



REPORT

on the

**2004-2005 EMPLOYMENT AND
UNEMPLOYMENT SURVEY**

Dr Wadan Narsey

May 2007

USP Library Cataloguing-in-Publication Data

Narsey, Wadan

Report on the 2004-05 employment and unemployment survey / Wadan Narsey. –
Suva, Fiji : Vanuavou Publications, 2007.

iv, p.94 ; 30 cm.

At head of cover title: Fiji Islands Bureau of Statistics
ISBN 978- 982-9092-09-0

1. Labor supply—Fiji—Statistics 2. Unemployment—Fiji—Statistics
3. Labor mobility—Fiji—Statistics I. Fiji. Bureau of Statistics II. Title.

HD5850.6.A6N37 2007

31.13799611

Copyright: Fiji Islands Bureau of Statistics

Reproduction of Material

Any table or material published in the 2004-2005 Employment and Unemployment Survey report maybe reproduced and published without the Fiji Islands Bureau of Statistics' prior approval. However, the source of information should always be identified and acknowledged in all modes of presentation.

Enquiries:

Fiji Islands Bureau of Statistics
Ratu Sukuna House,
Mac Arthur Street, Victoria Parade,
Suva, Fiji Islands

P O Box 2221
Government Buildings
Suva
FIJI

Telephone: [679] 3315822
Fax No: [679] 3303656
E-mail: info@statsfiji.gov.fj
Website: www.statsfiji.gov.fj

Or Wadan Narsey wnarsey@connect.com.fj Ph: 3384158 / 9910564

Contents

	<u>Page</u>
Preface	i
Contents	ii
Chapter 1 Introduction	1
Chapter 2 Survey Population	3
Chapter 3 The Labour Force: Currently Active Population (Last 7 Days)	8
Chapter 4 The Employment Status of the Economically Active	11
Chapter 5 Time Worked: Last 7 Days, and Previous 12 Months	16
Chapter 6 Incomes: Last 7 Days and Previous 12 Months	27
Chapter 7 Industry: Last 7 Days	33
Chapter 8 Occupations: Last 7 Days	39
Chapter 9 Transport: mode, distance traveled and time taken	43
Chapter 10 Job Satisfaction and Dis-satisfaction	46
Chapter 11 Employed But Not At Work	49
Chapter 12 Unemployment	53
Chapter 13 Internal Migration	61
Chapter 14 Household Chores	64
Appendices Additional Tables	67
Appendix 1 EUS Demographics	67
Appendix 2 Hours worked Last 7 Days	69
Appendix 3 Hours worked per day Previous 12 Months	71
Appendix 4 Gross Earnings over Last 7 Days	75
Appendix 5 Gross Earnings over Previous 12 months	77
Appendix 6 Mode of Transport	80
Appendix 7 Job Satisfaction Over Last 7 Days	83
Appendix 8 Economically Inactive Persons	86
Annex A Notes on Sampling Methodology, Data Processing and Estimation Procedures	90
Annex B Variables in Questionnaire	92

Preface

The 2004-05 Household Survey of Employment and Unemployment aimed to meet the data requirements of planners working towards improving the quality and productivity of Fiji's human resources. Household surveys to gather information on employment, unemployment, income and expenditure will now be conducted 5-yearly as the department aims to better understand the country's household sector.

The principal objective of the survey was to obtain comprehensive statistical data on the economically active population, comprising employed and unemployed persons, as well as on the inactive population of working age. From the data, the size and structure of the country's workforce have been determined. When compared to figures of previous years, changes in the labour market and in the employment situation can be obtained.

There is a continuing demand for regularly updated data on educational attainment, training level and field, availability for work etc. Such information is important in the design and evaluation of overall government policies aimed at promoting and creating employment. These include training programmes, schemes to help people start or return to work, assistance in setting up an enterprise and other incentives for employment promotion.

With a regular round of such surveys the department should be in a better position to monitor trends. For instance we would need to find out where the net annual increases in the labour force are being absorbed.

I am particularly grateful to Dr. Wadan Narsey for carrying out the detailed analysis and putting together this report. The department is fortunate to have secured his services and users of the report should find the tables and analysis in this report extremely useful.

