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Abstract

In the past decades, tourism has grown in prominence as an industry that has the potential to support the ambitions of Small Island Developing States in the Pacific. In Fiji, tourism is its largest foreign exchange earner, largest contributor to GDP and the largest employer and is held in high regard as a catalyst for the development of Fijian communities. To date, very few studies have been undertaken to assess the extent to which tourism has contributed to the development of Fijian communities nor is there sufficient empirical evidence to adequately understand the impact that tourism has had on the often complex socio-cultural character of indigenous communities. Two villages, Votua and Vatuolalai were selected as case studies for this research because of their history as being one of the first indigenous communities to participate in tourism. Multiple research methods were employed to gather empirical data, including qualitative as well as quantitative tools such as researcher-administered questionnaires, participant observations and interviews. The two case studies have demonstrated that tourism, through its economic benefits, has been a catalyst for the economic and social development of its people and community. Changes observed in these communities are indicative of the length of time and collective influences that have contributed to their development. The shift from a subsistence/semi-subsistence economy to that of a cash oriented society is evidence of the 40 years of influence that tourism, amongst other developmental factors, has had on these communities. Greater understanding must be gained by indigenous Fijians on how tourism affects their culture and way of life so that choices are made on how best to develop and adapt to the requirements of changing times.
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Chapter 1

Introduction
1.0 The background: Tourism in Fiji

The tourism industry has become a solution to receding agricultural economies of many nations, including those that were once colonies in the Caribbean, Indian Ocean and the Pacific (Harrison, 2001, pp. 2-3). Tourism development has been heavily supported by less developed countries for its potential to promote economic growth, increase employment opportunities and to improve the social standards of states, particularly, those with limited capacity for growth and development (Hall and Page, 1996, pp. 1-3). Similarly, tourism has also been a central force in supporting the economies of many SIDS (Small Island Developing States) in the South Pacific which were once primarily dependent on sugar and copra as their main source of foreign exchange. In periods following the drop in world agricultural prices, tourism provided support for these “young” Nation States. By the end of the 20th century, tourism had progressed to the forefront of economic growth and development in many Pacific Island countries including Fiji (Harrison, 2003, p.6). Today, Fiji like many former small island colonies, rely on tourism as the backbone of its economy and has been the key contributor to growth and development in Fiji during the Global Financial Crisis (Rao, 2002; Reddy, 2010).

Tourism has been viewed as the ideal industry for Fiji and other SIDS because of its non-extractive nature, and because it capitalizes on its tropical environment and culture (Hall and Page, 1996, p. 13). Pacific Island countries face immense challenges in building the base of their economies because of their geographical isolation, limited terrestrial resources and infrastructure; Fiji’s case is no different. Fiji’s geographical characteristics, with limited land mass, limited mineral resources (limited to gold and some potential for nickel and copper) and poor industrial capacities topped by its unstable political image, have conditioned the nature of Fiji’s economy and development. The limited development options available for a SIDS such as Fiji make tourism the most attractive option despite the risks of being a highly volatile industry (Hall and Page, 1996, pp. 13-14).

In Fiji’s case, tourism has been going on for over 40 years and has been the highest employer and foreign exchange earner since the 1960s. Tourism has continued to be
the key driver of economic recovery and has continued to support Fiji’s economy, despite the coups in 1987, 2000 and 2006, which hindered Fiji’s economic performance (Harrison and Pratt, 2010). The 1987 coup caused a 26% decline in arrivals, the 2000 coup caused a 28% decline in arrivals and 29% decline in earnings, whilst in 2006 only a 1% reduction in visitor arrivals was observed with a 5% decline in earnings. This trend, to some extent, is the result of heavy discounting and marketing, but also shows the resilience of tourism to the political environment in Fiji (Harrison and Pratt, 2010, p. 163).

During the onset of the current Global Financial Crisis, tourism stood as the key driver of the growth of 1.8% of Fiji’s economy as at May, 2010 (Reddy, 2010). It accounted for over 30% of Fiji’s Gross Domestic Product and brought in over F$820 million, compared to the sugar industry with F$200 million. The total number of people employed directly in tourism stood at 39,000, accounting for about one-third of Fiji’s employment sector (Reddy, 2010). These numbers demonstrate just how “ideal” an option tourism has become, and it has been continually supported by Fiji’s elected and non-elected leadership from post-colonial times through to the present. In 2010, $23.5 million was provided to the tourism sector as part of budgetary allocations by Fiji’s military regime and a further F$23.5 million has been approved for 2011 (Fiji Sun, 28 November, 2010, p. 4). Other policies, including the controversial Surfing Decree1, tax incentives, marketing campaigns and Open Skies Policy, are being pursued by Fiji’s military regime to increase tourism’s economic potential (Fiji Focus, 2010, p. 7). Despite Fiji’s negative political image and poor relations with its major source markets, tourism arrivals remained strong and breached the 600,000 mark in 2010. It is predicted to earn a record $F 1.2 billion by 2016 (Fiji Bureau of Statistics, 2010; Reddy, 2010).

Interestingly, tourism is also an industry that involves complex economic, physical and social activities, which have varying impacts on the host economy, environment and communities. This is important when considering countries in the Pacific, which highly value and hold close associations with the environment and their cultural

1 Regulation of Surfing Areas Decree 2010 – Legislation on the liberalizing of surfing resources and declaring it as common property.
resources and traditions. According to Butler’s Destination Life Cycle Model (1980), once the exploration phase is triggered, a destination may begin a typical cycle of development and can progress through to maturity, decline and/or rejuvenation. During this process, it is suggested that often-irreversible changes in culture, economics, and society may occur. Furthermore, some changes may, to varying extents, prompt elements of discontent and irritation amongst host communities (Doxey, 1976). In fact, as well as raising standards of living, tourism also contributes to changes in behaviour, culture and tradition of Pacific island communities. It is also perceived to place immense pressures on such social institutions as the family, church and the village, especially for indigenous populations (Sofield, n.d; Ravuvu, 1988).

These views are supported more by critics inclined towards underdevelopment theory, who blame tourism as the cause of many social ills. Harrison, for instance, points out:

> According to this view, such countries (“peripheries” or “satellites”) are underdeveloped rather than less developed, and their structural position in the world economy is so conditioned by their relationships with developed societies (“centres” or “metropoles”) that economic dependence is accompanied by social and cultural dependence. Tourism, rather than being a tool for “development”, becomes another mechanism through which dependence on developed societies is maintained (Harrison, 2003, p.12).

The domination of less developed countries’ tourism industries by multi-national corporations (MNCs) is well known (Harrison and Pratt, 2010; UNWTO, 2007; Hall, 1996). This is true as well for Fiji, with the operation of large multinational hotels (as well as a number of smaller, locally owned lodges, backpacker hotels and the Tanoa group of hotels) such as the Shangri-La, Sheraton, Hilton, Westin Sofitel and Novotel to name a few, which usually operate on special management contracts. These hotels are often partly owned by local stakeholders such as the Fiji Teachers Union (Hideaway Resort) and the Fiji National Provident Fund, which has invested in a number of properties, including the Intercontinental Resort at Natadola. These
hotels employ large numbers of local people, mainly in roles with low wages and very few benefits (Samy, 1980). Furthermore, the import appetites of these multinational chains are also well known, but arguably necessary in maintaining high standards and brand image since local capacities and linkages are not well established. Hence, high importation and leakages, coupled with the repatriation of profits, are socio-economic realities faced in many SIDS including Fiji (Harrison and Pratt, 2010; Reddy, 2010).

The United Nations Declaration on Indigenous Rights, Agenda 21, the Millennium Development Goals (MDG’s) and the United Nations’ stance on sustainable development have strengthened awareness of the need to protect biodiversity and promote and conserve indigenous cultures. Tourism has been central as a key industry with the potential to promote sustainability but has also been blamed by some for causing changes in key socio-economic aspects of communities closely involved with tourism (Douglas and Douglas, 1996a). Nonetheless, because of the conflict between development and conservation, destination-based studies are required to explore and validate claims surrounding tourism’s impacts and assess its contribution to the development of local communities.

This thesis does not intend to promote underdevelopment theorists nor highlight what is already known on tourism in the Pacific, but rather, the aim is to shed light on tourism’s influence on communal development in an indigenous Fijian or “i taukei” community in Fiji.

### 1.1 Purpose of the study

This study is an attempt to understand how tourism can be a tool to achieve social and economic growth in two indigenous Fijian communities, and specifically focuses on the villages of Votua and Vatuolalai. These two villages are among the first in Fiji to have been involved with tourism and illustrate the complexities of tourism’s impact, both economically and socially, from an indigenous perspective. They also show that tourism is a key agent of social and cultural change for indigenous communities.
Existing literature, although limited, suggests that the benefits and disadvantages of tourism differ for different communities (Wahab and Pigram, 1997), and that influences experienced through tourism are viewed differently from individual to individual and from culture to culture (Font and Ahjem, 1999).

1.2 The problem at hand

There have been many debates concerning the perceived benefits of tourism. Questions arise whether or not cultural exchange is beneficial. However, what is important for this research is that a clear perspective is gained on particular destinations, so that benchmarks are established to measure its impacts.

For a Pacific Island developing state such as Fiji, having accurate benchmarks is vital for the measurement of a valued and highly encouraged industry such as tourism. Accurate evidence and well balanced viewpoints are essential for planning and achieving sustainable development for rural communities and their way of life. Proper understanding will allow for conclusions to be drawn on how to balance impacts and improve benefits derived from tourism.

This study represents an endeavour to understand the socio-economic impacts experienced by the people of Votua and Vatuolalai as a result of more than 30 years of pioneering interaction with The Warwick Resort and Spa and The Naviti Resort. The research will examine what changes have occurred and will highlight how tourism has influenced the development of indigenous Fijian communities.

1.3 Objectives of research

The title of this research encapsulates its purpose: “Tourism’s impact on communal development in Fiji: A case study of the socio-economic impacts of The Warwick Resort and Spa and The Naviti Resort on the indigenous Fijian villages of Votua and Vatuolalai.” Following from this, the aims and objectives are as follows:

a. to outline the development of tourism in the Coral Coast of Fiji and its impact on the villages of Votua and Vatuolalai

b. to understand the perceptions held by the local communities on the social and economic impacts of tourism
c. to assess the level of economic dependency on tourism

d. to identify the extent to which tourism has influenced the growth of business and economic activity in the respective villages

e. to determine the extent to which tourism and external parties have contributed to the development of the respective communities

f. to evaluate the extent to which tourism has affected the empowerment of women and youths

g. to identify changes in tradition and cultural practice

h. to identify conflicts within and between the local communities as a result of tourism

i. to provide recommendations on how benefits can be sustained for the long term

1.4 Organisation of the study

The broad outlines of the chapters are indicated below, along with brief descriptions.

Chapter 1 introduces the research problem, local context and general overview of the study. Chapter 2 comprises an in-depth literature review of tourism in less developed countries, economic and social impacts, and previous studies into the social and economic impacts of tourism in the Pacific. Chapter 3 provides a background to this study and places in context the area of study and the historical developments it has undergone. This chapter moves the thesis from a broad regional setting to the local scene, and is followed by Chapter 4; where the methodology employed and challenges for this research are detailed. The penultimate chapter, Chapter 5, will report the findings of the research conducted on the two villages of Votua and Vatuolalai. Conclusions and recommendations for future research, based on the findings of this research, are found in Chapter 6.

1.5 Summary

In summary, this chapter has introduced the broad objectives of the paper.
It is important to understand the socio-economic impacts of tourism on indigenous communities, a topic that so far has been little discussed in Fiji. Furthermore, studies carried out on such sensitive issues are sparse in the wider Pacific. This thesis will highlight the perceptions of those directly involved in tourism, who have experienced the impacts of tourism, and further provides an accurate understanding of how tourism contributes to the development of an indigenous Pacific Island community in this modern era.

Chapter 2 provides an in-depth review of the relevant literature. It also provides a theoretical platform, and sets the stage for understanding the dynamics of the potential areas in which tourism influences the development of communities socially and economically.
Chapter 2

Review of past research
2.0 Literature review

In this chapter, a review of relevant literature is undertaken to establish what research exists on tourism’s contribution to communal development. More specifically, this section reviews research on tourism’s socio-economic contribution to less developed societies, with a specific focus on Pacific Island indigenous communities.

The debate on tourism’s impacts on local indigenous communities is an ongoing process, unique for each destination (Milne, 2005). Tourism has proven its potential as an important development tool for many developing countries and has been the backbone of economies in the Pacific and Small Island Developing States (UNWTO, 2010; Rao, 2002). It is argued that, socially tourism may also be a beneficial contributor to communal development, not only raising economic standards but also encouraging cultural preservation and positive cross-cultural exchange (Richardson and Fluker, 2004).

However, instances of leakage, inequitable pay schemes, economic dependency, and demonstration effects have often been associated with tourism in LDCs (Richardson and Fluker, 2004; Samy, 1980). This is of importance to the Coral Coast, where tourism has been occurring for over 30 years, and data from the two communities can lead to relevant conclusions and suggestions concerning tourism planning and sustainability in Fiji.

This section will provide a setting from which tourism in developing countries is better understood. First, the general literature on tourism in LDCs is reported before social and economic impacts are related to the Pacific setting.

2.1 Tourism in less developed countries

The World Trade Organisation (WTO) classifies countries according to their GDP and Total Disposable Income; the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) on the other hand employs a different method, arriving at an index level (Human Development Index), and grades every country using a combination of factors, including wealth distribution and standards of living. An important unifying factor
for both classification systems is the consideration of economic as well as social conditions as key determinants of levels of development. Using both classification systems, less developed countries (LDCs) (as observed by WTO and UNDP) tend to have a high dependence on tourism (UNWTO, 2010). More interestingly, when compared to well established tourism destinations, less developed countries rely on tourism more for contributions to their GDP (Weaver and Oppermann, 2000, pp. 248-250).

Tourism’s importance in the context of development remains a much-discussed issue, with many differing points of view. The perceptions held on tourism and development often change in line with the evolution of global economics and the general changes in the global political environment (Harrison, 2001, p. 5). Western capitalist theorists attribute international tourism and its rise to the parallel spread in capitalist western society from more developed to less developed regions. Different perspectives are also offered by geographers, who concentrate on the influence to changes in landform features associated with tourism development. Scholars of a more socio-geographic perspective, however, view development in a more integrative way, taking into account the interactions between host and visitor and the many social impacts imposed by tourism development (Butler, 1980; Weaver and Oppermann, 2000, p. 294).

Many development theories mention tourism as a form of development and factor of change in social and economic standards. What “development” actually means still arouses much debate (Harrison, 2001, pp. 28-31). Modernisation theory is based on the philosophy that progress by less developed states occurs in ways already experienced by more developed societies. Modernisation perspectives encourage foreigners (usually from more developed states) to invest in less developed countries. Often, regulations are relaxed, facilitating high importation of goods and expertise which is deemed necessary in facilitating large-scale tourism and development. By contrast, according to neo-Marxist (underdevelopment theorists), backwardness and deprivation is caused by the less developed nature of former colonial states (MacNaught, 1982; Harrison, 2001, p. 9; Sharpley and Telfer, 2002).
Irrespective of development theories, tourism has gained much recognition as a driver of growth and development in LDCs, a trend that has grown steadily from the 1970s (UNWTO, 2010). In the 1970s (during the onset of declining agricultural prices) many international agencies and government departments including several in Fiji, commissioned reports to identify potential economic sectors outside agriculture. For most LDCs, tourism was identified as a sector that could facilitate sustained economic growth and development (Belt Collins, 1973; Edelmann, 1975; Tosun, 2002). As a result, many LDCs turned to tourism as a development option and more SIDS with few other alternatives invested heavily in tourism. At present, high dependence on tourism is predominantly identified in LDCs, and more notably in resource-deprived island States in the Caribbean and the Pacific (UNWTO, 2010) (see table 2.1).

Table 2.1 - Top twenty tourism countries (LDCs) by GDP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>% of GDP</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>HDI status</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Tourists</th>
<th>T/P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aruba *</td>
<td>43.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>101,000</td>
<td>723,514</td>
<td>716%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Lucia</td>
<td>41.8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>166,000</td>
<td>317,939</td>
<td>192%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seychelles</td>
<td>38.8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>86,000</td>
<td>128,654</td>
<td>149%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antigua and Barbuda</td>
<td>36.1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>84,000</td>
<td>238,804</td>
<td>284%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maldives *</td>
<td>35.1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>337,000</td>
<td>395,320</td>
<td>117%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bahamas</td>
<td>32.2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>327,000</td>
<td>1,608,153</td>
<td>492%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbados</td>
<td>30.4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>270,000</td>
<td>547,534</td>
<td>203%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vanuatu</td>
<td>27.3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>215,000</td>
<td>62,082</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lebanon</td>
<td>26.4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>900,000</td>
<td>1,139,524</td>
<td>127%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Vincent &amp; Grenadines</td>
<td>24.5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>120,000</td>
<td>95,506</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sao Tome &amp; Principe</td>
<td>23.9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>160,000</td>
<td>10,518</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fiji</td>
<td>23.8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>853,000</td>
<td>549,911</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Kitts &amp; Nevis</td>
<td>23.6</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>48,000</td>
<td>67,531 (2002)</td>
<td>140%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Croatia</td>
<td>20.4</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>4,000,000</td>
<td>3,743,874</td>
<td>94%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominica</td>
<td>20.1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>72,000</td>
<td>79,257</td>
<td>110%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samoa</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>186,000</td>
<td>101,807</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belize</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>297,000</td>
<td>236,573</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jamaica</td>
<td>18.4</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>3,000,000</td>
<td>1,478,663</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mauritius</td>
<td>18.4</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>1,253,000</td>
<td>761,063</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cape Verde</td>
<td>17.3</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>518,000</td>
<td>197,844</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12,484,071</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1 presents data for the top twenty LDCs that have tourism as the largest contributor to GDP. Of the twenty countries, all but three are island states, only four have a population of more than a million, and some countries, e.g. Aruba, the Bahamas, St. Lucia and Barbados, receive tourist numbers that are many times in excess of their population. These countries are also classified as high or medium developed according to the World Bank or the UNDP and yet, accounted for only 1.6% (13 million tourist arrivals) of world arrivals in 2005 (UNWTO, 2005). This demonstrates that tourism can be vital to the economies of LDCs and more importantly SIDS even though tourist arrivals are relatively small (Harrison, 2009).

In the early phases of tourism, travel was mostly intra-regional where people moved from the developed metropolis to more remote less developed destinations within the developed countries (Harrison, 2001, p. 9). This trend is still being observed today but on a larger global scale. Travel from more developed to less developed regions continues to be a driving factor that influences global travel and is exemplified by tourism arrival data in most LDCs including SIDS in the Caribbean, Indian Ocean and Fiji (Sharpley and Telfer, 2002, p. 28).

Trends in tourist movement are different for specific regions as there is unequal distribution of tourists amongst LDCs. Political stability, security and appropriate infrastructure are vital pre-requisites in facilitating tourism though these are areas that are lacking in some less developed countries. In such regions as Africa and the Middle East, there are considerable differences in tourism accounts and arrival numbers, which are directly related to the differences in developmental features (Akama, 1999; Harrison, 1992). This is prominent throughout the various regions in the world and is a key point when specifying differences between tourism benefits among LDCs.

Tourism’s contributions to the overall development of less developed societies are profound (Font and Ahjem, 1999). Hence, understanding the development of a destination and its relation to the global community is vital to understanding tourism’s contribution to communal development.
2.2 Tourism in the South Pacific

The South Pacific has always conjured images of tropical beauty and romantic images in the minds of many outsiders (Hall, 1996; Harrison, 1992; Milne, 2005). From the days of the early explorations to the present, the region has to some extent maintained its allure and image in the minds of many as an ideal travel destination. However, despite this fact, tourism for the South Pacific is complex and has undergone many changes in how it is managed and perceived from within.

