20) What are you main living expenses?

(i) HOUSEHOLD BUDGET

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Detail</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Amount per period stated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rent/housing repayment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electricity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hire purchase#</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water (per quarter)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kerosene</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School/College fees</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health bills (medication)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clothing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Church obligations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traditional obligations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sundry (telephone, etc)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To be calculated later by interviewer:
   a) Total for shelter, clothes, food, fuel expenses____________________________
   b) Total for transport, education, health expenses__________________________
   c) Total for church and customary obligations______________________________

Further information required to complement a) and b) are qualified in Section 3.
(ii) RELIGIOUS OBLIGATIONS

21) Do you practice a religious faith? 1. YES □ 2. NO □

22) If so, what is your religious faith? 1. Methodist □ 2. Baptist □ 3. Catholic □
    4. Seventh-Day Adventist □ 5. Other _________ (Specify)

23) Do you have financial religious obligations? 1. YES □ 2. NO □

24) How much does your household normally contribute per week?
   (serves as a cross-check for household expenses table)

25) What are these payments usually for?

26) Does your household manage OK with these payments? 1. YES □ 2. NO □

27) Does tourism affect your religious faith at all? 1. YES □ 2. NO □

28) In what way(s)? ________________________________________________________________

(iii) TRADITIONAL OBLIGATIONS

29) What are your main traditional obligations?
   1. Marriages □ 2. Deaths □ 3. Other □ ________________ (Specify)

30) How much does your household commit to funding a traditional demand?
   1. Less than $20 □ 2. $21-50 □ 3. $51-$100 □ 4. > $100 □
   5. Don’t know □

31) Does your household manage OK with these payments? 1. YES □ 2. NO □

32) Does tourism affect your traditional demands at all? 1. YES □ 2. NO □

33) In what way(s)? ________________________________________________________________
SECTION 3 - ACCESS TO FACILITIES, GOODS AND SERVICES

34) Does the household have the following?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CHARACTERISTIC</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
<th>COMMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Concrete walls, floor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corrugated iron walls, wooden floor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roomed dwelling</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Separate kitchen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Separate bathroom</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electricity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kerosene for lighting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flush toilet</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pit toilet</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water-seal toilet</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shared toilet</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piped water</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Own piped water</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Share piped water</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

34B) Are you satisfied with your household’s current access to:

a. Piped water 1. YES 2. NO
b. Electricity 1. YES 2. NO
c. Transport 1. YES 2. NO
d. Education 1. YES 2. NO
e. Health Services 1. YES 2. NO
f. Communication facilities (telephone, postal) 1. YES 2. NO

(A) FOOD

35) What main food items do you consider necessary for your household’s needs?

36) Do you obtain any food items from the village plantations and/ or the sea?
   1. YES 2. NO

37) What proportion of your household food comes from either the land or the sea?
   1. Less than 50% 2. 50% 3. 75%
   4. 100% 5. None at all

38) Which outlet(s) do you normally shop for food?
39) Why do you shop there?
   1. Cheap ☐  2. Fresh Food ☐  3. Convenient location ☐
   4. Don’t know ☐  4. Other ______________________

(B) EDUCATION

40) Are any of your household members currently in education / receiving training?
   1. YES ☐  2. NO ☐

41) How many household members attend primary school? ________

42) How many attend secondary school? _________________________

43) How many pursue tertiary education? ________________________

44) What are the education fees per term/semester?_______________

45) How far is the school/college / training centre to the village?