Timoci I Bainimarama
Government Statistician

Chapter 1

Introduction

The Bureau has conducted a number of surveys on employment and unemployment over the years, usually in response to special requests from other arms of government, such as the Ministry of Planning. Thus the first major survey was conducted in 1973, as a response to a request from the then Prime Minister's Working Party on Unemployment.¹ The last Employment and Unemployment Survey was conducted in 1982 by the Bureau in response to the needs of the Fiji Employment and Development Mission.² The report was published in 1985.³

The 2004-05 Survey on Employment and Unemployment is intended to be part of a regular on-going exercise to obtain comprehensive national data on employment and unemployment that is not normally obtained through the Bureau's Annual Employment Survey, which tends to focus on formal sector employment.

Thus this Report presents comprehensive tables on national employment, unemployment, and under-employment conditions by a number of useful disaggregations: rural/urban, gender, divisions, ethnicity, age, industries and occupations.⁴

There are national estimates of the employed and unemployed, incomes, hours and days worked, major activities, industries, occupations, qualifications, mode of transport, distance traveled, and time taken to reach place of employment.

For the first time in a Bureau survey on employment, there is data and interesting tables on time spent on household chores. They indicate extremely uneven gender burdens in Fiji, with Females indicated to be relatively far more burdened than Males, at all ages and across employment status.

There is also considerable data on the numbers and categories of economically inactive persons in the country.

This Report tries to use definitions which are consistent with those used by the ILO⁵, although a number of departures are also made. For instance, in international practice, the "currently active" or "usually active" categories are defined in relation to all persons above some reference age. Given however that there a significant number of primary and secondary school drop-outs or push-outs in Fiji, no age limits are used in the definitions here.

Additionally, international practice uses some standards of minimum hours per day spent in working or days per year to define the economically active. This Report prefers to give actual distributions of workers according to hours per day and days per years actually worked.

¹ This resulted in the *Report on Employment and Unemployment*. Government of Fiji. 1973.

² *Final Report to the Government of Fiji* by the Fiji Employment and Development Mission. Parliamentary Paper No.66 of 1984.

³ *A Report on the Fiji Employment/Unemployment Survey* of 1982. Fiji Bureau of Statistics, June 1985.

⁴ There was some difficulty in defining "formal" and "informal" sectors.

⁵ ILO (1990) Surveys of economically active population, employment, unemployment and underemployment. An ILO manual on concepts and methods. ILO, Geneva.

This approach also explains an interesting paradox. While the general public perception is of considerable unemployment in the country, the official statistics indicate fairly low rates of unemployment of around 5 percent. While this Report also notes that the “stated” Unemployment rate is about 4.7%, there are extremely high levels of under-employment in several categories of workers, especially Family Workers, Self-employed and Community Workers. When this under-employment is taken into account, the effective rate of unemployment becomes considerably higher (at over 20%).

The economically active population are all persons of either sex who furnished the supply of labour for the production of goods and services as defined by the UN system of national accounts and balances, during a specified time reference period.

The 2004-05 EUS derived information on economic activity and inactivity using two time reference periods. One section⁶ referred to any economic activity and reasons for inactivity over the previous 12 months. This period was used to define the usually active and an important defining variable “usual activity”.

A second section⁷ derived information on economic activity and inactivity over the previous 7 days only, giving rise to the definition of “currently active” population. This is synonymous with the term “labour force” and gives the more accurate picture of the “current situation” at the time of the survey.

The bulk of the tables on incomes earned, time worked etc, are derived from the section on population “currently active” for the last seven days.

The “at school” field was used to define those who were potentially economically active, while the “reasons for inactive” field was used to eliminate those who were definitely not economically active.⁸

This Report is broken into various chapters with simple commentary accompanying the basic tables, in order to be more “user-friendly” for stake-holders.

⁶ Questions 1.15 to 2.28.

⁷ Questions 3.1 to 4.8.

⁸ This resulted in an interesting category of those Not At School, Not Working, and Not Inactive by the usual categories. Some proportion of these may be categorized as unemployed, even though not recorded as such.

Chapter 2

The Population

Population estimates from the survey (using the sampling weights) give an idea of the effective coverage by the EUS of the total population. These estimates exclude institutional populations.

Table 1 indicates that Fijians comprised some 53% of the population, Indo-Fijians 42%, and Rotumans and Others 5%.