For countries in the South Pacific region, tourism was introduced in the late 1900s as an alternative by means of which their economies and national ambitions can be sustained in the long term. This came as the economic benefits demonstrated by Hawaii and Tahiti set an example that many countries in the region had hoped to follow (Belt Collins, 1973). Prior to the 1970s, most South Pacific countries were British, French, American or New Zealand colonies and territories. By the late 1970s most countries had gained independence and had become new nation states inheriting dwindling agricultural industries. The low resource base, limited land resources and geographical isolation meant that there was limited economic potential in agriculture and other manufacturing industries. Thus, tourism was sought and encouraged as a means of moving these countries forward both economically and socially.
Researchers argue that most economies of South Pacific countries maintain survival under the Migration, Remittances, Aid and Bureaucracy or MIRAB economic structure (Milne, 2005). This typically meant that economies were characterised by high dependence on foreign aid, remittances from citizens working abroad and, in most cases, the government was the largest employer. It is argued that MIRAB structures create an unbalanced economic environment that stunts local private sector development, a factor which may still be true for the smaller countries in the South Pacific (Milne, 2005, p. 10). However, through the past 20 years many changes have come about in island economies which have altered economic structures.

Shifted global power balances have led to less reliable aid flows and international lending agencies have placed growing pressure on island governments to cut bloated payrolls and open themselves to open and free trade (Milne, 2005, p. 10).

As such, tourism has risen in prominence and is today, for most of the larger and more accessible island states in the region, the major industry (Rao, 2002). Tourism has been described as “a new kind of sugar” and for particular countries, this has literal implications (Belt Collins, 1973). Take for instance Fiji, with tourism replacing the sugar industry as the largest foreign exchange earner in the 1980s. The
Cook Islands, Tahiti, New Caledonia, Papua New Guinea, Samoa, and Vanuatu have also benefited from tourism in the past decades with all countries receiving an excess of 100,000 visitors in 2007, contributing to high percentages of employment and economic contributions (SPTO, 2010). Studies conducted by Milne (2005, pp. 18-20) identified that tourism had contributed over $US 1.5 billion in South Pacific Tourism Organisation member countries whilst employing over 4 million people in 2004.

Tourism’s economic and social contributions to the South Pacific are continually being examined and in the region, tourism is more significant to some countries than others. It is suggested that tourism accounts differ in the Pacific due to many factors mainly derived through the lack of adequate access and sheer geographical isolation (Hall, 1996; Sofield, n.d; Milne, 2005). However it may be viewed, tourism’s rise to prominence is becoming a significant driver of economic growth and development in the region and is projected to continue to rise in the decades to come.

As a result, the impacts of tourism then become an important point for debate as these are now usually contextualised as part of a sustainability meta-discourse. The impacts of tourism are complex in nature and are foremost in influencing perceptions about tourism at all levels.

2.3 Economic impacts of tourism

Tourism is an export industry that countries can develop to meet economic objectives primarily through its contribution to foreign exchange (Weaver and Oppermann, 2000, p. 248). Tourism affects the balance of payments of countries in three general ways: directly through government taxes and revenue, indirectly through the progression of the tourist dollar throughout related sectors, and induced through the provision of related infrastructure such as roads and communication, which further benefits other industries and sectors (Collier, 1991; Lea, 1988, p. 18).

The tourism industry is a highly labour intensive industry. This is beneficial to countries in the South Pacific which rely highly on remittances and have high unemployment rates. Employment benefits generated by tourism are also classified into direct, indirect and induced impacts. Tourism also has the potential to generate
employment in related sectors such as agriculture and manufacturing (Weaver and Oppermann, 2000, pp. 256-257). Furthermore, the tourist dollar can be transferred through induced employment, when more jobs are created to cater for tourists as well as tourism workers. However, it is important to note that, in South Pacific countries, local residents employed in the tourism sector often assume “menial” roles and qualified expatriates are imported to fill highly paid managerial positions (Oppermann and Chon, 1997, pp. 111-112). This, in turn, means that skills of local communities are rarely developed to facilitate upward mobility of local labour, which is further compounded by the lack of higher education institutes which should train and educate locals to fill higher positions (Sofield, 2003; Economist Intelligence Unit, 1979).

A common unwanted economic impact associated with tourism is inflation. Tourists often have the ability to pay more than locals for certain products. This, combined with profit-seeking by local retailers, often results in reports of increased retail prices. In some instances, household products are too expensive for members of the local population not engaged in tourism, and in others there are separate pricing schemes for locals and tourists (Tosun, 2000). Tourism may also cause inflation in land prices. This benefits property owners yet often forms a barrier to locals, as property values are placed above purchasing ability. Inflation rates are often very high in LDCs and, more importantly, in Small Islands Developing States in the Pacific which depend highly on tourism (Oppermann and Chon, 1997, p. 113).

A further possible economic impact of tourism is the increased dependency of developing states on more developed states. Tourism requires capital and expertise, something that is lacking in most small island states in the Pacific. As a result, governments encourage foreign investors and import labour to establish tourism (Ryan and Page, 2000). The level of dependence created by tourism places countries in very fragile positions, not only because sudden changes may occur, but also because the repatriation of expatriate income and other leakages may lead to a loss in benefits. There are three general causes of leakage: the lack of availability of goods of the required quality, foreign ownership of tourism resources and the lack of skilled labour (Oppermann and Chon, 1997, pp. 113-114). Leakages are negative
impacts associated with tourism and are viewed as benefits lost. Measures must be taken to reduce them. Although leakages vary by country, empowering local industries and people, particularly in small island states in the Pacific, can make improvements.

Understanding the economic framework of tourism is essential. Leakages, inflation and dependency are all evident in LDCs yet are considered, to an extent, acceptable in the process of development. Therefore, economic costs of tourism must be monitored and controlled closely by destination communities so that more benefits may be gained.

2.4 The socio-cultural impacts of tourism

Tourism is a complex industry involving numerous factors that have varying socio-cultural impacts on any destination. As discussed by Runyun and Wu (1979, pp. 448-450), tourism, to an extent, encourages positive socio-cultural exchange and increased understanding. However, it is also alleged that tourism negatively influences changes in cultural practices, social structures and general behaviour of host populations (Akama, 1999). Tourism’s impacts are difficult to substantiate as many socio-cultural impacts may stem from other factors, for example, mass-media, and increased modernisation (Oppermann and Chon, 1997, pp. 117-119; Brougham and Butler, 1981; Runyan and Wu, 1979). As such, community perceptions about tourism are formed based on what they derive from the exchange with tourism.

Among the socio-cultural impacts associated with tourism development, many relate to how cultural exchanges and economic potential are enhanced within a destination community (Macleod, 2006; Weaver and Oppermann, 2000, p.283). Some argue that cultural commoditisation can affect cultures of developing societies through over-exploitation. However, if planned correctly, tourism has immense potential to raise standards of living (Macleod, 2006, pp. 72-73). Tourism relies on the culture of host communities as attractions and it is alleged that tourism further encourages the continuous practice of aspects of culture such as dances, crafts and art, which may otherwise be lost (Macleod, 2006; Weaver and Oppermann, 2000, p. 283). The encouragement of further entrepreneurial activities through related agricultural
business and small enterprises are also known impacts directly influenced by tourism development, contributing to the enhancement of social standards. As noted by Weaver (1998), if managed appropriately, genuine cultural exchange may be established, supposedly allowing for learning by both hosts and guests. More importantly, tourism purportedly promotes the empowerment of local communities, women and youth and is argued to provide a diverse spectrum of areas where economic gains can be derived by local communities (Macleod, 2006; MacNaught, 1982, pp. 359).

The impacts of tourism are complex and assessing them mainly depends upon the theoretical or ideological orientation of the observer. Tourism is also considered to cause cultural impacts because of the tendency for tourism to impose foreign values and beliefs on the host society (Akama, 1999). Although it may not be obvious to host populations, tourism and the need to cater for guests may indirectly force locals to adopt and even assimilate aspects of the guest culture. This would mean that locals would have to accept, or fall subservient to, the cultural demands and requirements of foreigners. This is considered negative as it places the culture of locals as being less important than tourists (Macleod, 2006; Ryan and Page, 2000). A further socio-cultural impact of tourism, often considered as negative, is the copying of tourist behaviour by the host population (Macleod, 2006; Weaver, 1998; MacCannell 1976). Tourism has the tendency to introduce host populations to new ways of life and behaviours totally different from their own. Such close interactions of people with large cultural differences often leads to the host society demonstrating aspects of the guest culture, leading to what is termed the “demonstration effect” (Cohen, 1988). Locals in contact with foreigners often display behaviour typical of western tourists at the village setting and at times the subsequent behavioural change can cause conflicts at different social levels within the host community (McNaught, 1996; Cohen, 1988).

Tourism is also alleged to provide a new form of activity which draws people out of their “normal” roles in villages for work at the hotels. As a result, traditional roles in the village setting may be disrupted to varying extents depending on the type of employment as well as the nature of tourism occurring (de Burlo, 2003; Douglas and
Douglas, 1996a, p. 51). Douglas and Douglas (1996a) list differences in host and guest culture, ratio of visitors to residents and speed and intensity of development as determinants of the extent of impacts on host communities in the Pacific. Tourism supposedly influences indigenous cultural practices as well, as it adds a new (often commercial) context to which culture is performed. As a result, age-old traditions may lose their significance through alteration and over-exploitation to meet tourism demand (Cohen, 1988). Studies conducted by Burns (2003) raised the implications that tourism had for the women of Beqa (a small island just south of Viti Levu). Burns (2003, p. 85), stated that women who worked at the hotel had taken on new roles as main breadwinners of the family. This allegedly altered the traditionally subordinate role of Fijian women, outlining areas for possible conflicts within the communities. She also expressed the observation that tourism on Beqa Island provided women with a source of social mobility, adding a new dimension to communal living as women are traditionally confined to the home (Niukula, 1980). Bolabola (1980), in her study of the impact of tourism in Fijian communities, identified how tourism and the comodification of woodcarvings have led to alterations in the motifs, design and process used in manufacturing. It was alleged that as a result of increased demand from tourists, wood carvers were making ornaments from readily available wood (as opposed to the rare Vesi hardwood traditionally used). Carvers were also using Polynesian motifs and were carving masks, animals and other items which are not “traditionally” Fijian, but were made because it appealed to tourists (Bolabola, 1980; Niukula, 1980, p. 94). More generally, in his study of the changes in indigenous Fijian culture, Ravuvu (1988, pp. 32-48), affirms that the introduction of economic activity is possibly one of the strong influences for changes and will continue to be a force that will influence the modernization of Fijian communities.

An important note to consider when dealing with the socio-cultural impacts of tourism is the level of acceptance that host communities have towards change. MacNaught, (1982, pp. 365-366), suggests that some cultures of Pacific Island countries are more resilient to change and interactions with tourists, while others are more sensitive. Nonetheless, MacNaught (1982) and N. Douglas (1996) agree that changes in socio-cultural aspects of a society will be influenced by changes in the
nature of contact with tourist, their numbers and length and intensity of contact. Attitudes and views toward the costs of tourism involvement also change. Doxey (1976) devised an index of resident irritation to describe the levels of contentment that locals have towards tourists and visitors. The Irridex, is based on the idea that as visitor numbers increase, feelings of the host communities would also change, along with changes or impacts arising from increased visitation or tourism involvement. Doxey’s Irridex, despite being discredited by some and having little empirical evidence, demonstrates the multitude of possible impacts and changes in perception towards tourism over time (Weaver and Oppermann, 2000, p. 298; Doxey, 1976).

Tourism has a number of impacts upon social structure and the basic nature of personal interactions. As in the case of Pacific Island countries, it is perceived that the negative socio-cultural impacts may be more because of the vast differences between the hosts and guest cultures (Douglas and Douglas, 1996a; Sofield, n.d). Features of cultural imperialism, demonstration effects, cultural commoditisation, authenticity and changes in social structure of less developed countries are viewed in close relation to tourism development. There are continuing debates over what is perceived as positive, negative, and the actual potential which tourism may have on host communities.

Social exchange theory (SET) is founded on the principle that people’s behaviour, beliefs and perceptions are directed by certain tangible and intangible exchanges, consisting of rewards and costs (Zafirovski, 2005). SET studies conducted on tourism demonstrate that at the individual level, tourism employees who benefit directly from tourism have positive attitudes towards it (Ward and Berno, 2011). Similarly, in the case of communities, perceptions, and responsiveness to tourists and tourism entities are also influenced directly by the nature of benefits and non-benefits derived from them (Choi and Murray, 2010; Anderereck, Valentine, Knopf and Vogt, 2005). Hence, it would be correct to assume that communal perceptions about tourism depend upon its perceived environmental, economic and social costs and benefits.
2.5 Summary

This chapter has reviewed literature on the socio-economic impacts of tourism. It has provided a commentary on literature that exists on tourism development as well as the social and economic impacts of tourism.

The literature review has set the stage for an examination on the dynamics of tourism and impacts on local indigenous communities.

The following chapter provides a background to the research area and outlines the history of the two communities. In effect, it concentrates research away from the global and regional perspective on to the local setting. In particular, it will outline the external influences on Votua and Vatuolalai and set the stage for an empirical analysis of data and the following conclusions.
Chapter 3

The local setting
3.0 Introduction

This chapter will highlight the area in which this study is set. It will provide a brief outline on the geographical features and history of Fiji and then focus on the two case studies.

3.1 Fiji

The Republic of the Fiji Islands is an archipelago comprised of about 332 islands (with a combined land mass of about 18,274 sq. /Km) which lies 16° S of the equator and just to the west of the international dateline (see figure 3.1). Most of its 830,000 people live on the two main islands of Viti Levu and Vanua Levu. Viti Levu, where the nation’s capital Suva is located, is the largest (10,390 sq km), most populated, and most developed island. The island of Vanua Levu is smaller (5,538 sq km), much more sparsely populated and economically less developed (Fiji Bureau of Statistics, 2010). Over 25% of the population is concentrated around the capital, Suva, and in and around Fiji’s second city, Lautoka and in Nadi and Ba, all on the main island. Among the remaining islands, 150 are inhabited, with Taveuni and Kadavu being the larger islands followed by Koro, Gau and Ovalau. There are also a few smaller island groups. These include the Lau Group of Islands to the east and the Yasawa and Mamanuca groups of Islands, which lie to the west, and are relatively well established in terms of tourism.
Tourism in Fiji first began in Suva in the early 1900s, with the establishment of the White Settlers League in 1920, a body comprised of early white settlers who marketed Fiji’s agricultural lands to other potential settlers (Scott, 1970, p. 1). The White Settlers League then developed into what was the Suva Tourism Board, and into what is now Fiji’s national tourism organisation, Tourism Fiji. However, despite its early beginnings, tourism was not really considered as a major industry until the late 1960s after it was realized that economic avenues other than agriculture were required to sustain national economic growth and development (Belt Collins, 1973).

Later, in 1973, a comprehensive Tourism Development Programme (TDP) compiled by Belt, Collins and Associates for Fiji, suggested that tourism was well suited to Fiji’s social and natural conditions. The programme also highlighted that Fiji had the immense potential to gain foreign exchange advantages through tourism. The programme further identified specific “regions of interest” in most of the 14 provinces of Fiji, extending from the western parts of Viti Levu to the eastern islands of Lau. The programme, more importantly, raised the initial perception that that tourism was to become a vital economic activity, possible throughout the Fiji group.
A number of TDPs were later developed, including the more current Fiji Tourist Development Plan 2007, which followed on from the initial recommendations of the Belt Collins report, but have moved towards the encouragement of alternative forms of tourism which yielded more benefits for Fiji’s communities and were able to retain profits within Fiji.

Today, the western provinces of Ba and Nadroga have remained the major tourism areas. Its close proximity to the Nadi international airport as well as the clustered nature of tourism facilities are a strong factor for tourism’s concentration in these areas (FVB, 2005; Ministry of Tourism, 2009). The leading tourism regions in Fiji include Denarau (27%), Nadi (12%), the Yasawa (6%) and Mamanuca (15%) groups as well as the Coral Coast of Fiji (18%), which are all situated on the western side of the country (refer to figure: 3.2).

**Figure 3.2: Concentration of tourism in Fiji**

![Figure 3.2: Concentration of tourism in Fiji](image)

*Source: Ministry of Tourism, 2009*

### 3.2 The Coral Coast

The Coral Coast of Fiji is the area situated on the south-western corner of Viti Levu, an area renowned for its rich coral and marine biodiversity, with ideal tropical weather and low levels of rainfall throughout the year. It is spread over 5 districts in
the province of Nadroga. Today, these districts vary with regards to the number of villages as well as the number of hotels situated within them.

Figure 3.3: Map of the Coral Coast

The southern Coral Coast underwent a series of developments in the mid-1900s, the first of which was the construction of the Queen’s Highway in 1942. This was undertaken by the United States Army and provided the initial portal to further development in the area. This also opened the area to the exploration of its potential for tourism. In 1952, Fiji’s first resort hotel was constructed in Korolevu, next to the village of Votua. The construction of the Warwick Resort (also near Votua) in 1972 and the Naviti Resort (at Vatuolalai) in 1974 followed. After this, the Tambua Sands and Hideaway resorts were built in the latter parts of the 1970s to 1980s (Kinivilame

Source: www.mapia.com
Ravonoloa2, pers comm. 2009). The operation of these major hotels in the past decades has further led to the establishment of other small-scale tourism initiatives such as backpackers, ecotourism, dive centres and home-stays.

Today, the Coral Coast is Fiji’s second largest tourism destination (with over 40 licensed establishments) and accounts for over 150,000 international visitors annually (Ministry of Tourism, 2009). Tourism has been perceived as the lifeblood of the Coral Coast as it has contributed to the development of the various communities mainly through employment, land lease benefits and other tourism-related activities (Kado, 2007; Fong, 2006; Tawake et al, 2003; Sofer, 1990). However, studies also suggest that tourism is a factor for influencing socio-cultural changes within the various districts along the Coral Coast (Kado, 2007; Fong, 2006; Tawake et al, 2003; Sofer, 1990; Samy, 1980).

3.3 Korolevu-i-wai

The district of Korolevu-i-wai is one of the smallest districts in Fiji and includes the four villages of Tagaque, Komave, Votua and Vatuolalai. Perceived as one of the most significant districts in Fiji in terms of tourism, it is where Fiji’s tourism industry was pioneered, with the villages of Votua and Vatuolalai being the first communities to partake in tourism in the 1950s and 1970s. Today, it is a district with one of the densest concentrations of hotels and tourism establishments with over 30 licenced hotels and guest houses (Ministry of Tourism, 2009). The Korolevu-i-wai people are, in most respects, more developed in terms of standard of living and infrastructure by comparison to other rural Fijian communities in Fiji (Fong, 2006, p. 81).

The Korolevu-i-wai tourism industry has influenced a lot of development over the past thirty years which has led to the opening of vast numbers of businesses within the communities (Fong, 2006; Sofer, 1990). For instance, the Korolevu-i-wai area houses several organized village tours, dive excursions, horse riding, small shops, game-fishing, handicraft and other money-making activities in which the villagers are a main beneficiary. Additionally, shops and restaurants have opened to meet the

---

2 Kinivilame Ravonoloa is the son of the district chief – the Tui Davutukia
demands of workers in the industry as well as tourists. Examples of these community initiatives include Vilisite’s Restaurant in Votua, horse riding and hair salon in Vatuolalai, village tour in Nagasau Settlement and Korolevu Handicraft Centre in Jafau Settlement (Fong, 2006, pp. 81-82).

Over the years, settlements have also been established in the district to cater for migrants who have moved into the area to work either directly or indirectly in tourism. These settlements include Qalito, Nasi, Uciwai, Jafau, Korolevu Settlement, and Votua Housing (Fong, 2006; Bolabola, 1980). People from different parts of Fiji are still drawn to the region, attracted to the economic activity stemming from the tourism industry, with some taking up permanent residency in the area. A number of recent settlers in the district are Indian farmers who have been able to secure pieces of land through native and crown land leases (Kado, 2007, Fong, 2006).