46) Is this distance:
   1. Close ☐  2. Far ☐  3. Don’t know

47) What is/are the student(s) likely do after completing his/her education /training?
   Further studies ☐  2. Look for paid employment ☐  3. Hotel work ☐
   4. Work in the village ☐  5. Move to another area (village/town/city) ☐
   6. Don’t know ☐

(C) HEALTH

48) How much do you usually pay for a health visit? ________________
   1. $1-$10 ☐  2. $11-$20 ☐  3. $21-50 ☐  4. More than $50 ☐
   5. Don’t know ☐

49) What medicine do you normally keep at home?________________________

50) How much does this medicine cost?________________________(cross check
    for household expenditure list)

51) How often do family members in your household fall sick?
   1. Seldom ☐  2. Frequently ☐ ________ (specify how often)  3. Don’t know ☐

52) Where do the sick usually go for medical consultation?________________________

53) Are you satisfied with the health service/facility offered?
   1. YES ☐  2. NO ☐  3. Don’t know ☐

54) Do you use traditional Fijian medicine?  1. YES ☐  2. NO ☐
55) What type do you use the most?

56) What is this type mostly used for?

(D) TRANSPORT

57) What modes of transport do household members rely on for:

a) Work
   5. Other □ (specify)  6. Don’t know □

b) School/College
   5. Other □ (specify)  6. Don’t know □

c) Shopping
   5. Other □ (specify)  6. Don’t know □

d) Health centre
   5. Other □ (specify)  6. Don’t know □

e) Visiting other towns/villages
   5. Other □ (specify)  6. Don’t know □

(E) INFORMATION

58) How do you usually receive national and overseas news?
   6. Other □ (specify)

59) Do you receive such information daily?  1. YES □  2. NO □

60) Does anyone in your household use a computer?  1. YES □  2. NO □

61) Do you see any value in you or other members of your household having access to a computer?  1. YES □  2. NO □  3. Don’t know □

62) If so, for what reason(s)
FINANCIAL SERVICES

63) Do you contribute to any savings scheme? 1. YES 2. NO

64) If so, state type
   1. Bank  2. FNPF  3. Insurance Scheme  4) Other ____________(specify)

65) Have you currently got a loan with a financial facility? 1. YES 2. NO

66) If so, was it easy to apply for? 1. YES 2. NO

67) How do you think finance organisations could help households like your own?

NATURAL RESOURCES

68) How long has your household (vuvale) lived in Namatakula?
   1. Less than 10 years  2. 10-14 yrs  3. 15-20 yrs  4. Over 20yrs

69) How long has your house been standing?
   Less than 10 years  2. 10-14 yrs  3. 15-20 yrs  4. Over 20yrs

70) Do you have access to land elsewhere? 1. YES 2. NO

71) Do you tend any crops in the village? 1. YES 2. NO


73) What do you do with the harvest?
   1. Domestic consumption  2. Share with other village households

73B) A recent Ministry of Agriculture study states that local villages might be able to supply certain crops for use by tourism hotels. The 2 main crops mentioned are pawpaws and tomatoes. Do you feel this is a good idea? 1. YES 2. NO 3. Don’t know

73C) If not, can you give your reasons?

73D) The same study mentions that if such crop projects were to succeed, local farmers need to have a good business sense ensuring constant supply of crops and good quality. Do you think such a project is possible for a village community such as Namatakula?
   1. YES  2. NO  3. Don’t know

74) Do you keep livestock on the land? 1. YES 2. NO

75) What do you do with the livestock?
   1. Domestic consumption  2. Share with other village households
76) Do members of your household fish?  1. YES □  2. NO □

77) What type of seafood is normally caught?
   6. Other □__________ (specify)

78) What does your household usually do with the catch?
   1. consumption □  2. Share with other village households □

79) Sometimes areas of land get over-used, or areas of sea become over-fished. What traditional methods do you employ (if any) to assist the village address this issue?

80) Do those members of your household who have full time work at tourism resorts, have enough time to tend to crops or to go fishing?  1. YES □  2. NO □

81) If not, how has this affected your lives?

82) Do you know if any local tourist hotels use any methods to help protect the land or the coastal sea areas without destroying the environment?

83) Do you have any ideas what would be a good way to improve agriculture in the village or fishing in the sea areas?

PART B

SECTION 1 – LIVED EXPERIENCE

84) How have tourism resorts in the area influenced your household and your village?