Ethnicity\Div	Central	Eastern	Northern	Western	All	Perc.
Fijian	194234	32466	60817	144235	431753	52.8
Indo-Fijian	118439	798	62799	164194	346231	42.3
Others	13752	608	9366	5540	29267	3.6
Rotuman	3951	4354	389	2008	10702	1.3
All	330377	38226	133372	315977	817952	100.0
Perc. Division	40.4	4.7	16.3	38.6	100.0	

Table 2.2 indicates that while Females are some 49% of the national population, they are under-represented in some ethnic groups in some Divisions (e.g 45% amongst Fijians in the Northern Division) and somewhat over-represented in others.⁹

Ethnicity	Central	Eastern	Northern	Western	All
Fijian	48	48	45	48	48
Indo-Fij	50	53	51	50	50
Others	52	46	45	54	50
Rotuman	52	46	60	39	47
All	49	48	48	49	49

Table 2.3 gives the age structure of the different ethnic groups. It will be seen that ethnic Fijians have a much higher proportion of younger persons, Indo-Fijians have a slightly higher proportion of older persons (Over 55). In aggregate however, the Dependency Ratio¹⁰ for Fijians is 0.76 persons per working age person (aged 15 to 55), some 47% percent higher than the 0.52 figure for Indo-Fijians. This would have a strong bearing on the relative capacity of the income earners of the different ethnic groups to achieve higher standards of living, to save and to accumulate for the future.

Ethnicity	% < 15	% 15 to 55	% Over 55	Depend. Ratio
Fijian	33	57	9	0.76
Indo-Fij	23	66	10	0.52
Others	22	62	11	0.61
Rotuman	29	59	13	0.68
All	29	61	10	0.65

⁹ Note that in many tables with disaggregation, statistics for Rotumans and Others may be more unreliable because of small sample sizes.

¹⁰ Defined here as the Ratio of (Persons Below 15, and Over 55) to (Persons aged 15 to 55).

Table 2.4 gives an indication of the school attendance of the different ethnic groups, by age groups.

Age	Fijian	Indo-F	Others	Rotuman	All
0 to 4	6	5	3	0	6
5 to 14	89	92	88	89	90
15 to 19	69	76	76	85	73

Worth noting is that only 90% of the persons aged 5 to 14 were attending school, with the proportion a slightly higher 92% for Indo-Fijians compared to 89% for Fijians. Some 10% of this age group were not attending school- either they had never attended school or had dropped out.

Of the 15 to 19 age group, some 73% on average were at school, with a high of 85% for Rotumans, and a low of 69% for Fijians. These numbers are of concern, given the need to maximize the education potential of the workforce.

	Fijians	Indo-F	Others	Rotumans	All
Senior Secondary	81255	70544	6174	3015	160988
Certificate Diploma	24623	24836	2841	916	53216
Degree/Post Graduate	3624	5593	1323	129	10670
Other Qualification	442	73	39	0	554
Sum of Above	109943	101047	10378	4061	225429

Table 2.5 gives the highest educational attainment of the population for the higher educational attainments. Of interest is that while there is still a large ethnic imbalance at Degree and Post-graduate Degree level between Fijians and Indo-Fijians, the numbers are quite evenly balanced at the other levels, with an equal number of certificate and diploma graduates, and with a higher number of Fijians having attained Senior Secondary than Indo-Fijians. These last two categories are a good indication of likely future degree attainments.

Table 2.6 gives the Length of Stay of persons by ethnicity and region. Urban areas have a higher percentage who have stayed in the same location for Less than 5 years (37%) compared to 26% in the Rural areas.

Of note is that Fijians have had a higher percentage in Urban areas who have stayed for Less than 5 years than Indo-Fijians.¹¹

	Fijian	Indo-Fij	Others	Rotuman	All
Less than 5 years					
Rural	28	23	18	21	26
Urban	38	35	41	26	37
All	33	30	34	24	31
More than 5 years					
Rural	72	77	82	79	74
Urban	62	65	59	74	63
All	67	70	66	76	69

¹¹ With the expiry of land leases over the last five years, Indo-Fijians have probably had greater overall mobility than other ethnic groups, but much larger proportions of them have emigrated overseas and that would not be recorded in this EUS..