3.4 Location of the villages

Within the district of Korolevu-i-wai lie the two villages that have been selected for the examination of tourism’s impacts on indigenous communities. Justification for the use of case studies for this study is provided for in more detail in the following chapter. This section will provide a description of these villages in the context of the geographical and socio-cultural setting.

Votua village and Vatuolalai are about 6 to 10 minutes drive apart and have been selected for their various attributes with regards to tourism.

Vatuolalai

Vatuolalai consists of 32 households and a population of about 185-200 people. It is located immediately next to where the Naviti Resort is situated. It is one of the most well developed villages in the country in terms of modern housing and amenities. In the 1970s, landowners agreed to lease their land to the hotel on the basis that preference for work was given to the people of Vatuolalai. The villagers first took part in tourism through the construction of the Naviti Resort and were among the first Fijians to gain employment in tourism after the resort opened in 1974. Today,
employment at the resort, among other forms of tourism, still continues in Vatuolalai.

Figure 3.4: Satellite image of Vatuolalai village

Source: www.googleearth.com

Votua

Votua village is located about 8 minutes from the Warwick Resort and about 5 minutes from where the Korolevu Resort was located before closing in late 1983. Votua is the chiefly village of the district of Korolevu-i-wai and is where the district chief, the Tui Davutukia, resides. The village holds a place of importance within the district and is often where meetings and important decisions regarding the district are made. The village of Votua comprises about 44 households, and has a general population of about 200 people. The people of Votua have been engaged in tourism since the 1950s and many villagers still partake in some form of tourism to this day.
Both villages are located at the heart of the tourist belt, on the Queen’s Highway which links Suva with Nadi and Lautoka. The two case studies are typical of villages in the district in terms of geographical features, distance from markets, access to various services and links to the tourist industry (Sofer, 1990, p.109). Over the years, the people of Votua and Vatuolalai have endured environmental, social and economic changes with regard to tourism.

Empirical studies conducted on Votua in the late 1980s highlighted the social impacts of tourism on the village setting. Sofer (1990, p.110), whilst acknowledging the profound impact that tourism had in elevating the economic profile of villagers, also acknowledged that tourism had some negative implications. Sofer (1990), noted that in the 1980s, tourism was responsible for about 80% of money brought into Votua village. This was mainly through employment undertaken by villagers in lowly skilled and low paid jobs in the hotels (Kado, 2007; Sofer, 1990, pp. 110-117; Samy, 1980). Similar results were shown by studies conducted on poverty alleviation in Fiji, which discovered that tourism was a large contributor to wealth in the village of Vatuolalai (Kado, 2007). Observations were also made on the low level of crop
cultivation undertaken in both villages. It was suggested that people were spending less time on fishing and farming as a result of engaging in work at the hotels (Fong, 2006; Sofer, 1990). Both villages have established their own marine protected areas in the early 2000s as a response to overfishing and over-extraction of conch-shells and other large shell-fishes for the souvenir trade. Fong (2006) established that the MPAs in Votua and Vatuolalai were effective in restoring fish populations and further notes that the results were complemented by the encouragement by tourism in the area to increase conservation.

The two villages of Votua and Vatuolalai have been at the forefront of tourism for over 3 decades and continue to provide invaluable data on the impacts of tourism on indigenous communities.

3.5 Conclusion

This chapter has discussed the area in which this study is set. It has highlighted the geographical characteristics of Fiji, the beginnings of its tourism industry and has focused in on the Coral Coast, the district of Korolevu-i-wai and on the two case studies, Votua and Vatuolalai. It has set the stage for understanding on the methods used in this study.
Chapter 4

Methodology
4.0 Introduction

The socio-economic impacts of tourism on the villages of Votua and Vatuolalai cannot be understood if the most appropriate research approaches are not selected. Interpreting of tourism’s impacts on indigenous communities is a complex undertaking, and is dependent on identifying methods most appropriate in fulfilling the objectives of this research.

This chapter will discuss the methods employed in collecting empirical data for this study. It will highlight the research problem and describe the overall aim of the research before more detailed explanations are provided on the methods employed in gathering empirical data for this study.

4.1 Research problem

The issue on the impacts of tourism on local indigenous communities is complex with many differing points of view. However, for more sustainable policies to be adapted at the national and community level, a greater depth of knowledge on the social and economic impacts of tourism in indigenous communities must be gained.

The intrinsic, often immeasurable, value of culture and the need to obtain sustained benefits from tourism depends upon interpreting the complexities of how tourism influences an indigenous community both socially and economically (Ayres, 2000; Ravuvu, 1988).

4.2 Aim

The aim of this project, then, is to analyse and interpret tourism’s social and economic impacts on Votua and Vatuolalai. These two communities have been at the forefront of tourism development and can best demonstrate examples of how Fijian culture and communalism can change as a result of involvement in tourism.

The overall aim of this research is to understand the social and economic implications of tourism for the two indigenous Fijian villages of Votua and Vatuolalai.
4.3 Research objectives

Below are the objectives of this study:

a. to outline the development of tourism in the Coral Coast of Fiji and its impact on the villages of Votua and Vatuolalai

b. to understand the perceptions held by the local communities on the social and economic impacts of tourism

c. to assess the level of economic dependency on tourism

d. to identify the extent to which tourism has influenced the growth of business and economic activity in the respective villages

e. to determine the extent to which tourism and external parties have contributed to the development of the respective communities

f. to evaluate the extent to which tourism has affected the empowerment of women and youths

g. to identify changes in tradition and cultural practice

h. to identify conflicts within and between the local communities as a result of tourism

i. to provide recommendations on how benefits can be sustained for the long term

4.4 Research methods

Empirical data for this study were collected mainly through the use of a combination of qualitative as well as quantitative research methods, which include the use of questionnaires, interviews, literature review and the use of some statistical interpretation.

The emphasis on a qualitative research approach is justified for social science research as it allows for interpreting communities and explaining the possible reasons for social phenomena (Jennings, 2001). Inductive approaches further allow
for the research problem to be explained from an insider’s perspective. Jennings (2001) states that inductive approaches involve collecting data from an internal viewpoint, established in the natural setting. As such, using an inductive approach would be the most appropriate for the assessment of the social and economic impacts of tourism on indigenous communities. These indigenous communities are complex and require careful analysis and interpretation, which can be largely derived through interviewing, interacting and gauging the perceptions of people in the community.

From 2006 to the present, including when I was an undergraduate student, several trips were undertaken to local communities throughout Fiji, including Kadavu, Vorovoro, the Mamanuca Group, Votua and Vatuolalai. I stayed in these communities for varying lengths of time, averaging from 2 days to a week. It was during such trips that the villages of Votua and Vatuolalai were first visited. These field visits set the stage for the formation of friendships and trust between me and the communities. The interest in the two communities and the subsequent observations further set the stage for establishing the research problem and the main aims for this study.

4.5 Data collection

A number of methods, predominantly qualitative, were used to gather the empirical data for this study. This included a case study of the two villages of Votua and Vatuolalai. These two communities represent appropriate examples of communities involved in tourism and it is assumed that such case studies can present appropriate data on the phenomenon of tourism’s impacts.

In-depth interviews with the Turaga ni koro (Village Headman), Turaga ni mataqali (Clan head) and heads of social committees were conducted alongside informal interviews. Participant observations were also used to provide data that could verify inferences made on tourism’s contribution to the development of Votua and Vatuolalai.

The data collection methods employed in this study are detailed below.
4.6 Review of previous research

A review of literature was conducted to gather information relevant to explaining the research problem. Various journals, edited books and publications on tourism in less developed countries, the Pacific region and Fiji were used as secondary data for this study.

The literature reviewed (chapter 2) provided a commentary that began from a broad global perspective and gradually developed with the focus moving from less developed countries in general to the particular study area. It was essential that focus be narrowed down from a broad perspective so that adequate understanding is gained prior to the introduction to the local context and dynamics of the communities used as case studies in chapter 3.

4.7 Case Study

This study employed a case study method as a means to collect primary data. This thesis supports the notion expressed by Veal (2006) that case studies are vital in interpreting complex social phenomena including social and economic impacts on communities. The two villages, Votua and Vatuolalai, are considered ideal areas with which social data can be derived to provide a better understanding on the research problem.

Veal (2006), explains that the case study method is vital to community-based research because it allows for the study of unique historical developments of people and their society. The case study method is a relevant research method for this study because it:

- investigates a contemporary phenomenon within its real life context when the boundaries between phenomenon and context are not clearly evident
- copes with the situation in which there more variables of interest than data points
- relies on multiple sources of evidence, with data needing to converge in a triangulating fashion
benefits from the prior development of theoretical propositions to guide data collection and analysis (Veal, 2006, p.108)

As mentioned previously, the two villages of Votua and Vatuolalai were selected because of their extensive relationship and contact with the tourism industry. The history of tourism in Fiji began in the Coral Coast with the operation of the Korolevu resort and later the Naviti and Warwick resorts, involving people from the two communities both directly and indirectly. Their direct role as landowners, with a large majority of people involved in some way in interacting with tourism and tourists, meant that gaining insight into the impacts of tourism would be possible by the use of case studies.

4.8 Participant observation

Participant observation formed a large part of this research and was used extensively to explain the occurrences observed in the two communities. Previous visits to the two communities first stimulated interest in examining tourism’s impacts on the Coral Coast because of observations on the differences in behaviour and maintenance of culture in these areas. As an indigenous Fijian, my insights and experiences of village life and protocols provided a strong background with which to use the participant observation method to examine the phenomena occurring in the villages of Votua and Vatuolalai.

During the course of this research I lived in the communities for two weeks and actively participated in village life. As a researcher I performed duties that any 23-year-old male would be engaged in, including gardening, fishing and other communal work such as village clean-ups and attending village meetings and other functions. Being part of village affairs was considered essential, and created positive perceptions of the researcher, allowing me to blend into the community and develop favourable relationships. Participant observation is justified especially where “the researcher is confident of obtaining reasonable access; the research problem is observable and capable of being addressed by qualitative data; and the research setting is sufficiently limited in size and location for it to be effectively observed” (Waddington 1994, p.108).
This was particularly true for this study, as I had the opportunity to be part of the communities during four visits lasting between two days to two weeks. Staying in the communities provided valuable insight into the functioning of the two villages up close and allowed observation of the way in which people in these communities lived. Ethical considerations were duly considered in the course of this thesis. These ethical considerations included respecting the protocols of the communities, maintaining anonymity of respondents, being non-intrusive and maintaining the integrity of the research. Observations were as objective as possible, despite my being included as part of the community.

The main strength of participant observation is the access granted by the communities to observe the front stage and back stage parts of the communities through inclusion in community functions and being part of the village. This was made possible particularly because traditional ties exist between people from the provinces of Nadroga and Cakaudrove, my own province. Access was positively enhanced through such social functions as the occasional evening kava sessions, church, village meeting and family meetings as well as a number of drinking parties involving the youth of the village.

The broad access provided confidence and justification for the use of participant observations, which enabled in-depth examinations of the social dynamics of these two communities.

### 4.9 Interviews

In all, over 40 interviews were conducted over the course of this research which included 18 in-depth interviews with selected individuals and when opportunities were presented, informal interviews were also initiated (over 20 informal interviews were conducted). Table 4.0 outlines the advantages and disadvantages of interviews as a means of data collection.

---

3 May, August, December, 2009 and January 2010
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Advantages of Interviews</th>
<th>Disadvantages of Interviews</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• No items are overlooked</td>
<td>• Takes time to arrange</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Questions and answers can be clarified by both interviewer and respondent</td>
<td>• Time consuming for researcher as it takes longer to collect data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Researcher can achieve depth of response</td>
<td>• Travel can be costly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Can be used to probe sensitive or difficult areas</td>
<td>• Excellent interviewing skills are needed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Good response rates</td>
<td>• Risk of interviewer bias</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Respondents do not need to be literate to participate</td>
<td>• Data analysis can be time consuming</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Responses are enriched by observing nonverbal cues (important in cross-cultural research)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Can be used as an exploratory stage in a larger study</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Source: Adapted from Hancock, 1998, p.11).

4.10 In-depth interviews

A total of 16 in-depth interviews were conducted as part of empirical data collection for this research. These interviews were conducted with key persons of interest, usually people who had extensive knowledge on issues being researched. This included the heads of various committees (conservation committee, youth, women, church and development) as well as key individuals in administrative positions.
including the village headman in each village. Village elders and retirees were also interviewed to gather historical accounts of the social and economic impacts of tourism in the respective communities. Interviews were conducted using questions concerning their perceptions, experiences and ideas of evidence of economic and social impacts of tourism in both Votua and Vatuolalai (refer to appendix 2).

In-depth interviews are deemed useful for this study as authorities within each community and their views were essential in answering the inquiries as to the impacts affecting each community. Walsh (1996) expresses the opinion that in-depth interviews with purposefully selected individuals can yield richer information than can questionnaires, and add a greater dimension of comprehension on a particular phenomenon. As such, key people with extensive knowledge on village and community issues were identified and interviewed so that a greater depth of understanding was gained on issues pertaining to village development.

4.11 Informal interviews

In the community setting, informal discussions or encounters can also yield unexpected but rich qualitative data (Walsh, 1996). As such, this study employed the use of informal interviews as a medium of data collection. Over 20 informal interviews and casual discussions were held with many community members in their natural setting in informal and unexpected circumstances. Opportunities dictated when and how the information was to be collected. However, for the most part, the interviewees were selected and at times the researcher anticipated and planned to attend certain gatherings.

Impromptu interviews were held around afternoon volleyball matches, informal meetings, kava sessions as well as family and other formal and informal social gatherings. The researcher used these opportunities to engage local community members and stimulate open exchange on issues pertaining to the impacts of tourism on the village. In a village setting, where most communication is conducted orally and at a more personal level, informal interviews and discussions were a key form of collecting data where in-depth personal perceptions were revealed (Bouma and Ling, 2004).
Caution was exercised in all aspects of discussions with interviewees, with some people selected specifically for their status and influence in the village. However, most informal interviews, particularly with elders in the village, came through chance and anticipation of particular gatherings, for instance, meetings at the village halls and invitations to kava sessions in particular homes were all opportunities to for informal interviews.

The use of triangulation has allowed for a better understanding on the manner in which responses are provided to this research. It was discovered that informal interviews conducted in these communities yielded very interesting findings, with some people contradicting responses made in the administered questionnaires and further confirming Walsh’s (1996, p. 60) point that if barriers to engaging community members were eliminated, more in-depth data can be collected through informal interviews.

4.12 Researcher-administered questionnaires

I administered questionnaires to 78 households in both villages. The use of researcher-administered questionnaires was selected to ensure that uncertainties which arose at any stage of questioning were settled on site. Walsh (1996, pp. 64-88), explains that questionnaires are practical in accessing a large sample and its qualitative use permits questioning various activities, which is justified for this research. Hancock (1998) also lists the advantages and disadvantages of using questionnaires (table 4.2) and mentions that questions will often arise requiring instant clarification by the researcher. Hence the use of researcher-administered questionnaires.
Table 4.2: Advantages and Disadvantages of Questionnaires

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Advantages of Questionnaires</th>
<th>Disadvantages of Questionnaires</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Relatively simple method of data collection.</td>
<td>• Cannot probe a topic in depth without being lengthy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Rapid and efficient method of data collection</td>
<td>• Respondent can omit items without Explanation, leaving data incomplete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Data can be collected from a widely scattered sample</td>
<td>• Selection of forced choice items may be insufficient to reflect respondent’s choice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Relatively inexpensive</td>
<td>• Amount of information is limited by respondent’s interest and attention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• One of the easiest tools to test for reliability and validity</td>
<td>• Questionnaires can go astray</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Respondents have time to consider each question</td>
<td>• Production and distribution can become expensive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Data analysis can be done quickly</td>
<td>• Sample is limited to those with literacy skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Can be used to collect data on a wide range of topics and attributes</td>
<td>• Most people express themselves better through the spoken word</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• No opportunity for the researcher to interact with respondents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• If respondents are anonymous they cannot be followed up</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Source: Adapted from Hancock, 1998, p.12).
The use of researcher-administered questionnaires was ideal for this research as several variables were included to gauge perceptions on the social and economic implications of tourism. The questionnaires were designed to determine economic activities, number working in tourism, energy requirements for cooking, perceived benefits from tourism, perceived disadvantages (family, community and economic) and other related questions. The use of researcher-administered questionnaires was justified as clarifications sought by respondents were addressed on site, allowing for a clearer data set to be collected.

However, despite attempts to limit the disadvantages of using questionnaires, problems were encountered, particularly when sensitive issues were raised. For example, hesitation was observed when questions related to village issues were answered by groups such as families and couples or more often by people from specific clans. Fijian culture is highly stratified and the observance of traditional roles is still being practised in the two villages. Hence, people from lower ranking clans were observed to be reluctant to answer questions pertaining to land lease benefits, village conflicts and land lease distribution. Further clarification through interpersonal discussions and informal interviews provided resolutions for some of these areas.

4.13 Population

The population cohort was drawn from both villages, including all households, people working at the resorts, owners of small tourism businesses and key people in each community. There are about 76 households in both villages.

4.14 Samples and cohorts

A cohort was identified to provide empirical data for this study, and the entire population of both villages was selected. Every household was provided questionnaires over a period of about a week. This was done so as to eliminate instances where people in the villages could discuss matters related to the questionnaires and share opinions. This is particularly important when studying small communities where discussions are held and consensus is induced through
social relationships (Veal, 2006). The researcher focused more on clarifying questions and ensuring that comprehension was established for each question so that accurate responses were received.

The completion rate was 100%: all questions in all questionnaires were answered by the respondents. This was facilitated mostly by the design of the questionnaire, experience the villagers already had as research subjects and, more importantly, through the instruction of the district Chief that that villagers should participate in the study.

### 4.15 Problems

Indigenous Fijian culture is stratified and is characterised by strong kinship and social order. As a result respondents will rarely provide a straightforward answer if it affects commonly held beliefs or perceptions concerning the whole community. Because of the cultural factors, difficulties experienced were mainly related to reluctance in expressing honest opinions. However, despite this, problems were fairly limited. Listed below are some of the problems encountered in collecting data for this research.

- Despite being an indigenous Fijian, the image of being an outsider still remained. In some instances, older womenfolk would restrict information provided about social issues because, as mentioned by a 65-year-old respondent, it was “their own affairs”, and not for outside consumption.

- Much research has previously been conducted in these two villages and would also influence, either negatively or positively, perceptions held by villages on the benefits that studies may provide. This was briefly addressed in the previous chapter and is provided for in more detail in the next chapter.

### 4.16 Benefits

- A total of 4 visits to the two villages allowed me to create friendships and allowed trust to be established between the researcher and members of the community, which was vital in facilitating the opinions of community members.
• Unrestricted access into the communities provided me with the opportunity to observe “real” phenomena occurring in the villages.

• Being an indigenous Fijian with traditional relationships with the local communities made it easier for me to engage with the members of the communities on a personal level.

• Staying in the villages provided a unique chance to “be part” of the community and observe the daily activities of the village. This extended to being part of informal social gatherings in kava sessions as well as alcohol drinking sessions.

• Unrestricted access to key persons such as Kini Ravonoloa, the son of the Tui Davutukia (Chief) made it easier to gain access into sensitive records and information on the two communities.

• My being young age but also married reduced worries and perceptions held by elders on relations with the young women in the village. This too, had an effect on being accepted into homes and taking part in discussions with elders.

A key advantage was that I lived with a family from a non-chiefly clan. Usually, guests of the chiefly family are accorded special treatment and such visitors are rarely shown the backstage elements of village life. This greatly improved the ease of gaining access to the grassroots community as it allowed me to “blend in” and ask questions without being seen as a “chiefs” guest.

4.17 Coding

Every returned questionnaire was given a number, and the data entered into an Excel spreadsheet. The use of mixed methods in the questionnaire meant that more quantitative as well as qualitative data was drawn via slightly detailed explanations as well as agreement and importance ratings.

Statistical data included such variables as age, marital status, and numbers of people in households were all assigned numerical codes to allow for analysis using Excel
spreadsheets. Agreement and importance ratings were also coded and analysed via Microsoft Excel.