85) Can any members of your household remember what life was like before the tourism resorts in the area appeared? (note down reference years)

86) Apart from providing jobs to villagers, like that of Namatakula, what else do tourism resorts provide for local people?
87) Have you noticed any changes in tourism in the past ten years?

88) What do you think has brought about these changes?

89) Does your village have a role to play in tourism in the Coral Coast area?

SECTION 2 – COPING MECHANISMS

90) How does your household cope with shortages in food and water if this were to occur?

91) Has anyone in your household lost his/her job suddenly? 1. YES □ 2. NO □

92) How did your household cope?

93) Ill health of a working family member or loss of a working family member can bring great changes to a household. What changes would it bring to your household?

94) What would you do to cope?

95) Has your household experienced damage due to a natural disaster?
   1. YES □ 2. NO □

96) What was the nature of the disaster?
   5. Other □

97) How does living in a community rather than in an urban setting affect your household’s ability to cope when faced with some of the problems already mentioned?

98) How are kinship ties important to you and your family?

99) If you moved to the town area, how will these ties be affected?
100) What do you understand by the words “poverty” (dravudravua) and “hardship” (bula dredre)?

101) Do either of the 2 terms apply to your household?
M.A. Supervised Research Project Questionnaire
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Objectives of Research
The study focuses on examining the impact of Coral Coast tourism resorts on the livelihoods of Fijian village households in the same area. In order to understand this impact further, the researcher wishes to gather information from different goods and services stakeholders also located in the Coral Coast vicinity. The results of this questionnaire will assist the researcher in the compilation of a thesis whose principal objective will be to examine how rural based hotels in Fiji serve to enhance the livelihoods of people who live in nearby villages.

Confidentiality
Your responses will remain confidential to the student. Your individual answers will not be identifiable once the information is analysed.

GOODS AND SERVICES STAKEHOLDERS

(Questions to be completed by stakeholder)

Interviewee ID No._____________ (to be completed by researcher)

Please tick appropriate responses in part A:

Part A: Socio-demographic information
1. Gender of interviewee  1. Male □  2. Female □
2. Age group of interviewee 1. 20-30 yrs □  2. 30-50 yrs □  3. >50 yrs □

Part B: Employment information
3. Occupation ________________________________
4. Length of time in occupation
   1. 0-4 yrs  2. 5-10 yrs  3. > 10 yrs

5. Describe your main employment responsibilities

___________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________

Part C: Descriptive questions

Please respond to the following questions with short descriptive answers:

6. Coastal rural resorts in Fiji tend to benefit from the availability of employees from nearby villages who in turn seek employment at nearby tourism developments. What factors are involved?

___________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________

(185)
7. To what extent do coastal tourism developments in Fiji contribute to assisting the livelihoods of nearby rural villages?
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________

8. What do you understand by the term “hardship” or “poverty” in the context of a typical Fijian coastal rural village?
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________

9. Do you feel that some villages along the Coral Coast could be considered as living in hardship or poverty?  1. YES  2. NO

10. Apart from providing jobs, how do tourism developments impact on the livelihoods of local villages in the Coral Coast area in Fiji?
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
(186)
11. What other sectors or industries aside from tourism, if encouraged to develop in rural coastal areas could assist nearby villages with their livelihoods?
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________

12. How could policy makers generally facilitate the livelihoods of coastal villages in the rural coastal areas?
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________

13. Do you or your organisation have a role in the tourism industry in relation to impacting on the lives of local villages (either directly or indirectly)?
   1. YES □  2. NO □
14. If so, in what way(s)?

_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________

15. What has the impact of tourism been on your professional activity?

_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________

16. Has this impact changed in the past 10 years?
   1. YES   2. NO

17. If so, in what way(s)?

_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________

18. Does your professional activity relate only directly to tourism or do you also provide goods/services to other types of industry?
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________

19. Do you think other types of industry could provide the same opportunity for rural villages as tourism does?
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________

20. How could the relationship between tourism developments and goods and service providers in rural areas be enhanced?
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________