Usual Activity (including Employment Status)

Table 2.7 gives a broad “activity profile” of the entire Fiji population. “Usual Activity” is a composite classification derived from the merger of two categories: Employment Status of all economically active persons over the previous 12 months (Question 2.4) and Reasons for Economic Inactivity over the previous 12 months (Question 1.16).

Usual Activity	Fijian	Indo-Fij	Others	Rotuman	All
A Wage earner	59975	80504	3928	1691	146098
B Salary earner	26863	17891	3203	926	48884
C Employer	696	2235	332		3263
D Self-employed	58928	29311	3340	239	91818
E Family worker	28372	7083	1375	1127	37957
F Community worker	1412	645	177		2235
H Retired/pensioner	4923	7481	436	96	12936
I Handicapped	1510	2057	22	105	3694
J Other Reason for Inactive	5577	6508	429	594	13109
K Not looking for work	1169	789	92	44	2094
L FT Household Duties	49793	67494	3919	1290	122497
M NAS/Underage	52102	23449	2783	1159	79493
N Full-time student	130170	91676	8267	3254	233368
T NAS/of school age	3122	1534	333	37	5025
U Unemployed/looking for work	5128	5918	382		11429
V Unemployed/Stopped looking	2011	1655	249	139	4054
All	431753	346231	29267	10702	817952

Normally, A to F would represent economically active persons while H to N represents those stating themselves to be “Inactive”, However small proportions of the latter group are also economically active, indicated either by other data on activities over the previous 12 months period, or the data for activities over the previous 7 days.

Salient points that stand out are: the relatively larger number of wage earners amongst Indo-Fijians (80,504) than amongst Fijians (59,975); the larger number of salaried persons amongst Fijians (26,863) than Indo-Fijians (17,891); three times as many Indo-Fijian employers (2,235) than Fijians (696); almost twice as many self-employed Fijians as Indo-Fijians; far more Family workers amongst Fijians (28,372) than amongst Indo-Fijians (7,083); and far more persons on full-time household duty amongst Indo-Fijians (67,494) than Fijians (49,793).

There were also some 3694 persons who gave “handicapped” as their reason for economic inactivity. There were also some 5025 persons who were of school age, but Not At School (NAS) and not working. These have been classified as “T NAS/of school age”.¹²

¹² A large proportion of this group are 6 and 7 years old, and for whatever reason have not made it to school. A significant proportion (26%) are possibly dropouts as they indicate some educational attainment and they could therefore be considered as “Unemployed”. Some may be handicapped but were not acknowledged to the EUS as such.

Table 2.8 gives the gender break-down of Usual Activity. Dominating the statistics is that of the 122,497 persons designated as on Full-time Household Duties, 99% were female. This very naturally creates the tendency for females to be under-represented in other major occupations: 19% of Employers, 27% of Wage Earners, 25% of Self-employed, and 37% of Salary Earners.

Main Activity	Female	Male	All	% Fem.
A Wage earner	39263	106835	146098	27
B Salary earner	18303	30581	48884	37
C Employer	617	2647	3263	19
D Self-employed	23105	68713	91818	25
E Family worker	19486	18470	37957	51
F Community worker	1730	505	2235	77
H Retired/pensioner	4951	7984	12936	38
I Handicapped	1816	1878	3694	49
J Other Reason for Inactive	7808	5301	13109	60
K Not looking for work	730	1364	2094	35
L FT Household Duties	120855	1642	122497	99
M NAS/Underage	37452	42042	79493	47
N Full-time student	113858	119509	233368	49
T NAS/of school age	2680	2344	5025	53
U Unemployed/looking for work	4883	6545	11429	43
V Unemployed/Stopped looking	2244	1810	4054	55
All	399781	418170	817952	49

While they were roughly a half of family workers, females were a very large 77% of Full-time Community Workers.

Table 2.9 gives the Division Distribution of Persons by Usual Activity.

Table 2.10 gives the rural: urban distribution of Persons by Usual Activity.