4.18 Reliability and validity

The need for reliability and validity in qualitative research is as important as when using quantitative methods (Walsh, 1996). The methods used, if replicated, should potentially show similar results to that presented in chapter 5 of this study. However, it must be noted that despite similarities in basic data collected, differences will exist in the depth and rigour of data, which are influenced largely by the circumstances experienced by the researcher.

Gaining the trust of the communities and being one of the community members has largely influenced the results of this study. The use of researcher-administered questionnaires and interviews as well as participant observation has contributed to the overall quality of results and findings of this thesis. Furthermore, the use of cross-examination of results via the multiple research methods employed have not only positively influenced this study, but has also upheld its integrity in being reliable and valid.

4.19 Ethical considerations

Ethical considerations regarding all households interviewed and people encountered were taken into careful account when conducting data collection at both Votua and Vatuolalai. People in both communities were advised that the research being undertaken was for a Master’s thesis, using Votua and Vatuolalai as case studies. This was extremely important, as the research sought to highlight potentially sensitive information concerning the villages and their people. The researcher has also, throughout the course of this research, respected requests for confidentiality on the part of all persons who have contributed to this thesis.

4.20 Summary

This chapter has outlined the methods employed throughout the course of this thesis and highlighted events and experiences endured. The chapter which follows contains
the analysis and interpretation. It details the analysis of data using relevant literature and past research as mentioned in chapter 2.
Chapter 5

Results
5.0 Introduction

This chapter will outline the results of the empirical study undertaken on the two case studies Votua and Vatuolalai. Analysis of the researcher-administered questionnaires, interviews and observations conducted on the two communities produced the results that are presented here. A total of 34 questionnaires was administered in Vatuolalai and 44 in Votua, and this is indicative of the number of households in each village. The results are organised into 7 different parts, which is based on the structure of the questionnaire (refer to appendix 2). The results are themed into the 7 different categories so as to better align the findings of this paper with the overall aims and objectives of this thesis, which were outlined in previous chapters:

The findings from empirical studies conducted on Votua and Vatuolalai are themed into the following categories:

I. Population education and housing;
II. Livelihood, income and resource use pattern;
III. Health;
IV. Conflicts and problems;
V. Community participation and tourism;
VI. Local values and beliefs about tourism; and
VII. Socio-economic benefits to communities.

5.1 POPULATION, EDUCATION AND HOUSING

1. In an attempt to gauge the level of economic wealth and development within the communities, observations were made on the type of housing and infrastructure. The graphical analysis can be found in appendix one and the summary and discussion is outlined below.

Both communities are relatively well endowed in terms of modern housing and amenities. All homes have corrugated iron roofs, and 90% of houses are made of
brick and concrete; all homes in both villages have flush toilets. What was not
included in the questionnaire but was observed is the frequency of luxury items such
as sofa sets, television sets, DVD players, refrigerators and gas stoves. Of the 78
households in both villages, 95% of homes had some of the above items. This
suggests that there high standard of living in the cohort.

Vatuolalai however, is evidently the more “developed” of the two communities with
all houses having at least three of the following luxury items: television sets, DVD
player, hi-fi stereo, sofas, and all but two houses are made of concrete. In Votua,
90% of homes had 2 or 3 of such luxury items and 18 were observed to have outdoor
kitchens that require firewood, compared to 7 outdoor kitchens observed in
Vatuolalai.

A male respondent stated that “ because we have jobs at the hotels, we can easily buy
TV sets, gas stoves, sofas and other items on easy weekly installments through hire
purchase”. Another respondent said that, “every week we look forward to being paid
for the work we do, the FNPF⁴ gets deducted and we have money to spend on buying
food, essentials and whatever obligations to the Vanua”. A female respondent said,
“when mobile phones first came to Fiji, people in my village were the first to buy
phones, even without reception in the village”. These statements demonstrate the
level of understanding that the villagers have towards their economic potential and
what it has done to them. A village elder said that “ there is no longer a need to move
to Suva, we have all the comforts of Suva in our very own village. Is this a good
thing?, I think so”.

2. Do all the children in your household go to school? If not, what are
some of the reasons they do not go to school?

In Vatuolalai, 15% of children do not attend school and in Votua, 7% of all children
between the age of 6 and 16 do not attend school. For both villages, more than 85%
of children attend school which involves a 30 to 40 minute bus ride to the nearest
school in Sigatoka or in Nasikawa.

⁴ Fiji National Provident Fund – Fiji’s superannuation scheme.
In Vatuolalai 8.8% of the population state that they need their children to help out at home. One respondent said, “my grandparents live with us and because my parents are both working, I need to help out at home”. Some 5% of respondents state “other reasons” where respondents attribute dropping out of school after failing form 4 and form 6 examinations as the main factor that drives children to seek work in the massage parlour, hair braiding salon and later in the hotels. In Votua, 3 (6.8%) respondents state “other reasons” such as employment and confidence of gaining employment in the hotels as a reason why education is not actively pursued by children and their parents.

In comparison, Vatuolalai has a higher occurrence of children not attending school when compared to Votua. A key reason for this was shared by a respondent who is also a university graduate. He stated that “most people in our village know how easy it is to get jobs at the resort, so they don’t really care too much about education. Because work is guaranteed, children just give up after failing form 4. I mean, why should they worry when they have their own land, own homes, steady incomes? At least that’s how they think; there is little need for formal education”.

On the other hand, Votua villagers place heavy emphasis on education. This was reflected by a community leader who said that “a lot of people in this village are teachers, work for government and have good jobs in other parts of Fiji and the world. We know that education is important because work at the resort can only get you so far, people want better things for their families”. Another respondent stated that “we know that work at the hotels is not stable; in the slack periods we get laid off, and this is not good”.

3. In this part, respondents were required to rate a set of 7 statements on education. The analysed data is presented in detail in appendix 1

Respondents generally agreed on the role of education. Some 91% of respondents in Vatuolalai and 88.6% in Votua agree that it has become easier for children to go to school (figure A.12 and A.18). As one respondent said, “having a reliable income from the hotels has allowed me to pay for school fees and worry less about purchasing items such as books, uniforms and paying for bus fares. My children attend school in Sigatoka, some 40 minutes bus ride away”. Another respondent
mentioned that “the contributions to the FNPF have allowed me to withdraw my pension fund to pay for my child’s education at the Fiji Institute of Technology to study business.”

Similarly, 88% of respondents in Vatuolalai and 95.5% in Votua are better able to pay for school fees (figure A.13 and A.19). Some 82% of Vatuolalai respondents and 88.6% of respondents in Votua agree that they are now able to send their children to good schools; 3 respondents further explained that with the income from tourism (work at the hotels and village based business) they are able to pay for their children to study in larger schools in Suva. Another 4 respondents also noted that they are able to send their children to the premier boarding schools in Suva, which often require larger investments in terms of purchasing of boarding kits which include mattresses, bed sheets and other essentials on top of school fees at the beginning of each school term. This often amounts to over $2500 per year, including transportation costs. The remaining 3 charts in appendix 1 express similar results, with 88% of respondents in Vatuolalai and 95.5% of respondents from Votua agreeing the tourism has taught practical skills to earn an income with 100% from both communities agreeing that it is important for their children to go to school.

The last graph (figures A.12 and A.24), however, demonstrates some interesting results, as 100% of respondents in Votua and only 79% in Vatuolalai agree that tourism has shown the importance of education to the community. Some 17.6% of respondents in Vatuolalai disagree, with one respondent stating that “tourism has introduced a dependency by villagers on tourism for economic employment, creating a shift away from education.” One respondent said that “the youth of the village choose to drop out of school after form 6 and form 7 because they know they will have a job waiting for them at the resort. A retired deacon of the Methodist church said:

“In our village, I think only 6 people have graduated from tertiary institutions with diplomas and degrees. Most children just finish from 6 and go straight into the hotels. It seems that people here do not care too much about education because work is guaranteed. I have served in different parts of Fiji, and to come back and witness this kind of
attitude in my own village, it is worrisome; people are not looking for other, better opportunities”.

More details can be found in the illustrative case studies at the end of the chapter (5.8.1).

5.2 Livelihood, income and resources use pattern

4. Respondents were given a list of income sources and asked to identify which were their main sources of income. The results are outlined below:

Table 5.1a: Sources of income for Vatuolalai

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sources of income</th>
<th>Source (number of respondents)</th>
<th>Main source (number of respondents)</th>
<th>Source (%)</th>
<th>Main Source (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Work at the hotel</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>70.6</td>
<td>64.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourism related business</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>55.9</td>
<td>14.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lease form the hotel</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>23.5</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Handicraft / basket weaving</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Handicraft business</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canteen business (groceries, kava, cigarette etc.)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farming Staple and Cash crops</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farming Vegetables</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remittances</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social welfare</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fishing</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sea Cucumber collecting</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Sea food collection (e.g. shells / mud crab / sea urchin)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coral / ornamental fish collection</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boat operation / sea transportation</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle-men agent for marine products</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seaweed cultivation</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wood/mangrove collection</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5.1b: Sources of income for Votua

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of income</th>
<th>Source (number of respondents)</th>
<th>Main source (number of respondents)</th>
<th>Source (%)</th>
<th>Main Source (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Work at the hotel</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>65.9</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourism related business</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>34.1</td>
<td>11.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Handicraft business</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Handicraft / basket weaving</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farming Staple and Cash crops</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canteen business (groceries, kava, cigarette etc.)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farming Vegetables</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remittances</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lease form the hotel</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fishing</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sea Cucumber collecting</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Sea food collection (e.g. shells / mud crab / sea urchin)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coral / ornamental fish collection</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boat operation / sea transportation</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle-men agent for marine products</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seaweed cultivation</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wood/mangrove collection</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social welfare</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tables 5.1a and 5.1b demonstrate that hotel work as well as tourism related businesses take precedence as key income sources in both villages. In Vatuolalai, 64.7% of respondents stated “work at the hotels” as their main source of income compared to 50% in Votua. This is followed by “tourism related business”, with 34.1% of respondents in Votua and 55.9% of respondents in Vatuolalai indicating it as an income source.

This significant difference can be attributed to the diversity of village based tourism enterprises operating in Vatuolalai, which include village stays, village tours, nature tours, hair braiding parlour, massage parlour, home stays, handicraft business and a
jet ski business. However, in Votua, villagers earn money through village stays, village tours and handicraft businesses and are highlighted by 15% of respondents who mainly benefit from participation in home stay programmes. Another additional factor can include the location of the villages and the close proximity of the Naviti Resort to the village of Vatuolalai.

Another key difference is income received from land leases. In Vatuolalai, 23.5% of the population identify lease from the resorts as a source of income whilst in Votua only 4.5% earn money from land lease payments. This can be attributed to the fact that in Vatuolalai, the chiefly clan mataqali, comprised of 8 households, receives lease payouts from the Naviti Resort, whereas in Votua, only one nuclear family receives lease money. The reason for this is that the land on which the Warwick Resorts sits is owned by a mataqali that is comprised of only one family.

Both communities share similarities with respect to money earned from farming, with 20.5% of respondents in Votua stating it as an income source compared to 11.8% in Vatuolalai. This difference can be attributed to the different experiences endured by the two communities. Respondents from Votua provided details of when the Korolevu Hotel ceased operation and the villagers were forced back into semi-subsistence agriculture to ensure that they feed their families. One respondent stated that “we know what it is like to be in tourism; during peak seasons, we all earn money; during low seasons, coup, cyclones, we don’t have jobs nor do we have food to eat. Why? Because when we work at the resort, we don’t farm. When we get laid off, we don’t have money to buy and no farm to rely on”.

In the following section, questions pertaining to food, its collection, and consumption patterns are asked to gauge the participation of villagers in their perceived “traditional” activities in areas of agriculture and fisheries.

5. **How often do you fish or collect seafood?**

Villagers from both communities stated that they do not engage in commercial fishing. Respondents agreed that at times they would receive cash from other villagers as a form of payment if seafood was needed for certain family obligations, or events, but fishing was not perceived as a source of income as they did not supply
a steady market nor earn money on a regular basis. This means that seafood collection and fishing was done primarily for subsistence.

The graphs in figure 5.1a and 5.1b demonstrate how often people in the communities engage in seafood collection or fishing.

Generally, more people in Votua fish and/or collect seafood than people in Vatuolalai. Furthermore, the cohort in Votua fish more frequently than the Vatuolalai cohort. Here, it was observed that 82.4% of respondents in Vatuolalai agreed to being engaged in fishing and/or seafood collection, compared to 97.7% of respondents in Votua. This implies that a greater number of people in Vatuolalai (17.6%) do not engage in fishing and/or seafood collection than the cohort in Votua (2.3%). Additionally, in Vatuolalai a total of 38.2% of respondents also stated that they engaged in fishing at least once a week, compared to 61.4% of respondents in Votua. Lastly, a total of 17.6% of respondents in Vatuolalai agreed that they had “never” engaged in fishing, compared to 2.3% in Votua.

The following questions aim to examine reasons for these observed phenomenon.
6. Has seafood collection become more difficult since your involvement in tourism? YES/NO

The majority (above 50%) of the respondents from both communities agree that tourism has made seafood collection more difficult. In Vatuolalai, a total of 65% of respondents agreed that seafood collection or fishing has become difficult since their involvement in tourism and in Votua, 52% agreed to the statement, 13% less than that of the Vatuolalai cohort.

Table 5.2: Has seafood collection become more difficult since your involvement in tourism?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Village</th>
<th>Yes (%)</th>
<th>No (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vatuolalai</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Votua</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The possible reasons for the marked difference between villages in the responses can be attributed to a number of factors which are discussed below.

7. If yes, please indicate reasons why you think seafood collection has been affected:

Figure 5.2a: Factors affecting seafood collection - Vatuolalai
A high percentage of the Vatuolalai (58.8%) cohort agree “work at the hotels” is a main reason for not fishing or collecting seafood, as do 45.5% of the Votua cohort, 13.3% less than respondents in Vatuolalai. Similar responses were also received from both cohorts with regard to having money to buy fish (Vatuolalai- 47%, Votua – 31.4%) , time (Vatuolalai- 55.9%, Votua – 38.6%), and perceived changes in fishing areas (Vatuolalai- 47%, Votua – 44.1%) as possible contributing factors to why fishing may be affected.

This is clarified further by persons who chose to elaborate more on their responses, including respondents that provided “other” possible reasons for difficulties endured in fishing and/or seafood collection. Respondents agreed that “more people are now able to purchase fish from other villagers who own nets or from other places outside the village including Sigatoka town”. Another potential factor identified is “easy access to other forms of protein” such as “chicken” and “tinned tuna” which can be purchased easily in or near the village and “stored” for longer periods, eliminating the need to fish or collect seafood on a regular basis. Other reasons provided from respondents include the shift in general perception towards fishing, outlined by the
following response: “I consider fishing a hassle because I work at the bar, when I come home I am too tired to go out and fish. It is easier to just buy it and store it in the fridge”. Another potential contributing factor is mentioned by one respondent who said, “since the Marine Protected Area (MPA)\textsuperscript{5} was set up, people have slowed their interaction with the ocean, only two families still own fishing nets; people are also not fishing because we respect the ban on fishing in the designated zone”. It was further observed that villagers had to travel further to fish as the MPA was located in the village seafront, hence making it more of a “hassle”. Both villages maintain their own MPAs and having had numerous workshops administered by the Institute of Applied Sciences as well as Fiji Locally Managed Marine Area Nework (FLMMA), are very knowledgable on marine conservation issues. This was also observed in the general agreement to “changes in fishing areas”.

8. How often does your family eat local seafood?

Seafood is consumed by most villagers on a fairly regular basis; respondents from both villages agree they consume seafood at least once a month.

Figure 5.3a: Frequency of eating local seafood - Vatuolalai

\textsuperscript{5} A Marine Protected Area (MPA) is a demarcated marine area which is protected from any form of resource extraction. Villagers are restricted from fishing or engaging in any form of seafood collection in this area, which often varies in size. Typically, MPAs area spread over “significant” biological zones with high resource yield.
In Vatuolalai, a total of 73.5% of the cohort consumed seafood at least once a week, compared to Votua at 84%. This is attributed to the eating culture in indigenous Fijian communities, which holds high regard for fish, and it is often consumed routinely on Sundays. It was also observed that in Vatuolalai, 2 (5.9%) of households owned nets and also had family members that do not work and would fish on a regular basis.

In Votua, 11.4% of respondents agreed that they ate fish or seafood every day, these households attributed this to the fact that their families had strong cauravou (young men) who would go out and spearfish regularly. Similarly, the womenfolk in these households were avid fishers and stated that they would go out and fish and collect shellfish to supplement their families’ daily diet.

9. **How often do you spend time in agricultural activity? [Circle one answer]**

Agriculture is also another key indicator of “traditional” societies and is an activity that is characteristic of many Fijian communities. However, responses to the question indicates that a substantial percentage of the population in both communities no longer or only infrequently engage in agricultural activity.

---

6 Seafood includes, fish, shellfish, mollusk and any other edible tropical marine organism.
In Vatuolalai 26.5% of respondents never engage in agricultural activities, 20.6% participate once a month, 17.6% every two weeks and 35.3% engage in agricultural activity at least once a week.

In Votua, more respondents take part in agriculture with only 4.5% of respondents “never” engaging in agriculture, 6.8% partaking in farming at least once a month, 22.7% every two weeks and about 65.9% engaging in agriculture at least once a week, 30.6% more than the cohort in Vatuolalai.

10. Has farming become more difficult since your involvement in tourism?

Similar results are found when asked about difficulties in farming.

Table 5.3: Has farming become more difficult since your involvement in tourism?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Village</th>
<th>Yes (%)</th>
<th>No (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vatuolalai</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Votua</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A small majority of respondents in both communities agree that farming has become more difficult with 56% of Vatuolalai respondents and 51% of respondents from Votua agreeing to the statement.

11. If yes, please indicate reasons why you think farming has been affected:

Respondents were asked why they believed farming is now more difficult.

Figure 5.5a: Reasons farming has been affected - Vatuolalai
Results were similar, in that in Vatuolalai, it was felt that work at the hotel (52.9%), having money to buy produce (55.9%) and lack of time (40.9%) to tend to the farms were key reasons why farming has been affected. These key reasons are followed by shifts in perception towards farming as 32.4% of villagers perceive that farming has become more of a “hassle” to them, particularly as they are involved in paid, shift work at the resort.

Votua respondents also agree with the main categories above, which include, work at the hotel (43%), having money to buy produce (47.7%), having less time to tend to the farms (40.9%) as well as viewing farming as a hassle (29.5%) as key reasons why farming has been affected.

One respondent stated, “our parents have worked at the resort, they did not farm that much, now we are working at the resorts and it is our way of life now to work, earn money, and then buy our food. It is easier that way; it is difficult to do both”. Another respondent said, “I do not have the time to go and farm; farming involves going daily to the gardens, weeding and being consistent, I cannot do this as I work
at the resort, so I pay my cousin maybe $20 a week to plant and look after my garden”.

The data above describe the level of engagement in agriculture by the cohort. The Vatuolalai cohort is less active in agriculture yet are less vocal about the reasons for their views compared to the Votua cohort. Such factors were noticed by Sofer (1980), who observed that people of Votua had returned to farming because the Korolevu hotel had closed. This trend of re-focussing on agriculture still continues in Votua. An elderly male respondent stated, “we know the good and bad things about tourism and we have to keep planting so that we may be sautu or wealthy because the measure of the wealth of a village is by the yield of the land. We know this and I want the younger generations to stay in the village and farm”.

12. **How often does your family eat local produce?**

Both communities consume local produce on a fairly regular basis and respondents agreed to having consumed local produce at least once every three days.

![Figure 5.6a: Frequency that families eat local produce - Vatuolalai](image)

![Figure 5.6b: Frequency that families eat local produce - Votua](image)

In Vatuolalai, 47.1% of respondents consume local produce on a daily basis, while 29.4% do so every two days and 14.7% every three days. When the two communities
are compared, the Votua cohort stands out as being more frequent consumers of local produce. In Votua, daily consumption stands at 52.3%, 22.7% every two days and 25% every three days.

The trend observed can be attributed to the availability of green leafy vegetables and staples, which are available within the village. In Vatuolalai, a respondent stated that, “some families who are related to villagers from the highlands often sell vegetables and produce within the village on behalf of their relatives; this is easy for us”. Another villager said, “Nowadays people choose to buy from others in the village that want to sell, when food is plentiful or mature. We get it from the gardens, but, more often we buy.” A respondent from Votua said that “nowadays our young men don’t want to do the difficult work of farming; it’s easier to work and pay someone else for cassava or dalo”.

13. Has your family’s diet changed because of your own or family members’ involvement in work at the hotels?

Most respondents from both communities feel that their diets have not changed, a position taken by 59% in Vatuolalai and 68% of respondents in Votua.

Table 5.4: Has your family’s diet changes because of your own or family members involvement in tourism?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Village</th>
<th>Yes (%)</th>
<th>No (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vatuolalai</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Votua</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For respondents who did agree, the stated reasons for dietary change include “an increased liking for western diets such as chicken, tinned fish and meat”. Another respondent stated that “people are going for easy and faster food options and people now prefer to buy food from the supermarkets such as, rice, noodles and potatoes and not prepare and eat cassava, dalo or yams regularly”.

14. If yes, what are some of the reasons you think caused such changes? please indicate below:

In this section, members of the cohort that agreed diet had changed were presented with a set of responses and were asked to state their agreement, as outlined by table 5.5:
Table 5.5: What are some of the reasons you think caused such changes?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Vatuolalai</th>
<th></th>
<th>Votua</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LESS (%)</td>
<td>MORE (%)</td>
<td>LESS (%)</td>
<td>MORE (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. My family fishes</td>
<td>35.3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>27.3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. We farm</td>
<td>32.4</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>31.8</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Our families prefer processed food</td>
<td>26.5</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Time spent working at the hotels:</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>38.2</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>27.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. My family finds that buying food is preferred</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>26.5</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>18.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Don’t know</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Generally, the Vatuolalai cohort believe diets have changed because of the following factors: there is less engagement in farming (32.4%), less fishing (35.3%), more time spent working at the hotels (38.2%) and that bought food is prefered (26.5%).

The Votua cohort also expressed similar responses, as indicated in table 5.5, with a general agreement that less time is being spent on farming produce for consumption (31.8%), less fishing and seafood collection (27.3%), more time spent working at the hotels (27.3%) and buying is prefered more (18.2%) as the main reasons behind the percived change in diets.

### 5.3 HEALTH

In this section, respondents were presented with questions pertaining to healthcare. The findings are outlined as follows.

**15. How do you rate your health situation today compared to before tourism?**

Table 5.6: How do you rate your health situation today to before tourism?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Village</th>
<th>Better (%)</th>
<th>Much better (%)</th>
<th>No change (%)</th>
<th>Worse (%)</th>
<th>Much Worse (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vatuolalai</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Votua</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
68% of respondents of Vatuolalai rate their health situation as “much better”, while 26% agree that the health situation has become “better” with 6% stating “no change”.

In Votua, 79% of respondents rated their health situation as “much better”, while 14% agree that the health situation has become “better” with 7% stating that there has been no change.

The following questions enable better understanding on the reasons for the response.

16. What has contributed to making your health condition better or much better?

The following tables outline the responses from the cohort on the various statements issued to them, which include; better healthcare services in the community, the ability to get better healthcare services either in the community or at another location, water supply is better, sanitation or toilets are better, the drainage system and village surroundings are better.

Table 5.7: Better healthcare services are now available in the community

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Village</th>
<th>Yes (%)</th>
<th>No (%)</th>
<th>Not sure (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vatuolalai</td>
<td>61.8</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>11.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Votua</td>
<td>63.6</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>18.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The two communities demonstrate generally similar results with most respondents agreeing that better healthcare services are now available in the community, as indicated in table 5.7. In Vatuolalai 61.8% of respondents agree while 17.6% do not, similarly 63.6% of the Votua cohort agree, with 11.4% in disagreement.

In this section, the meaning of “health care services” is dynamic and includes medical services as well as overall village health and sanitation as defined by the villagers. In Fijian, tiko bulabula refers to medical health as well as the overall wellbeing of the community, inclusive of such things as village cleanliness and sanitation. The data suggest respondents recognise their village health committees and village nurses as key authorities on village health issues. In both villages, a
A village health committee is maintained, which oversees general village health issues. The committee is comprised of about 12 individuals tasked with monitoring and managing areas such as village cleanliness, drainage, sanitation and health. The village health committee is also responsible for disseminating information on communicable and non-communicable diseases as well as other broad village health issues. This committee liaises with various groups such as the government health department, NGOs and specific interest groups which relate to their key functions and are expected to oversee issues pertaining to village health. One respondent said, “We are lucky to have a very active health committee which provides the relevant health services to the community. They regularly attend meetings and workshops and come and implement what they learn in the village”. Another respondent said, “in our village, we have our own health committee that oversees issues pertaining to our health and wellbeing; when we have any issues like a recent outbreak of scabies, our health committee was quick to get help and medicines from the health authorities, so we just went straight to them”. More details can be found in the illustrative case studies at the end of the chapter (5.5).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Village</th>
<th>Yes (%)</th>
<th>No (%)</th>
<th>Not sure (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vatuolalai</td>
<td>88.2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Votua</td>
<td>90.9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Most respondents from both communities feel they can obtain healthcare services in the communities or at another location, which in turn suggests they have the ability to travel to Sigatoka or Suva for treatment. In Vatuolalai, 88.2% of respondents agree with 90.9% of respondents from Votua also in agreement.

Similar results are found in their responses to other questions.
Table 5.9: Water supply is better

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Village</th>
<th>Yes (%)</th>
<th>No (%)</th>
<th>Not sure (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vatuolalai</td>
<td>94.1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Votua</td>
<td>93.2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Respondents who had agreed to improved healthcare established that their water supply had improved because of tourism with 94.1% of respondents in Vatuolalai and 93.2% of respondents in Votua in agreement. This can be attributed to the fact that villagers in Vatuolalai receive their water supply directly from the resort and Votua villagers have their own reservoir which had recently been upgraded through aid from New Zealand and money raised by the villagers.

Table 5.10: Sanitation (toilets, drainage etc.) is better

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Village</th>
<th>Yes (%)</th>
<th>No (%)</th>
<th>Not sure (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vatuolalai</td>
<td>94.1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Votua</td>
<td>93.2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The majority of villagers from both communities agree that sanitation is better. This can be attributed to the fact that all homes in both villages have flush toilets. In Vatuolalai, all homes have flush toilets. One respondent said:

“When we started working in the hotels and developing our communities, we first wanted good houses with good toilets; having flush toilets elevates our standards, this is modern, and it is good that we no longer have the unhygienic pit or water seal toilets in the village; this is a sign of progress”.

In Votua, a sewerage treatment facility\(^7\) had been established and is also a key factor of influence for the following results.

---

\(^7\) The “Wai Votua” is a village scale wetland waste treatment system funded by the New Zealand government.
Table 5.11: The drainage system and village surrounding is cleaner and better

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Village</th>
<th>Yes (%)</th>
<th>No (%)</th>
<th>Not sure (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vatuolalai</td>
<td>70.6</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>17.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Votua</td>
<td>93.2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Compared to Vatuolalai (70.6%), 93.2% of Votua respondents agree that the drainage system and village surroundings have become cleaner and better. This phenomenon can be attributed to the general awareness of respondents from both villages on drainage issues because of training received through MPA workshops. Additionally, in Votua, the existence of their village sewerage treatment plant has contributed to their responses and perceptions on improved drainage and village cleanliness.

In general, consensus among the cohort can be attributed to the following factors. Firstly, the existence of village health committees and their partnerships with specific interest groups in holding workshops and training has provided villagers with some understanding on sustainable environmental standards and requirements. NGOs such as the Fiji Locally Managed Marine Area Network (FLMMA), Nature Fiji, and the Institute of Applied Sciences (IAS) have influenced perceptions on health, sanitation, and development. In Vatuolalai, water is sourced free of charge from the Naviti Resort, with the resort providing a free garbage collection service to the village community. Additionally, a respondent said that, “exposure to the cleanliness and standards in the hotels has opened our eyes to what a clean village should be”. Another respondent said, “we have our village health committee which oversees the cleanliness and health standards in the village”. Workers at the hotels are exposed to higher standards in terms of housing and hygiene standards at the hotels. Lastly, in Votua a village sewerage treatment plant is operating and could be a reason for the differences between the two villages.

The tables and following questions will provide for better understanding on the reasons for above responses.
Table 5.12: Was any of the above directly related to tourism?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Village</th>
<th>Yes (%)</th>
<th>No (%)</th>
<th>Not sure (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vatuolalai</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Votua</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.12 shows a general agreement towards the link between tourism and the improvement in the health of the cohort. In Vatuolalai, 50% of the cohort attribute the improvement in health to tourism while 38% disagree. In Votua there is a similar agreement with 57% of the cohort agreeing.

The level of disagreement may be attributed to the indirect nature of how tourism affects healthcare and how this was perceived by the cohort. Health or *tiko bulabula* conjure perceptions of government provided health services hence, there is little recognition of the direct link that tourism has on healthcare. However, some responses attribute “available disposable income from tourism” as a factor which supports their abilities to afford better healthcare services outside the community. Another respondent said, “because tourists frequent our village, we are more aware of health and sanitation standards that we must meet; compared to other villages in the province we are relatively okay considering our level of *tiko bulabula* or “health”.

5.4 CONFLICTS AND PROBLEMS

In this section, responses to questions pertaining to conflicts and problems, and how they may be influenced by tourism, are outlined below.

17. *Have you experienced conflicts related to tourism? YES/NO?*

A relatively small majority of respondents from both communities have not experienced any conflicts because of tourism. In Vatuolalai, 65% of the respondents deny having experienced any conflicts related to tourism compared to 59% of the Votua cohort.
Table 5.13: Have you experienced any conflicts related to tourism? Y/N?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Village</th>
<th>Yes (%)</th>
<th>No (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vatuolalai</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Votua</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

However, about 35% of respondents in Vatuolalai and 41% of respondents in Votua state that they have experienced conflicts related to tourism. Further questions were presented to guide further discussions on the nature of conflict and who was involved. The questions are as follows: “Can you please say what the conflicts were about? What rules were broken? If yes, who were the violators? What do you think maybe the cause of such behavior?”

In general, the cohort was hesitant to divulge details on the conflicts endured. However, in Votua respondents were more aware and discerning about the causes of conflicts and its relation to tourism compared to Vatuolalai. Through discussions and in-depth interviewing, greater detail was revealed and includes conflicts related to alcohol consumption by people who worked at the resort, family conflicts, conflicts pertaining to village protocols, culture, as well as conflicts between community members and the resorts, concerning lease and current lease arrangements. The following section outlines some cases of conflicts observed in the communities.

One respondent said,

“We face conflicts within our village. A common example is the consumption of alcohol where, after the Saturday night shift, people, especially women, would carry on drinking into Sunday. Sometimes there would be fights, brawls and other similar incidents would occur as a result of this”.

The above quote exemplifies one form of conflict which was observed in the communities. Most villagers engage in shift work at the resorts and they often engage in alcohol consumption as a means to “de-stress”. This practice is not in accordance with village protocols, which prohibit alcohol or drunkenness in the village. Hence, perceptions of the cohort were generally negative towards the
occurrence of such a phenomenon. Villagers attribute this conflict to tourism, as work at the hotel primarily provides money to buy drinks and this phenomenon is more prevalent in hotel workers. Of particular importance, is the pattern of alcohol consumption prevalent in the communities, which involves binge drinking. This often leads to extended hours of partying and as exemplified by the quote, it often leads to brawls, infringement of village protocols and violation of Sunday observance.

Another respondent said “the young women of the village usually get drunk a lot and would come into the village intoxicated. This is not proper for Fijian women”. Traditionally, Fijian women are expected to maintain conservative roles in the community and are frowned upon if they engage in alcohol consumption. For this particular case, the respondent highlighted that women who worked at the hotel engaged in alcohol consumption and would be seen at drinking parties that would extend into the next day.

I observed a similar incident when a group of young women was seen drinking outside the village on a Sunday, after which they came back into the village without making an effort to conceal their drunkenness from other villagers. This was something I had never observed elsewhere. A key observation is the acceptance or tolerance of other villagers towards this incidence. Upon further discussions a respondent said:

We are used to these things happening, particularly in the festive seasons women would go out to drink in their little groups, as men would do. We know that it is not right culturally, but, it is accepted now because *keimami sa rarama*, [we have been exposed to the bigger world].

A village elder stated, “People in the village, particularly the youth, don’t feel any obligation to their community, because they have money they disrespect their parents and elders. This creates conflicts in families”. The respondent shared a sense of insecurity when interviewed, as he highlighted the importance of the obedience of youths, being expected to take care of the land and their culture. Youths have a special place in village society and are expected to tend to the obligations of the
village. For example, whenever there is a village function, youths are expected to prepare the village, food, and other traditional ceremonies such as the *i sevusevu*. This was no longer being performed satisfactorily as the pride of earning money and placing greater emphasis on the individual is prevalent. As stated in the quotation, youths no longer feel any obligation to the community and are more individualistic. Another observation emanating from the quotation is conflicts between the youths and elders. Fijian culture demands that youths obey and listen to their elders. The respondents highlighted that there were more “quarrels”, “back talking”, general disobedience, and fading moral values amongst the youth of the village. Respondents attributed exposure to money and work at the hotels as key drivers for the observed changes.

Another respondent commented: “work at the hotel and time away from home often leads both men and women away from their families and sometimes to engage in extramarital affairs”. Respondents from both communities agreed that instances of extramarital affairs were observed. Respondents identified work at the hotel as the main factor, particularly since people would work long hours and would be away from their families. Instances of affairs between other workers at the hotel as well as affairs within the village were observed. However, the cohort was generally hesitant to divulge the finer details pertaining to extramarital affairs within the village.

### 5.4.1 Village and Resort Conflicts

A respondent was emphatic that “the hotels don’t respect us as landowners and often do not consult us on changes to the coastal area and this caused conflicts between us”. Another respondent stated,

“We need a review of the lease agreement with the resorts. When the arrangements were made, our elders were not sure of what was agreed and this has been a concern of ours for a long time. This is a reason why we often have conflicts with the hotel management”.

Such quotations highlight conflicts that occur between members of the community and the hotels. The villagers take pride in ownership of land as well as ownership of customary marine areas, which they now share with the resorts. The communities are
socially attached to these areas for sustenance and refer to these areas as their *i qoliqoli* and *i kovukovu*, generally meaning areas of provisions. Respondents stated that they felt that they were being “exploited and sidelined” with regard to decision making on their resources. One particular incident is the extension of a causeway at the Naviti Resort, which had affected their fishing grounds. Respondents felt that the landowners “should have been consulted” and not “disrespected” by the hotels who were building on what belongs to the *i-taukei*. One respondent claimed that “we are not consulted, nor do the managers want to listen to us, the land and *i qoliqoli* belong to us so, we must be consulted if anything is done to it.”

Furthermore, respondents also agreed that land lease agreements should be reviewed. Some respondents felt that they were “cheated” “as stated by one respondent: “the hotels are making millions of dollars because they dictated the terms of the lease agreement to us at a time when we were not aware of what these agreements meant”. As the above quotes suggest, villagers lacked understanding on the actual conditions when they were agreed to and now want a new lease arrangement.

The researcher witnessed a specific conflict situation where villagers in Votua had applied and successfully implemented a “stay order” on the construction of a resort-style retirement home on their “sacred” burial site. Despite having already leased their land, villagers sought the court’s intervention to have a stay order implemented on construction. This situation was mainly instigated by the district chief, who resides in Votua, through advice provided by Arron (pseudonym), an environmental consultant. This particular situation reflects the level of caution that the villagers are taking with regard to tourism and demonstrates the nature and types of conflict occurring in the village.

The following question provides an insight into the frequency of tourism related conflicts being experienced.
18. How often is there conflict (of all types) related to tourism?

Table 5.14: Frequency of conflicts related to tourism

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Village</th>
<th>Regularly (%)</th>
<th>Occasionally (%)</th>
<th>Rarely (%)</th>
<th>Never (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vatuolalai</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>29.4</td>
<td>64.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Votua</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>63.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.14 demonstrates that majority of the cohort from both communities have never encountered any conflicts related to tourism. Some 64.7% of the Vatuolalai cohort states that conflicts related to tourism “never” occur while 35.3% state “rarely”, and 8.8% “occasionally”. In Vatuolalai, there was an observance of generally similar results, with the majority (63.6%) of respondents agreeing that conflicts “never” occur while 20.5% state “rarely” and 15.9% “occasionally”.

The Vatuolalai cohort was observed to be more positive towards tourism and its benefits. Conflicts were not frequent; however, my impression was that respondents were hesitant and unwilling to share thoughts on conflicts being related to tourism. This could be attributed to the more positive impacts experienced by people in the village, with the prevalence of large numbers of people working at the resort as well as villagers owning their own tourism based businesses. My impression is that because benefits for people in Vatuolalai outweigh the negatives, more positive perceptions and less frequent conflicts or problems associated with tourism were observed.

In Votua, more respondents (15.9%) responded that tourism related conflicts occur “occasionally”, compared to Vatuolalai. This may be because the village has had more experience in tourism, which spans 61 years. During these six decades, villagers have experienced many internal conflicts including village disputes, alcohol abuse, family break-ups and the breaking of informal village laws and protocols. Another key experiential factor is the closure of the Korolevu Resort in the 1980s, when many villagers lost their main sources of income. The closure of the Korolevu Hotel played a huge part in forming perceptions of and attitudes towards tourism as
people of Votua were among the first communities to have been involved in work in construction and daily operations of the resorts. For two decades people had worked and earned a steady income at the resort before it closed in 1982. This drove people back into their communities into semi-subsistence agriculture. These events essentially triggered an internal cultural renaissance in Votua, which has continued with villagers in this community observed to be more pragmatic and hesitant in encouraging or offering praise for tourism.

5.5 COMMUNITY PARTICIPATION AND TOURISM

19. In this section, respondents were given a list of statements on tourism that required them to state their level of agreement.

Table 5.15: Members of my family are taking part in community meetings more often now compared to before tourism.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Village</th>
<th>Agree (%)</th>
<th>Neutral (%)</th>
<th>Disagree (%)</th>
<th>Don’t know (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vatuolalai</td>
<td>52.9</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>23.5</td>
<td>11.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Votua</td>
<td>54.5</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.15 demonstrates relatively similar results from the cohort, where the majority agree that family members are taking part in community meetings more often. The following table (table 5.16) outline community involvement and participation of women in both communities. The following statements were issued to gauge perceptions held on the empowerment of women.

When it comes to the role of women, similar agreement is expressed with approximately one third agreeing that women are more involved in communities than before tourism. However, opinions were clearly divided, as indicated in table Table 5.16.

Table 5.16: Women are more involved in community meetings than before tourism

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Village</th>
<th>Agree (%)</th>
<th>Neutral (%)</th>
<th>Disagree (%)</th>
<th>Don’t know (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vatuolalai</td>
<td>35.3</td>
<td>23.5</td>
<td>29.4</td>
<td>11.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Votua</td>
<td>36.4</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>22.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This difference can be attributed to the percentage of the cohort that are women below the age of 23, who generally make up about 30% of the Vatuolalai (28% of Votua) cohort, who asserted that they want to be more involved in decision making. One respondent said, “it is our culture to submit to men, but times are changing and we want our voices to be heard as well; we also work and earn money for our families”. More details can be found in the illustrative case studies at the end of the chapter (5.8.4).

5.5.1 Role of youths

Similar divisions are formed in both villages when relating to the role of young people.