Table 2.9 Divisional Distribution of Persons (by Usual Activity)

Main Activity	Central	Eastern	Northern	Western	All
A Wage earner	62163	2956	18741	62237	146098
B Salary earner	30558	715	2720	14891	48884
C Employer	1273		142	1848	3263
D Self-employed	29432	8967	24571	28847	91818
E Family worker	17700	6574	8915	4768	37957
F Community worker	1741	268	94	133	2235
H Retired/pensioner	2556	186	480	9714	12936
I Handicapped	1651	187	582	1275	3694
J Other Reason for Inactive	5318	927	2426	4437	13109
K Not looking for work	613		70	1411	2094
L FT Household Duties	39703	1996	20614	60183	122497
M NAS/Underage	33051	4036	14172	28234	79493
N Full-time student	96651	11170	36764	88781	233368
T NAS/of school age	2528	72	1261	1164	5025
U Unemployed/looking for work	3291	57	1015	7066	11429
V Unemployed/Stopped looking	2147	115	804	988	4054
All	330377	38226	133372	315977	817952

This overall classification sets the context for the closer examination of the Economically Active and Unemployed persons.

Table 2.10 Rural: Urban Distrib. of Persons (by Usual Activity)

Usual Activity	Rural	Urban	All
A Wage earner	57631	88467	146098
B Salary earner	10175	38709	48884
C Employer	959	2304	3263
D Self-employed	69223	22594	91818
E Family worker	27495	10462	37957
F Community worker	660	1574	2235
H Retired/pensioner	5669	7267	12936
I Handicapped	2143	1551	3694
J Other Reason/Inactive	6340	6769	13109
K Not looking for work	681	1413	2094
L FT Household Duties	64090	58407	122497
M NAS/Underage	44527	34966	79493
N Full-time student	112932	120435	233368
T NAS/school age	2791	2234	5025
U Unemp./looking	3963	7466	11429
V Unemp/Stopped looking	1376	2678	4054
All	410655	407297	817952

Chapter 3

The Currently Active Population: the Labour Force

This chapter provides the most current information on all persons who were economically active over the previous seven days- those who were working, not working but had a job, were expecting to work soon, or were unemployed (looking for work or given up looking).

Labour Force by Rural/Urban

Table 3.1 indicates that of the total survey estimated population of 817,952 some 49% were in the Rural areas, and 51% in Urban areas. Altogether 41% were in the Labour Force, with a slightly lower figure of 40% in Rural areas, and a slightly higher figure of 42% in the Urban areas.

	Rural	Urban	All
In Labour Force	165645	170245	335890
% of Labour Force	49.3	50.7	100.0
Total Population	410655	407297	817952
% in Labour Force	40.3	41.8	41.1

Table 3.2 Activity of the Labour Force (by Rural/Urban)

	Numbers			Hor. Perc.		Vert.Perc		
	Rural	Urban	All	Rural	Urban	Rural	Urban	All
A Working	156705	150711	307416	51.0	49.0	94.6	88.5	91.5
B Job/NAW	2636	6086	8723	30.2	69.8	1.6	3.6	2.6
C Working Soon	1240	2991	4231	29.3	70.7	0.7	1.8	1.3
D Unemployed	5063	10457	15521	32.6	67.4	3.1	6.1	4.6
All	165645	170245	335890	49.3	50.7	100.0	100.0	100.0

Table 3.2 gives the composition of the Labour Force, of whom 91.5% were actually at work, with another 2.6% having jobs but were Not At Work. Those working were evenly distributed between Rural and Urban areas, while some 67% of those Unemployed were in the Urban areas. The rate of Unemployment was 4.6% overall, 6.1% in the Urban areas and 3.1% in the Rural areas.

Table 3.3 gives the gender breakdown of the Labour Force. Females comprised 31% of the Labour Force, with Males 69%.

	Female	Male	All
In Labour Force	103155	232735	335890
% of Labour Force	30.7	69.3	100.0
Total Population	399781	418170	817952
% in Labour Force	25.8	55.7	41.1

Only 25.8% of all females were in the Labour Force, compared to 55.7% of all Males.

Table 3.4 indicates that while Females were 30% of those working, they were 39% of the Unemployed. Altogether, while the Male Unemployment rate was 4.1%, that for Females was 5.9%.

If one took into account that those who expected to be working soon were also still unemployed, then the possible Unemployment Rate for Females was 8.6% compared to only 4.7% for Males.