Table 5.17: The youths have more voice and opportunities in our communities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Village</th>
<th>Agree (%)</th>
<th>Neutral (%)</th>
<th>Disagree (%)</th>
<th>Don’t know (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vatuolalai</td>
<td>29.4</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>47.1</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Votua</td>
<td>29.5</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>34.1</td>
<td>15.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.17 shows that in both villages, there is disagreement that youths have more voice and opportunities in the villages, with 47% in Vatuolalai and 34.1% in Votua in disagreement. Nonetheless, there is general uniformity observed in their neutrality (Vatuolalai, 14.7% and Votua, 13.6%) and agreement, with 29% of respondents agreeing that youths now have more opportunities and voice in the village.

This can be explained by referring to Fijian culture, where youths are generally expected to “take their place” as the young members of the community, to adhere to advice and decisions made by village elders. However, respondents also indicated that youths have more opportunities in terms of work at the resort. One respondent said, “youths can easily get jobs at the hotels, even without passing form 6; as a result, youths don’t work hard in school”. Another respondent said, “youths have more opportunities now to work and earn money, youths are strong and are excited
about working and earning money; it’s easier because we have special arrangements with the resorts, so it’s good for us”.

5.5.2 Village unity

The following question was asked to assess the perceptions of the cohort on the Fijian notion of *duavata vakavanua* or communal unity. This question was asked to summate perceptions held on togetherness and communalism in the two villages. The results are outlined in table 19.

Table 5.18: The community has become more united

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Village</th>
<th>Agree (%)</th>
<th>Neutral (%)</th>
<th>Disagree (%)</th>
<th>Don’t know (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vatuolai</td>
<td>55.9</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>14.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Votua</td>
<td>65.9</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.18 demonstrates that a high degree of unity is perceived by the cohort with the majority from both communities in agreement (Vatuolai, 55.9% and Votua, 65.9).

Compared to Votua (6.8%), a higher percentage of the Vatuolai cohort (17.6%) disagree that the village has become more united. This difference of about 10% might be attributed to the prevalence of conflicts in Vatuolai and the perceptions held by the cohort that more conflicts are being observed within the village. Yet, there has been more experience of tourism in Votua and may be evidence that tourism leads to more instances of conflict and disunity. This is presented table 5.19.

Table 5.19: There are more conflicts amongst community members

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Village</th>
<th>Agree (%)</th>
<th>Neutral (%)</th>
<th>Disagree (%)</th>
<th>Don’t know (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vatuolai</td>
<td>26.5</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>44.1</td>
<td>14.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Votua</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>15.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Here, it becomes clear that there is a greater perceived occurrence of conflicts in Vatuolalai (26.5%) when compared to Votua (15.9%). However, there is a general majority of the cohort, between 44% to 50% that disagree to the statement that there are more conflicts amongst community members.

Table 5.20 outlines the perceptions held on the occurrence of conflicts between the villages of Votua and Vatuolalai and other communities.

Table 5.20: There are more conflicts between the case studies and other communities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Village</th>
<th>Agree (%)</th>
<th>Neutral (%)</th>
<th>Disagree (%)</th>
<th>Don’t know (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vatuolalai</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>64.7</td>
<td>17.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Votua</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>72.7</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.20 illustrates that a high percentage of respondents disagree that conflicts are occurring between communities. In Vatuolalai, 64.7% of respondents disagree that there are conflicts between communities with 72.7% of Votua respondents also disagreeing.

5.5.3 External influences

The following section is provided to gain insights and perceptions on external influences on the development of the respective communities. This section was included to ascertain the level of external influence imposed on the villages by outside forces such as the government and other organisations. This was done to gauge the level of influence and whether these parties have influenced development and perceptions towards tourism.

Table 5.21: Support from the government has improved

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Village</th>
<th>Agree (%)</th>
<th>Neutral (%)</th>
<th>Disagree (%)</th>
<th>Don’t know (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vatuolalai</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>76.5</td>
<td>14.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Votua</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>56.8</td>
<td>11.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.21 demonstrates that the majority of respondents (76.5% in Vatuolalai and 56.8% in Votua) disagree that support from government has improved. Respondents that agree attribute improvements in micro-finance schemes and business training as
key reasons for their response. The differences in responses can be attributed to the fact that not long before this research, a government team had visited Votua and had pledged support for their initiatives. Secondly, Vatuolalai is home to an ousted member of parliament (because of the military takeover) and support for him is still recognised.

Table 5.22 outlines perceptions of outside influence from “other” organisations. This section was included to gauge the level of support received from other NGOs and organisations (excluding government) which had given assistance in training and capacity building.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Village</th>
<th>Agree (%)</th>
<th>Neutral (%)</th>
<th>Disagree (%)</th>
<th>Don’t know (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vatuolalai</td>
<td>70.6</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Votua</td>
<td>84.1</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Here, there is general consensus that support from other organisations has improved: 70.6% of respondents in Vatuolalai as well as 84.1% of respondents in Votua agree that outside organisations have provided support by providing workshops, training and consultancy on issues pertaining to environmental sustainability and issues pertaining to tourism. Respondents agree that their communities receive support from organisations which include USP, FLMMA, visiting regional and international student groups and consultants.

When asked to comment further on whether these external parties make decisions about tourism, 50% of respondents in Vatuolalai and 20.5% of Votua respondents disagree while 29.4% in Vatuolalai and 68.2% of respondents in Votua agree and cite Arron (pseudonym) as a key advisor on issues pertaining to tourism developments occurring within the district. Table 5.23 provides results on opinions held by the cohort on influence from outside parties in tourism.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Village</th>
<th>Agree (%)</th>
<th>Neutral (%)</th>
<th>Disagree (%)</th>
<th>Don’t know (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vatuolalai</td>
<td>29.4</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>11.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Votua</td>
<td>68.2</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The marked differences between the responses received from the cohort can be attributed to the manner in which decisions are made within the district. Votua is the home of the district chief and the adopted village of Arron, an environmental consultant who provides advice to the district chief, and has also sat in a number of district meetings and has been instrumental in advising villagers on issues relating to the environment and tourism. More details can be found in the illustrative case studies at the end of the chapter (5.8.5).

In Vatuolalai, direct decisions concerning the hotels are taken by the land owning clan. With regard to other tourism related decisions, they are often made at the family, clan and village level with very little, acknowledged, interference from external parties, although FLMMA, USP and IAS often provide advice in areas pertaining to their MPA.

20. Do you think that such outside influence is good for the village?

YES/NO

Table 5.24: Do you think that outside influence is good for the village? Y/N

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Village</th>
<th>Yes (%)</th>
<th>No (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vatuolalai</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Votua</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Here, most agree that outside influence is good, citing reasons such as, “outsiders being knowledgeable and qualified on various issues which villagers are ill equipped to deal directly with”. Villagers were observed to be concerned about the welfare of their communities; they perceive that facilitating workshops in areas of marine conservation and environmental custodianship are key reasons why they think outside influence is good.

5.6 LOCAL VALUES AND BELIEFS ABOUT TOURISM

Tourism and its influence on social change is a much debated topic with many differing points of view. More importantly, the context of social change must be understood from the viewpoint of the communities being studied. More often, community members do not fully appreciate changes occurring around them and it is
the intention of this study to understand perceptions held by the cohort on these changes.

21. In this section, the cohort were required to rate their agreement on various statements. The results are presented below.

Table 5.25: Changes in village culture can be caused by many factors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Village</th>
<th>Strongly agree (%)</th>
<th>Agree (%)</th>
<th>Neutral (%)</th>
<th>Disagree (%)</th>
<th>Strongly disagree (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vatuolalai</td>
<td>44.1</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Votua</td>
<td>38.6</td>
<td>47.7</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The cohort expressed similar views on the causes of changes in village culture. In Vatuolalai, 94.1% of respondents agree that changes in village culture are caused by many factors. Similarly, in Votua 86.4% of respondents agree, with 13.6% stating their neutrality (table 5.25).

Table 5.26: The hotels will increase opportunities for my village

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Village</th>
<th>Strongly agree (%)</th>
<th>Agree (%)</th>
<th>Neutral (%)</th>
<th>Disagree (%)</th>
<th>Strongly disagree (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vatuolalai</td>
<td>58.8</td>
<td>35.3</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Votua</td>
<td>31.8</td>
<td>52.3</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.26 demonstrates similar results amongst the cohort but with notable differences in the emphasis on level of agreement. In Vatuolalai, the majority (58.8%) of respondents “strongly agree” that hotels will increase opportunities for their community, compared to 31.8% in Votua. Similarly, in Vatuolalai 35.3% of respondents “agree”, compared to 52.3% in Votua.

This pattern suggests that more villagers in Vatuolalai “strongly agree” that tourism will increase their opportunities, compared to villagers in Votua. The following table
demonstrate perceptions held by the cohort on allowing as many villagers as possible to work at the resort.

Table 5.27: We should allow as many people as possible to work at the hotels

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Village</th>
<th>Strongly agree(%)</th>
<th>Agree (%)</th>
<th>Neutral (%)</th>
<th>Disagree (%)</th>
<th>Strongly disagree(%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vatuolalai</td>
<td>23.5</td>
<td>35.3</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>26.5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Votua</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>27.3</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>31.8</td>
<td>18.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.27 demonstrates that 41% of villagers in Votua disagree with the statement that as many people as possible should be allowed to work at the resort, with 18.2% expressing their “strong” disagreement. In Vatuolalai, 58.8% of respondents agreed to the statement with 26.5% in disagreement.

This demonstrates that the cohort in Votua is more antagonistic towards tourism, which can be attributed to the length of time and involvement in tourism as well as having endured downturns in tourism. One respondent said, “work at the hotel is not everything; we need people to be in the village and to perform their duty to the vanua”.

Table 5.28: Tourism has been a main cause of changes in the attitude of youths

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Village</th>
<th>Strongly agree (%)</th>
<th>Agree (%)</th>
<th>Neutral (%)</th>
<th>Disagree (%)</th>
<th>Strongly disagree (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vatuolalai</td>
<td>35.3</td>
<td>26.5</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>32.4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Votua</td>
<td>43.2</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.28 shows that the majority of respondents from both communities (61.8%, Vatuolalai and 93.2% in Votua) agree that tourism is the main cause of changes in the attitude of youths. In Vatuolalai, there is a marked disagreement to the statement with 32.4% of respondents “disagreeing”, compared to 11.3% in Votua.

Of the 32% from Vatuolalai, 9 out of the 11 respondents are between the age of 21 and 30 and are unmarried. One respondent said that factors such as mass media, especially exposure to what is seen on television are strong derivatives of changes in attitudes.
Table 5.29 outline the responses from the cohort on changes in the roles of women.

Table 5.29: Tourism has been a cause of changes in the roles of women in my village

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Village</th>
<th>Strongly agree (%)</th>
<th>Agree (%)</th>
<th>Neutral (%)</th>
<th>Disagree (%)</th>
<th>Strongly disagree (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vatuolalai</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>32.4</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>23.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Votua</td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td>27.3</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>27.3</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When questioned, 47% of the cohort in Vatuolalai agree that tourism has been a cause of the changes in the roles of women in the village, with 17.6% noting “neutral” as a response and 35% disagreeing. Similarly in Votua, 50% of the cohort express their agreement that tourism has influenced changes in women’s roles, 20.5% neutral and 34% expressing their disagreement. Again, hesitation was observed as a significant percentage of the cohort highlighted “neutral” as their response.

Respondents added that women who were employed in the hotels or other tourism related businesses were able to earn more money for their families. In some instances, the women or the mother of the household was the sole bread winner. Another point raised by one respondent was that “women are better with money, they can save and manage money wisely; this can be witnessed through women’s projects in the village, which include village hall equipment such as crockery and plates for hosting village events, as well as a village education fund, set up by women in the respective communities”. One respondent said that “women, are becoming more recognised for their contributions to our community, yet at home they remain in their roles as mothers and the “second boss” in the household”.

The following statement was raised to assess the perceptions held by the cohort on tourism: “I believe that tourism is good”.

Table 5.30: I believe that tourism is good

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Village</th>
<th>Strongly agree (%)</th>
<th>Agree (%)</th>
<th>Neutral (%)</th>
<th>Disagree (%)</th>
<th>Strongly disagree (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vatuolalai</td>
<td>47.1</td>
<td>29.4</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Votua</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>34.1</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>27.3</td>
<td>15.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5.30 depicts the differences between the perceptions held by the two case studies. The Vatuolalai cohort has a more positive outlook towards tourism, with the majority (76.5%) agreeing that “tourism is good” compared to 47.7% in Votua. In Vatuolalai, 14.7% of respondents disagree that tourism is good, compared to 43.2% in Votua.

Table 5.31: There are a lot of unwanted problems because of tourism

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Village</th>
<th>Strongly agree (%)</th>
<th>Agree (%)</th>
<th>Neutral (%)</th>
<th>Disagree (%)</th>
<th>Strongly disagree (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vatuolalai</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>29.4</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>11.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Votua</td>
<td>29.5</td>
<td>45.5</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The cohort expressed similar results with a high degree of agreement from both cohorts that tourism is the cause of unwanted problems in their communities (table 32). Votua recorded a higher agreement for the statement with 75% compared to 47% in Vatuolalai. However, Vatuolalai respondents expressed their disagreement with 17.6% disagreeing and 11.8% “strongly disagreeing”, compared to 11.4% of the Votua cohort.

5.7 SOCIO-ECONOMIC BENEFITS TO COMMUNITIES

22. In this section, respondents were required to state their agreement on various statements provided to them.

Table 5.32: How do you rate your economic situation today compared to before tourism

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Village</th>
<th>Much better (%)</th>
<th>Better (%)</th>
<th>No change (%)</th>
<th>Worse (%)</th>
<th>Much worse (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vatuolalai</td>
<td>70.6</td>
<td>29.4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Votua</td>
<td>94.1</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.32 demonstrates that the majority of the population feel that their situation is “better” now than before tourism; 70.6% of respondents from Vatuolalai stated “much better” as their response, compared to 94% of Votua respondents. Table 5.33 highlight the percentage of the population that have “steady jobs at the hotels”.
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As many as 70.6% of respondents in Vatuolalai agree that they have steady jobs at the hotels, compared to 63.6% in Votua. In Votua, villagers work in different hotels along the Coral coast, but mainly in the Warwick Resort, Naviti Resort and Tambua Sands, some 20 minutes bus ride away. In Vatuolalai, this is also the case but with the majority of people working at the Naviti Resort. As a result of economic work at the resort, other benefits have risen which are highlighted in table 5.34.

Table 5.34 demonstrates that there is a general agreement on the economic benefits of tourism with the majority of respondents from both communities responding that they have been able to build good houses. The following table outlines the responses received from the cohort with regard to money received for their work.

Table 5.35: I get paid well for the work I do

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Village</th>
<th>Yes (%)</th>
<th>No (%)</th>
<th>Don’t know/Not sure (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vatuolalai</td>
<td>35.3</td>
<td>20.6</td>
<td>44.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Votua</td>
<td>29.5</td>
<td>43.2</td>
<td>27.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Respondents were selective towards their response, 35.3% in Vatuolalai agreeing that they get paid well for the work done, 20.6% not agreeing with the statement and 44% stating they “don’t know or are not sure”. In Votua, 43.2% of respondents disagree they they get paid well, compared to 29.3% that agree.

This, as stated by some respondents, can be attributed to the fact that people in this community have worked in resorts for most of their lives. With the respondents that do not agree, one respondent said that “when we were younger its was easier because we had no financial comitments, when we marry and have kids, the money is not enough”. Others attribute their response to the little possibility for climbing the work ladder.

5.8 Illustrative case studies

The following case studies are presented to illustrate and provide further detail on issues raised in the previous pages. They are placed in this section because they yield more detailed information obtained from periods of participant observation in both study villages. These can be seen to supplement and complement information obtained from the questionnaire survey.

5.8.1 Education

As indicated in previous pages (p.57-59), education is not perceived as a main priority for most respondents in Vatuolalai because of the economic opportunities available to the villagers. Most villagers stated that “there is little need for school” because they were “guaranteed” paid jobs at the hotels and that “it was easy to earn money from tourists”. However, because benefits such as lease pay-outs, employment and business opportunities are not shared equally between members of the community, some clans and families have pursued other areas, particularly in agriculture, fishing and education.

In Vatuolalai, I lived with a family from the gonedau or fishermen clan. The people of this clan often call themselves “pilgrims” because of their low status in the village. Their homes are located towards the fringes of the village and are not as developed
in terms of housing and additional amenities. They do not receive land lease benefits or own any village based businesses, do not have an influential role in decision making and village affairs and do not have many of their clan members employed in the resorts. Clans of higher status usually take first pick when it comes to the benefits mentioned. However, compared to other clans, the goneda are among the most educated in the village and have good jobs in government and the private sector. A respondent said:

“We know that we have low status in the village, more often, the other higher clans will be the first to be given preferential treatment when it comes to land lease pay-outs, opportunities for employment and assistance from government. We do not own any business because they are mostly owned and run by people from the other side of the village. To some, it may be a disadvantage, but we accept this and what we do is we try and excel in other areas, in particular education. Our clan is the only clan with graduates from university and there are many in our clan who live and work in other parts of Fiji”.

Another respondent stated:

“In Vatuolalai, we know where we stand; we cannot compete with our relatives, because it is not in our culture, so we don’t argue about setting up businesses or lease arrangements. What we can do is work hard in anything we do, I own a large plantation, and we own fishing nets, whereas people from other clans don’t. Moreover, I tried my best to put my children through school, I have a son who has a diploma in teaching, another works in government and is also pursuing his bachelor’s and my grandchildren all attend school in Suva. Other clans are not blessed in the ways that we have been blessed”.

The quotations and observations made demonstrate that members of the fishermen clan have effectively used other avenues such as fishing, agriculture and more importantly, education as a means with which they can attain wealth and
development. The case illustrates that tourism can influence shifts away from education and other activities such as farming and fishing. It has also demonstrated that education is not being actively pursued by those who benefit directly from tourism.

5.8.2 Community participation

As illustrated in previous pages (p. 83) most respondents felt that the villages evidenced community participation. My general observations bear this out. However, it is worth noting that many village activities are focussed, at least to some extent, on tourism.

The two communities have various committees that oversee issues pertaining to village welfare and development. While in the villages, I observed the effectiveness of these committees in ensuring that the village was well coordinated in meeting the demands of tourists, which frequently visited the villages. The villages maintain the following committees: health, education, conservation, women, youth, development and village committees. These committees are comprised of members from the various clans and meet once or twice a week to discuss specific issues. Through division of labour, each committee has its own task and its fulfilment enables the respective committees and community members to earn money for their villages and families.

It was observed that because the villages were frequented by tourists and other outside groups, villagers felt there was a greater need for a more coordinated approach in maintaining the village and managing various elements associated with tourism. For instance, the health committee is tasked with guaranteeing the overall well-being and health of villagers as well as ensuring that the village is kept neat and tidy. The health committee would raise funds to ensure that the village lawns were mowed, village hall cleaned and general health issues pertaining to pests (rats) were controlled. One respondent stated, “We know that the image of our village is important, so, we have our various committees that work together to fulfil our obligations to our visitors”.
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Another example was observed in the fulfilment of the roles of the women’s committee. The women’s committee is responsible for catering, making garlands for tourists, handicrafts as well as cultural performances. They would frequent the resorts and perform dances for a fee, which they managed and distributed amongst members. This was also observed with the youth committee, which is responsible for making cultural costumes, performing cultural performances at the resorts, village tours and providing the basic manpower to look after visiting groups and tourists.

It was observed that because the villages hosted many outside parties, more importantly tourists, they realised the need for a more organised approach to managing their activities. The diversity of the village committees represents the diverse activities that the communities are taking part in. Through tourism, the villagers are more active in organising and coordinating their activities, more importantly, community participation is encouraged from all sections of the communities as there is also an incentive to earn money.

### 5.8.3 Communal assimilation

From the previous pages (p. 83-85), the respondents felt that the villages were united. This was supported by observations made on the relationships and perceptions held by community members with other communities in the area.

In the peripheries of the two communities, other smaller communities have been settled by migrants from the Lau group of islands, who had initially moved into the area to work as carvers in the resorts. Over the past decades, these communities have expanded and people have remained in the district, with most of its younger members never having been to their villages of origin in the eastern most part of Fiji.

Today, these communities have become assimilated into the communities and are regarded by people of Votua and Vatuolalai as additional clans and part of the village kinship. People from these settlements, namely Jafau and Nawavu, speak the Votua and Vatuolalai dialects fluently; most do not speak their original dialects (Lau) and generally, do not identify themselves as being from Lau. One respondent said:
“People have come from other parts of Fiji and settled in our area, we accept them as one of our own, they too identify themselves as being from here. We are proud of them, some are teachers, others work for government and they all contribute in one way or another to the development of our district. We view them as another mataqali or clan in our village. They pay their church levies, they contribute to fundraising, pay their respects when there is a death in the village, contribute when there is a soqo or village function and they also cater during the week of renewal here in the village. We are one and that is how it is with us.”

The observations made in the two communities illustrate that tourism often leads to internal migrations of people from different parts of Fiji. As demonstrated by the above case, these migrants have become assimilated and accepted into the communities. Not only does this demonstrate the acceptance of people from these communities, but it also establishes that through tourism, people from different communities come together to accept a common identity.

**5.8.4 Role of women**

Previous pages (p.78-88) have shown that respondents generally felt that changes in the roles of women had been witnessed. The following observations will illustrate cases which demonstrate the nature of changes in the role of women.

An incident witnessed in one of the communities involved a conflict between a brother and his sister. In this particular case, the girl, who was employed at the hotel, had gone out to drink with some of her workmates who were also from the same village. She arrived home intoxicated and was confronted by her brother for being out late and coming home drunk. While the man was confronting his sister, her friends had come to the house to defend and vouch for her, pleading with the man to “understand” their situation as “nothing happened”, also suggesting that there were no men at their drinking party. Though this was a short encounter, lasting about twenty minutes, it nonetheless provided an insight into changes in the values and
behaviour of youths, women, and demonstrates the changes in the culture practised by people in these communities.

Though this may seem at first glance to be an ordinary event of friends defending friends, this is unheard of in Fijian culture. In Fijian culture, a conflict or situation within one family stays within that family and there is no outside intervention, regardless of the relationship maintained with other individuals. Furthermore, culture demands that girls listen to their brothers, and adhere to the norms of the family until they leave to marry into another family. In fact, young Fijian women traditionally have very little freedom, and are culturally bound to the home until they are 21, or married. Consequently, going out, partying and mingling with men is taboo.

The incident demonstrates a number of issues. Firstly, it shows that the woman’s workmates felt no obligation to respect the privacy of the family, intruding into a conflict situation that would normally be reserved for two siblings in their family. It also illustrates that the young women in the village had little regard for the cultural authority inherited by the young woman’s brother, thus undermining the role of men in Fijian culture.

In the situation described above women are working at the resorts and are exposed to new ideas and ways of life and thus enjoy more freedom from the cultural protocols that often regulate their behaviour. Women were also observed to have become more independent and unaware of their “place” in culture and society. They felt more comfortable and were able to go out, drink, argue and also question figures of cultural authority, which demonstrates the shifts that employment in and exposure to tourism has created in changing the roles of women.

5.8.5 External influences

As illustrated in the previous pages (p. 86-87) external influences play a vital role in the development of the two communities. The respondents generally indicated agreement and welcomed various external parties that contribute to communal development. The following case will evidence this.

A key observation made while in the two communities is the level of influence held by an American citizen, who first came to Fiji between 2003 and 2004 as a Peace-
Corps volunteer and worked in Votua and Vatuolalai on marine conservation issues. He later returned in 2005 as an environmental consultant and had forged a good relationship between the chiefly families in Votua. He was provided a place where he could stay and has since played a key role in influencing decisions made on many issues concerning the two communities.

I observed that Aaron (a pseudonym) played a pivotal role as a mediator and representative of the two communities with the outside world. He often leads negotiations on behalf of the communities in areas of conservation, organising of village stays and coordinating groups that visit the two communities. One respondent said:

“Aaron has been here for a long time; he is knowledgeable and cares about us. He lobbies for better conservation standards in the village and also promotes training and capacity building of youths and people in the village. He is also very knowledgeable and is passionate about developing our communities”.

Another respondent said, “Aaron is too pushy, he thinks he knows everything and often does not consult us or let us know why he does what he does. We too can decide for ourselves on these issues, he is an outsider, he probably thinks he is a kai Davutukia (Davutukian) but he is not, and he should respect us”.

Despite the contrasting perceptions that villagers have towards him, Aaron is nonetheless, very influential in the development of these two communities and has a key role in decision making. He has also been heavily involved in organising group visits to these communities. As a private consultant, he is able to attract visiting student groups from overseas universities and mediates on behalf of the communities. Aaron also decides on village stay arrangements and is also the lead person in promoting conservation issues.

One specific area that was experienced was when I was involved in arranging a field trip to the two communities. Aaron was very active in highlighting specific village issues and more importantly, dictated the terms of our arrangement with regard to the price charged for visiting the communities. On a previous visit to Vatuolalai, the
student group I travelled with was only required to make a donation to the village development fund for one night’s stay inclusive of dinner and breakfast. This deal was negotiated with the village elders and was a common practice in the villages. However, in our negotiations with Aaron, we were charged for every student that we brought into the village for three hours and these rates were not inclusive of meals. I later learnt from some villagers that Aaron receives a percentage from such visiting groups as our field trip and this was the reason we were charged a higher rate.

The external influences of individuals such as Aaron are important for communities such as Votua and Vatuolalai, which lack the capacity and “knowhow” in arranging and managing such diverse issues as conservation and tourism. He acts as a promoter and moderator on behalf of these communities on many issues and is a person of influence in the development of these communities. However, because his intentions are not clear, and the deals not transparent to other community members, there is also risk and suspicion of personal financial motives.

5.8.6 Cultural changes

Previous pages (pp. 90-93) illustrate perceptions held by the villagers on cultural changes taking place in their communities. The following case provides evidence on observed cultural changes on a key element of Fijian culture, commonly used in tourism, the i sevusevu. This ceremony is a key element of Fijian tradition and is also the primary feature of culture demonstrated to tourists.

The i sevusevu is traditionally performed by guests into a community to seek blessings and approval for entering their village. It often involves the presentation of kava as a gift, which entails an exchange of words announcing their arrival into the village, their place of origin, reason for the visit, accompanied by a request for their endorsement. Villagers are obliged to reciprocate with a kava presentation to new arrivals as a sign of approval and welcome. In circumstances where guests do not have kava to present as i sevusevu, villagers will make a presentation to guests as a sign of welcome and acceptance. The latter is more commonly practised in resorts in Fiji.
Young men of a village are all expected to take part in this ceremony to demonstrate the solidarity of the village in welcoming their guests as well as to demonstrate the strength of the village by showcasing their “strong” young men to guests. Youths are required to learn about the ceremony and its practice, through observing and taking part. The various rituals, words and techniques used in performing *i sevusevu* can mainly be learnt by participating in this event. Young men are expected to sit in a specific arrangement and are required to serve kava in a specific way which is unique to each province and village.

While in one of the villages, I observed an incident when there was a smaller number of men receiving guests, and in another situation, some young men performing the ceremony were scolded for not following correct procedures. One respondent stated, “You might notice that not many young men are here. We mean no disrespect; it is because most of our young men are occupied with work at the hotels, and a few others didn’t bother coming”. Another respondent said:

“Our youths today don’t pay attention to our cultural protocols, most of them do not know how to present the *i sevusevu*, they are not sensitive towards the seriousness of this event. Those guys were scolded because they were not sitting in the correct position and were playing around; this is not a joking matter. When we present to tourists, people are more relaxed, jovial and are expected to be like that for the sake of tourists. When we do this almost every day and in different contexts, people become complacent with adhering to the correct protocols and often take this important event lightly. This should not be the case”.

The above case provides evidence that the use of the *i sevusevu* ceremony in tourism has contributed to changes in how it is observed and practised in the communities. Men no longer feel a strong obligation to attend these events, and were observed to be more relaxed and casual about the ceremony. The difference in context by which this ceremony is used and the increased frequency of its practice has altered local values, perceptions and habits normally expected from the young men of the village. Because they follow more relaxed procedures when presenting to tourists, villagers
are not conforming to behaviours expected when performing this important ceremony in the village and this is indicative of tourism’s influence on indigenous culture.

5.8.6 Religion

Previous pages (p.94) illustrate that villagers generally perceive that social and economic benefits to them are being obtained. The following case will provide insight on some ways in which this is being achieved.

The two communities are predominantly Methodists. Methodism in Fiji is well arranged and well managed and receives its funding through church levies collected from members. These go towards salaries for church ministers, church administration and other church projects. However, the construction and maintenance of churches is the main concern of each congregation. People from these communities are respected throughout Fiji for their wealth and contributions to the church. This was evident in how their church structures were maintained as well as the organisation of their levy collection and church functions.

A major observation made in these two communities is the standard of their churches. The churches in these communities are large structures made of concrete and brick, adorned by mahogany pews and fittings, freshly painted and well maintained. One respondent stated:

“In our village, we take pride in our *lotu* or religion and we also take pride in the fact that we always meet our church fundraising targets. Last year we raised over $15,000 in church contributions and this is testament to our dedication to the church. It is easy for us because it’s collected every month and we set aside a portion of our salaries to meet the targets which we ourselves set”.

Another observation was made in the communities during the first week of January, 2010 on one of my stays in the village. The villagers decided that the first week of January was to be a week of “renewal” among the congregation. This involved a whole week of feasting where various clans were assigned days on which they were required to cater for the whole community in terms of food and Kava. I was struck
by the volume of food and the expenses incurred by the villagers during this week, which I roughly estimated would cost $1500 to $3000 per day. Meals would consist of chicken, beef, pork and fish and would be prepared in different ways which included traditional lovo or food prepared in the earth oven as well as a large variety of western and Chinese dishes, e.g., red pork, sweet and sour fish, stir-fried chicken to name a few. This illustrates that influence from the resorts and tourism has extended itself to the gastronomy of locals.

The level of economic wealth derived from the resorts has allowed for people in these communities to fulfil their obligations to the church. It has also allowed them to plan and arrange community wide functions to celebrate the festivities of the New Year whilst adapting a church oriented theme. The wealth of the villagers and the community was clearly evident in the standard of their church structures as well as their ability to afford a whole week of feasting. This indicates that tourism plays a vital role in the fulfilment of social obligations of the communities. With greater wealth, more lavish functions can be afforded.

5.9 Summary

This chapter highlighted the findings from the empirical studies conducted on Votua and Vatuolalai. The results were themed into seven, often overlapping sections which outline the core findings of the research. The seven sections include population, education and housing, livelihood, income and resource use patterns, health, conflicts and problems, community participation, local values about tourism and socio-economic benefits to communities.

The findings highlight that the two communities are relatively well developed in terms of durable housing and infrastructure with a good standard of living and respondents place a high value on education. It was also observed that most villagers are engaged in paid work at the hotels and are spending less time in fishing and agriculture. It terms of health and sanitation, it was perceived that the community members could afford and were satisfied with their current health status. Conflicts associated with tourism were also witnessed in different forms, mainly relating to village norms, family values, youths, communal living and problems between
community members and the resorts. The communities were generally positive towards tourism and attribute their development and wealth to tourism. Despite some variations and divisions between the two communities, there was general agreement that tourism may be the cause of many changes in village culture and economic prosperity.

The following chapter provides a conclusion of the general aims of this thesis, summarises what was observed, and makes some general recommendations that might be of use to community members and policy makers.
Chapter 6

Conclusions and recommendations
6.0 Introduction

The development of local indigenous communities remains a much discussed issue and most governments in the Pacific are actively searching for tools and means by which this can be attained. Tourism has been identified as a tool with which the development of indigenous communities can be realized. In the Pacific and, more importantly, in Fiji, this has been shown (Rao, 2002; Harrison, 2003; Fiji Bureau of Statistics, 2010) and is continually being promoted in Fiji because of its contributions to the economy and as a means by which local indigenous communities can be advanced.

This study is an attempt to understand how tourism has been a tool to achieve social and economic growth in two indigenous Fijian communities, and specifically focuses on the villages of Votua and Vatuolalai. These two villages are among the first in Fiji to have been involved with tourism and illustrate the complexities of tourism’s impact, both economically and socially, from an indigenous perspective. They also show that tourism is a key agent of social and cultural change for indigenous communities.

Existing literature, although limited, suggests that the benefits and disadvantages of tourism vary (Wahab and Pigram, 1997), and its impacts are viewed differently from individual to individual and from culture to culture (Font and Ahjem, 1999).

There have been many debates concerning the perceived benefits of tourism. Questions arise whether or not cultural exchange is beneficial. However, what is important for this research is that a clear perspective is gained on particular destinations, so that benchmarks are established to measure its impacts.

For a Pacific Island developing state such as Fiji, having accurate benchmarks is vital for the measurement of a valued and highly encouraged industry such as tourism. Accurate evidence and well balanced viewpoints are essential for planning and achieving sustainable development for rural communities and their way of life. Proper understanding will allow for conclusions to be drawn on how to balance impacts and improve benefits derived from tourism.
This study therefore, represents an attempt to understand tourism’s impacts experienced by the people of Votua and Vatuolalai as a result of more than 30 years of pioneering interaction with The Warwick Resort and Spa and The Naviti Resort. The research examines changes that have occurred and will highlight how tourism has influenced the development of indigenous Fijian communities.

The title of this research is “Tourism’s impact on communal development in Fiji: A case study of the socio-economic impacts of The Warwick Resort and Spa and The Naviti Resort on the indigenous Fijian villages of Votua and Vatuolalai”. Following from this, the objectives of this research are as follows:

a. to outline the development of tourism in the Coral Coast of Fiji and its impact on the villages of Votua and Vatuolalai

b. to understand the perceptions held by the local communities on the social and economic impacts of tourism

c. to assess the level of economic dependency on tourism

d. to identify the extent to which tourism has influenced the growth of business and economic activity in the respective villages

e. to determine the extent to which tourism and external parties have contributed to the development of the respective communities

f. to evaluate the extent to which tourism has affected the empowerment of women and youths

g. to identify changes in tradition and cultural practice

h. to identify conflicts within and between the local communities as a result of tourism

i. to provide recommendations on how benefits can be sustained for the long term

6.1 Summary of findings

The findings of the empirical study conducted on the two communities are outlined below.
a. As indicated in chapter 3, the Coral Coast is Fiji’s oldest tourism region and resort based tourism was pioneered there in the 1950s. The construction of the Korolevu hotel in 1952 represented the beginning of major tourism development in Fiji. This was followed by the construction of other resorts in this area including the Hyatt Regency Resort (later re-named Warwick Resort), Shangri-La’s Fijian Resort, Naviti Resort and, more recently, the Outrigger resort which was re-opened in 2005. The Coral Coast is today relatively well developed in terms of transportation, communication infrastructure and tourism resources and also hosts a diverse tourism product ranging from 5 star facilities, backpacker hotels to village stays.

With this, tourism has been identified as an invaluable development tool that has impacted greatly on the social and economic development of Votua and Vatuolalai. High participation by community members in the formal economy, improved housing and amenities, good living standards and more affluent lifestyles in community members exemplify the nature of impacts of tourism on these two communities.

b. As indicated in previous sections (5.1 - 5.3), the perception of community members from both villages was generally uniform with similarities observed across different variables. Villagers in both communities had generally positive perceptions about tourism mainly because of its economic benefits and contributions to social development. Respondents attribute their good standard of living, ability to afford good healthcare, education and better housing to their involvement in tourism. Furthermore, community members recognised that tourism has also influenced perceived changes in village practice, culture, people’s behaviour, values and the observance of traditional protocols.

However, some differences were observed between the two communities with regards to their perceptions on tourism’s socio-economic benefits and non-benefits. Vatuolalai villagers were more positive towards tourism than members of the Votua community. This may be attributed to the length of time and the nature of their involvement in tourism, an issue noted more
generally, by MacNaught (1982). These differences in perceptions can also be linked to social exchange theorists who argue that community perceptions towards tourism are formed by the receipt of tangible and intangible benefits and costs (Ward and Berno, 2011; Choi and Murray, 2010; Andereck et al, 2005).

People in Vatuolalai have benefited more in areas of economic and social development when compared to Votua, and, they have been involved in tourism for a shorter length of time. Votua villagers have encountered problems, which have made them more cautious in offering praise for tourism. In his study of the impacts of tourism on Votua, Sofer (1990) identified that the closure of the Korolevu hotel had a major impact on the livelihoods of villagers who had become dependent on tourism. The resort’s closure drove villagers back into farming and subsistence-based fishing. Sofer (1990) also observed that tourism had caused changes in the behaviour of villagers towards community work, with instances of village disputes also observed.

The experiences of Votua have led to the formation of more realistic attitudes, which are far from the initial euphoria described by Doxey (1979) and may be a reason for the marked differences in responses from the two communities (MacNaught, 1982).

c. Both communities are highly dependent on tourism for economic gains, and around 65% to 70% of villagers in both communities deriving their income from tourism (section 5.7). The majority of people in these communities have become dependent of tourism as their main source of income, either through small tourism-related businesses or through low-skilled work at the resorts. These findings reflect links between the economic benefits received from tourism and its impact on village lifestyles, further increasing their economic dependency on money from tourism.

d. A significant percentage of the population from both villages engaged in other tourism related businesses (34% - 56%), and community members running and earning money through their own operations (table 5.1a and
5.1b). These increases in entrepreneurial activities were observed to be more in Vatuolalai, with a prevalence of more businesses including a massage parlour, hair braiding salon, Jet Ski rentals, and village stays, which are mainly due to the village’s close proximity to the resort. These results add weight to the work of others who have observed that tourism empowers local communities in areas of business (Lea, 1988; Sofer, 1990; Collier, 1991; Oppermann and Chon, 1997; Sofield, 2003).

e. As indicated in previous sections (5.5.3 and 5.8.5), external parties have had an influential role on village development. The University of the South Pacific, Institute of Applied Sciences, Fiji Locally Managed Marine Area Network and Arron have contributed to training, capacity building and have provided villagers with education and advice on tourism’s impacts. Furthermore, external influences from the resorts have contributed to good housing and infrastructure given access to luxury items, good health services, good water supply and improved sanitation.

Such external parties have led to increased awareness by villagers on issues pertaining to tourism and sustainability and have affected community perceptions on village development in general.

f. Tourism has led to significant changes in the roles of women and youths. As indicated in previous sections (5.5 and 5.8.4), more women and youths are earning money and contributing economically to the community. This reflects a shift away from traditional roles to more modern ones as more women and youths are actively involved in managing and organising village activities, tasks traditionally reserved for men. A high level of community participation and village unity was also observed as villagers felt more involved in village matters. Most respondents from both communities perceived that the village was “more united” and felt they were more “involved” in community meetings. This was the result of many factors which were influenced mainly by an increased participation in tourism.

g. Tourism has influenced various changes in tradition and culture in the two communities (section 5.6 and 5.8.6). Villagers were spending less time in
agriculture and fishing, two typical “traditional” activities. The trends observed are direct impacts of tourism as more time is being spent in work at the hotels and less time is spent in these “traditional” activities. As a result, more people are living more affluent lifestyles as people are buying more. In his study of Votua, Sofer (1990) observed that tourism had caused a “narrowing interest” in agriculture and fisheries because of imposed competition for labour.

In addition, participation in tourism has contributed to changes in how certain aspects of culture are observed. For example, youths are not following village protocols, traditional ceremonies such as the *i sevusevu* are not being done correctly and specific relationships between siblings are not being observed. Such changes in the observance of social protocols, observance of relationships and values have further contributed to conflicts within the communities.

h. Despite the general perception held by villagers that conflicts do not occur frequently, a significant percentage of the population link tourism to some social ills. As highlighted in previous sections (5.4 and 5.8), such disputes focus on the behaviour of women, drunkenness, changes in the behaviour of youths, and infringements of village policies and norms, e.g. drunkenness on Sundays, brawls and not attending to village commitments.

Disputes between the communities and the resorts were also observed, e.g. villagers felt excluded from decision making pertaining to the use of their customary fishing areas, and villagers also felt cheated by current lease arrangements which, in their view are unfair.

The empirical evidence from this research illustrates tourism’s impacts on communal development and, more importantly, highlight the social and economic consequences of tourism on Votua and Vatuolalai.

Whether these observed changes are “good” or “bad” depends on the ideological orientation of the observer. From a cultural perspective, the changes may be
viewed as negative, but from a development perspective, these changes may demonstrate development, and natural evolution of culture in a society.

6.2 Limitations of the study

Nevertheless, some elements of this study limited its success and are outlined below.

First, because there had been little prior research on tourism and indigenous communities in Fiji and very little research on tourism’s impacts in Fiji and the Coral Coast, little literature was available to review. However, it did not adversely affect this study and its findings because literature about tourism in the less developed world and the Pacific is well established and was sufficient in addressing the objectives of this thesis.

Secondly, another limitation was the time spent in the communities, which amounted to only a month. A longer period would have produced more information about the communities. In addition, being there for a longer period would have allowed more immersion and greater access to more sensitive areas of the communities. However, for the purpose of this thesis, time spent and data gathered in Votua and Vatuolalai was sufficient.

Thirdly, barriers to communication were another limiting factor for this study. Despite having some understanding of the dialect, some slang and village jargon were difficult to interpret. However, this was managed with the help of an interpreter, whom I consulted regularly.

6.3 Contributions to literature

The findings of this empirical study have filled a significant void in the literature on tourism’s impacts on indigenous communities in Fiji, as it provides evidence for the social and economic consequences of tourism on indigenous Fijian communities.

In addition, the findings have shown links between tourism and enhanced standards of living, increased entrepreneurial activities and improved quality of life in these communities reinforcing the research of others (Sofer, 1990; King, Pizam
The study has also provided evidence of how engagement in tourism can lead to villagers living more affluent lifestyles, farming and fishing less, and choosing to purchase more. Moreover, the findings have also established tourism’s links to changes in gender roles, youth empowerment, changes to traditions, culture and conflicts which were observed in these other communities (Cohen, 1988; Bolabola, 1980; Sofer, 1990; Douglas and Douglas, 1996a; de Burlo, 2003; Burns, 2003).

### 6.4 Recommendations for future research

In undertaking this research, I have gained a better understanding on the limited interest and lack of general awareness on tourism’s impacts on indigenous communities in Fiji. Moreover, governments and policy makers attribute economic wealth and development as key implications of tourism, often overlooking its key social and cultural implications for vulnerable host communities.

This study has provided evidence of tourism’s longitudinal impacts on indigenous Fijian communities and has identified a need for more focussed, destination-based research to be conducted in different communities actively involved in tourism.

Following from the findings indicated above, several recommendations for future research can be made.

First, there is a need for more specific studies of tourism’s impacts on indigenous communities and their culture, which is a valuable resource in tourism, and provides indigenous Fijians with their identity in the global world. Much tourism in Fiji affects indigenous communities, and more research would supplement the findings of this study and indicate how negative impacts can be reduced and benefits increased for indigenous Fijian communities.

Secondly, resorts should be encouraged to foster better dialogue and closer relations with the respective villages. The findings have shown the ability of locals to own and operate their own tourism businesses. Closer linkages between the communities and the resorts would enable more appropriate village-based tourism products, further facilitating better service delivery, benefiting both parties.
Thirdly, government should encourage local participation in business by providing specific technical and financial support to existing or potential businesses in these communities. Although villagers in both communities reflect a certain level of experience and understanding of the basics of tourism business operations and dealing with money, they still lack expertise in areas of marketing and strategic product development. The success exemplified by Votua and Vatuolalai in areas of entrepreneurship establishes the ability of indigenous Fijians to own and operate businesses. However, assistance is required from government to facilitate training in business planning and management, book-keeping and marketing as well as to initiate microfinance schemes to help establish small scale businesses. This will increase participation by locals and encourage better organised and well marketed products.

Furthermore, government should establish policies that encourage better linkages between specific resorts and surrounding local communities in areas of agriculture. It was observed that despite the low soil fertility in the district, there is huge potential to breed organic livestock and grow pineapples, watermelons, corn and other crops consumed by tourists. Greater cooperation between government, the resorts and the communities may bear fruit in strengthening areas of agricultural production and internal linkages within the local economy⁸.

Finally, another important recommendation is to the communities involved in this research. If community members were made aware of the various social and cultural changes taking place, they would be able to decide on ways in which these impacts can be minimised and negotiated.

Following these recommendations would not make tourism problem-free, and there will always be debates about its impacts on indigenous communities. However, such debates should rely less on ideological dogma and more on rigorous research. It is hoped that this thesis is a step in the right direction.

---

⁸Fiji Papaya Project – A joint import substation project by the Taiwanese, Australian and Fijian governments.
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APPENDIX 1

POPULATION, EDUCATION AND HOUSING

Data collected from the researcher-administered questionnaires in the two villages of Votua and Vatuolalai are summarised and discussed in chapter 5 using literature reviewed in chapter 2.

Presented below is the graphical representation of the responses received from the two case studies. In an attempt to collect a broad range of responses, various questions were asked from 7 major themes using semi-structured questions which included 5-point Likert scales, to gauge the level of importance and agreement on various statements.

The importance and agreement ratings are as follows:

**Importance Rating:**
1 – Very important
2 – Important
3 – Fairly important
4 – Not very important
5 – Not important

**Agreement Rating:**
1 – Strongly agree
2 – Agree
3 – Neutral
4 – Disagree
5 – Strongly disagree

**Agreement Rating:**
1 – Much better
2 – Better
3 – No change
1. In an attempt to gauge the level of economic wealth and development within the communities, observations were made on the type of housing and infrastructure, the results are presented below.

**Figure A.1: House type**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Frequency (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Other, specify...</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brick/cement</td>
<td>91.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wood</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corrugated iron</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bamboo</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure A.2: Roof type**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Frequency (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Other, specify...</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concrete and tiles</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corrugated iron</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tile</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thatch/ leaves</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure A.3: Toilet type**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Frequency (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Other, specify..</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flush</td>
<td>96.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water seal</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pit toilet</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No toilet</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. Do all the children between the age of 6 and 16 attend school?

Figure A.4: Children below the age of 16 that attend school

3. If your answer to the above is no, please indicate why they do not attend school

Figure A.5: Reasons children do not attend school

4. In this part, respondents were required to rate a set of 7 statements on education in terms of their agreement. The analysed data is presented below.
Figure A.6: It has become easier for our children to go to school

Figure A.7: We are better able to afford school fees

Figure A.8: We are now better able to send of children to good schools

Figure A.9: My family has learnt practical skills to earn an income
Figure A.10: It is important for my children to attend school

![Bar chart showing response frequencies.]

- Agree: 100.0%
- Neutral: 0.0%
- Disagree: 0.0%
- Don’t know: 0.0%

Figure A.11: The chances for going to school is the same for boys and girls

![Bar chart showing response frequencies.]

- Agree: 73.5%
- Neutral: 5.9%
- Disagree: 20.6%
- Don’t know: 0.0%

Figure A.12: Tourism has shown the importance of education to the community

![Bar chart showing response frequencies.]

- Agree: 79.4%
- Neutral: 2.3%
- Disagree: 17.6%
- Don’t know: 0.0%
SECTION 1: POPULATION, EDUCATION AND HOUSING

1. In an attempt to gauge the level of economic wealth and development within the communities, observations were made on the type of housing and infrastructure, the results are presented below.

**Figure A.13: House type**

- **Brick/cement**: 88.6%
- **Wood**: 11.4%
- **Corrugated iron**: 9.1%
- **Bamboo**: 0.0%

**Figure A.14: Roof type**

- **Corrugated iron**: 100.0%
- **Thatch/leaves**: 0.0%
- **Tile**: 0.0%
- **Concrete and tiles**: 0.0%
- **Other, specify...**: 0.0%
2. Do all the children between the age of 6 and 16 attend school?

3. If your answer to the above is no, please indicate why they do not attend school

4. In this part, respondents were required to rate a set of 7 statements on education in terms of their agreement. The analysed data is presented below.
Figure A.18: It has become easier for our children to go to school

Figure A.19: We are better able to afford school fees

Figure A.20: We are now better able to send children to good schools
Figure A.21: My family has learnt practical skills to earn an income

Figure A.22: It is important for my children to attend school

Figure A.23: The chances for going school is the same for boys and girls

Figure A.24: Tourism has shown the importance of education to the community
APPENDIX 2

VOTUA AND VATUOLALAI SURVEY QUESTIONAIRES

Master of Arts in Tourism Studies
Research Questionnaire

1. Date of interview: ____________________  Location of interview: ____________________

II. Gender: ____________________  Yaca ni Yavu ni Vale

V. Age: ____________________

SECTION 1: POPULATION, EDUCATION AND HOUSING

2. Interviewer: Record the main material of the walls and roof of the house without asking

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>a. House type</th>
<th>b. Roof</th>
<th>c. Toilet type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Bamboo</td>
<td>1 Thatch/leaves</td>
<td>1 No toilet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Corrugated iron</td>
<td>2 Tile</td>
<td>2 Pit toilet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Wood</td>
<td>3 Corrugated</td>
<td>3 Water seal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Brick/ cement</td>
<td>4 Concrete and tiles</td>
<td>4 Flush</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Other, specify....</td>
<td>5 Other, specify....</td>
<td>5 Other, specify...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please help complete a list of all the people who normally live and eat their meals together in this household beginning with your immediate family and then the extended family.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3. NAME</th>
<th>4. SEX</th>
<th>5. AGE</th>
<th>6. SCHOOL</th>
<th>7. LEVEL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male. 1</td>
<td>Age</td>
<td>Is [NAME] attending school or tertiary education now?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female. 2</td>
<td></td>
<td>Highest level of education by?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1. No Edu</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. Primary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3. Secondary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4. Tertiary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5. Other (specify)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>SEX</th>
<th>YEARS</th>
<th>SCHOOL</th>
<th>LEVEL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
8. Do all the children between the age of 6 and 16 in your household attend school? YES/NO

9. If your answer to the above is no, please indicate why they do not attend school
1. I do not have children
2. We cannot afford the school fees
3. We need the children to help out at home
4. The school is too remote
5. Above the mentioned age group
6. Other reason (please state below)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statements on Education:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Now I would like to read a list of statements on education. Can you indicate to what extent you agree or disagree with each of these statements? Compared to before tourism establishment … (Tick one option for each statement)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>0 Don't know</th>
<th>1 Disagree</th>
<th>2 Neutral</th>
<th>3 Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10. It has become easier for our children to go to school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. We are now better able to afford the school fees</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. We are now able to send our children to good schools</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. My family has learnt new practical skills to earn an income</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. It is important for my children to attend school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Tourism has shown the importance of education to the community</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. The chances for going to school is the same for boys and girls</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SECTION 2: LIVELIHOOD, INCOME AND RESOURCE USE PATTERN

17. Please indicate which are the sources of income that your family relies on and which may be considered as the most important sources of income

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Tick if source</th>
<th>Which is the most important source for your family</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Fishing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. See Cucumber collecting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Other Sea food collection (e.g. shells / mud crab / sea urchin)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Farming Staple and Cash crops</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Farming Vegetables</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Canteen business (groceries, kava, cigarette etc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Work at the hotel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Handicraft business</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Tourism related business</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Lease form the hotel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
11. Coral / ornamental fish collection
12. Handicraft / basket weaving
13. Boat operation / sea transportation
14. Middle-men agent for marine products
15. Seaweed cultivation
16. Wood/mangrove collection
17. Remittances
18. Social welfare
19. Other income sources, specify …

18. How often do you fish or collect seafood? [Circle one answer]
1   Every Day
2   Every two days
3   Every three days
4   Once a week
5   Every two weeks
6   Once a month
7   Never

19. How often do you spend time in agricultural activity? [Circle one answer]
1   Every Day
2   Every two days
3   Every three days
4   Once a week
5   Every two weeks
6   Once a month
7   Never

20. Has seafood collection become more difficult since the your involvement in tourism? YES/NO

21. If yes, please indicate reasons why you think seafood collection has been affected:

   1. Because people are involved in work at the hotel
   2. Because people have the money to buy fish from the markets
   3. Because there is no time to go fishing or to collect seafood
   4. Because fishing areas have changed significantly
   5. Other reasons (please explain)
   6. Don’t know

22. Has farming become more difficult since the your involvement in tourism? YES/NO
23. If yes, please indicate reasons why you think farming has been affected:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>LESS</th>
<th>MORE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Because people are involved in work at the hotel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Because people have the money to buy produce from the markets</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Because there is no time tend to the farms</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Because villagers view farming as a hassle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Other reasons (please explain)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Don’t know</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

24. How often does your family eat local seafood?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Every Day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Every two days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Every three days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Once a week</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Every two weeks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Once a month</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Never</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

25. How often does your family eat local produce?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Every Day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Every two days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Every three days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Once a week</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Every two weeks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Once a month</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Never</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

26. Has your family’s diet changed because of your own or family members’ involvement in work at the hotels? YES/NO

27. If yes, what are some of the reasons you think caused such changes, please indicate below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>LESS</th>
<th>MORE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. My family fishes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. We farm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Our families prefer processed food</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Time spent working at the hotels:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. My family finds that buying food is preferred</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Other, specify ...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Don’t know</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### SECTION 3: HEALTH

**28. How do you rate your health situation today compared to before tourism?**

|---|----------------|-----------|--------------|---------|--------------|

Please tick the correct response

*Interviewer: If answer 1 or 2 go on to Q 28; If answer 4 or 5 then go on to Q 29*

**29. What has contributed to making your health condition better or much better?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Dk/Ns</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Better health care services are now available in the community</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) I can afford to get better healthcare services either in the community or another location</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Drinking water supply is better</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Sanitation (toilets, etc.) is cleaner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) The drainage system and village surrounding is cleaner and better</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) Living standards have improved</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g) Have access to better information on healthy lifestyle practices</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please specify)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**30. What has contributed to making your health condition worse or much worse?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Dk/Ns</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) The quality of healthcare in the village has diminished</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) I am unable to access the healthcare service in the community or other location due to availability of funds</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Changes in diet have increased instances of diseases amongst children</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Toilets and village surroundings are dirty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) The current drainage system is ineffective</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) Other (please specify)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**31. Was any of the above in (23 or Q24) directly related to the tourism?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Dk/Ns</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
SECTION 4: CONFLICTS AND PROBLEMS

32. How often is there a conflict related to tourism? [Circle only one]

1 Regularly  
2 Occasionally  
3 Rarely  
4 Never

a. Have you experienced conflicts related to tourism? YES/NO

b. Can you please say what the conflicts were about?

c. If yes, who were the violators?

33. Can you specify:

- What rules were broken?

34. What do you think maybe the cause of such behavior?
### Section 5: Community Participation and Tourism

I would like to read a list of statements on the community. Please indicate to what extent you agree or disagree with each of these statements? As a result of tourism...

[Tick one option for each statement]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Don't know</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Members of my family are taking part in community meetings more often</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Women are more often involved in community meetings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>The youth has more voice and opportunities in our communities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>The community has become more united</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>There are more conflicts amongst community members</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>There are more conflict between neighbouring communities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Support from the government has improved</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Support from other organizations has improved</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>There have been other outside parties involved in making decisions about tourism</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.a</td>
<td>If you agree to the above please state who they are:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.b</td>
<td>What are their roles in decision-making?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10. Do you think that such outside influence is good for the village? YES/NO
11. If YES or NO, please state why


### SECTION 6: LOCAL VALUES AND BELIEFS ABOUT TOURISM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>36.</th>
<th>Statements</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.a</td>
<td>Changes in village culture can be caused by many factors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.b</td>
<td>If answer is 1 or 2 for the above, please explain your views</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>The hotels will increase opportunities for my village</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>We should allow as many people as possible from my village to work in the hotels</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.a</td>
<td>Tourism has been a major cause of changes in attitudes of youths</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.b</td>
<td>If answer is 1 or 2 for the above, please explain your views</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.a</td>
<td>Tourism has been a cause of change in the roles of women in my village</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.b</td>
<td>If answer is 1 or 2 for the above, please explain the types of changes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>I believe that tourism is good</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>If answer is 1 or 2 for the above, please state why</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
There are a lot of unwanted problems because of tourism

If answer is 1 or 2 for the above, please explain your views

I believe that tourism is both good and bad

If answer is 1 or 2 for the above, please explain your views

### SECTION 7: SOCIO-ECONOMIC BENEFITS TO COMMUNITIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Please tick the correct response</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interviewer: If answer is 1 or 2 then go on to Q 39; If answer is 4 or 5 then go on to Q 40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>38.</th>
<th>What has contributed to making your economic situation better or much better?</th>
<th>(1) Yes</th>
<th>(2) No</th>
<th>(9) Dk/Ns</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a) I have got a steady job at the hotels</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b) I get more pay for the work I do</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c) A number of people in my household are working at the hotels</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>d) I have been able to build a good house</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>e) I save my money</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>f) I invest my money</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>g) Other (please specify)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
What has contributed to making your economic situation worse or much worse?

- (1) Yes
- (2) No
- (9) Dk/Ns

a) We are not paid well in the resorts
b) I get paid less for the work I do
c) My job at the hotel is not a steady one
d) The cost of living is high (eg: the cost of bread, rice, gas has gone up)
e) I have had to spend a lot of money on medical expenses
f) The interest rates for loans are too high
f) Other (please specify)

TURAGA NI KORO/MATAQALI REPRESENTATIVE/ COMMITTEE REPRESENTATIVE

1. How many people live in the village?

2. What are the main sources of income to the village?

3. How many households are involved in tourism?

4. How is lease money shared?

5. How many residents from the village are employed at the Resort?
   a) How many are employed as casual workers?
   b) How many are employed as permanent workers?
6. Economically, how has the village benefited because of tourism?

7. During the recent financial crisis, has anyone
   a) Lost their jobs? Please explain
   b) Worked reduced hours? Please explain

8. Economically, has the village lost in any way because of tourism?

9. Has the social and economic life in the village changed since tourism became important? YES/NO
10. If yes, please indicate changes that have come about as a result of your community’s involvement in tourism

11. Socially, has the village benefited because of tourism? YES/NO
12. If yes, please state in what ways has tourism been of benefit

13. If no, please explain in which ways has tourism impacted your community?

14. Can tourists visit the village? YES/NO
15. If yes, when and how are the visits arranged?
   - Please explain
16. What do tourists like to do in the village?

17. Do you think that such visits benefit the village? YES/NO

- Please explain

18. Do you notice examples of changes that have occurred in terms of practice of culture as a result of tourism? YES/NO
19. If yes, what are they?

20. Do you think that factors other than tourism contribute to changes in culture? YES/NO
21. If yes, please state which factors you think are involved

22. Describe the relationship between villagers and tourists

23. Are close relationships formed between villagers and tourists? YES/NO
24. If yes, please explain the nature of relationships

25. Are there examples of conflicts between villagers and tourists? YES/NO
26. If yes, please explain the nature of conflicts

27. Are there restricted areas in the village to which tourists cannot go? YES/NO
28. Where are these areas?
29. If yes, who enforces the restrictions?
30. What, if any, are the punishments?

31. Are there restricted areas in the hotels and grounds to which villagers cannot go? YES/NO
32. If yes, who enforces the restrictions?

33. What, if any, are the punishments?

34. Has the Resort been involved with the community in partnerships and projects? YES/NO
35. If Yes, please explain

36. In what ways have the hotels contributed to the development of your community?

37. If positive, what positive contributions have the hotels made to your community?

38. If negative, what have the negative contributions been?

39. How can such negative impacts be avoided?
40. Overall do you think that the hotels has brought (please circle one)
   I. More benefits than costs?
   II. More costs than benefits?
   III. About the same?

“Au va’a vinavina’a ‘ena omunu solia tu a omuni gauna bibi ena va’adidi’e oqo. Ni ‘alougata ji’o ena qaravi i tavi”

“Thank you for your time and contributions to this survey”