	Numbers			Hor %		Vert.%		
	Female	Male	All			Female	Male	All
A Working	91353	216062	307416	29.7	70.3	88.6	92.8	91.5
B Job/NAW	2963	5760	8723	34.0	66.0	2.9	2.5	2.6
C Working Soon	2755	1476	4231	65.1	34.9	2.7	0.6	1.3
D Unemployed	6084	9437	15521	39.2	60.8	5.9	4.1	4.6
All	103155	232735	335890	30.7	69.3	100.0	100.0	100.0

Table 3.5 gives the ethnic break-down of the Labour Force. Some 53% of the Labour Force are Fijians, 43% Indo-Fijians, Others 3.8% and Rotumans 1.1%. These proportions are roughly the ethnic composition of the total population.

	Fijian	Indo-Fij	Others	Rotuman	All
Labour Force	176303	143173	12724	3691	335890
% Share	52.5	42.6	3.8	1.1	100.0
Tot. Population	431753	346231	29267	10702	817952
% of Population	40.8	41.4	43.5	34.5	41.1

However, both the major ethnic groups had a very similar proportion comprising the Labour Force—about 41% each. This might seem surprising given the earlier observation of the much larger number of housewives amongst Indo-Fijians. However, Fijians also have a much higher proportion of children, which evidently

	Fijian	Indo-Fij	Others	Rotuman	All
A Working	162601	130020	11657	3137	307416
B Job/Not At Work	4908	3148	285	381	8723
C Working Soon	2140	1717	286	87	4231
D Unemployed	6653	8286	496	85	15521
All	176303	143173	12724	3691	335890
A Working	52.9	42.3	3.8	1.0	100.0
B Job/Not At Work	56.3	36.1	3.3	4.4	100.0
C Working Soon	50.6	40.6	6.8	2.1	100.0
D Unemployed	42.9	53.4	3.2	0.5	100.0
All	52.5	42.6	3.8	1.1	100.0
A Working	92.2	90.8	91.6	85.0	91.5
B Job/Not At Work	2.8	2.2	2.2	10.3	2.6
C Working Soon	1.2	1.2	2.3	2.4	1.3
D Unemployed	3.8	5.8	3.9	2.3	4.6
All	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

balances out, leaving both ethnic groups with a similar share of the Labour Force. Table 3.6 indicates that the ethnic groups are fairly similar in terms of their activity status, although Indo-Fijians have a slightly higher 5.8% Unemployment rate.

Table 3.7 gives the divisional break-down of the Labour Force. 43% is in the Central Division with the Western Division making up another 35%. The Northern and Eastern divisions had 21% between them.

Table 3.7 Composition of the Labour Force (by divisions)

	Central	Eastern	Northern	Western	All
Labour Force	143518	17936	55187	119249	335890
% of Labour Force	43	5	16	36	100
Total Population	330377	38226	133372	315977	817952
Labour Force as %	43	47	41	38	41

Table 3.8 gives the activity status of the labour force by the divisions.

Of note is that the Western Division with only 35% of the Labour Force had 52% of the Unemployed, and the highest Unemployment rate of 6.9%.

Of interest is that of those who expected to be working

soon, almost 70% were in the Central division, possibly indicating relatively higher opportunities in the labour market there.

Of the Labour Force who had a job but were not at work, the Central Division had 4.6% and Eastern 4.0%, while the other two divisions had less than 1% each Not At Work.

Table 3.8 Activity Status of Divisional Labour Forces

Labour Force L7D	Central	Eastern	Northern	Western	All
A Working	128483	16805	52621	109507	307416
B Job/Not At Work	6426	869	476	951	8723
C Working Soon	2942	161	528	599	4231
D Unemployed	5666	101	1563	8191	15521
All	143518	17936	55187	119249	335890
Horizontal %					
A Working	41.8	5.5	17.1	35.6	100.0
B Job/Not At Work	73.7	10.0	5.5	10.9	100.0
C Working Soon	69.5	3.8	12.5	14.2	100.0
D Unemployed	36.5	0.6	10.1	52.8	100.0
All	42.7	5.3	16.4	35.5	100.0
Vertical %					
A Working	89.5	93.7	95.3	91.8	91.5
B Job/Not At Work	4.5	4.8	0.9	0.8	2.6
C Working Soon	2.1	0.9	1.0	0.5	1.3
D Unemployed	3.9	0.6	2.8	6.9	4.6
All	100	100	100	100	100

Chapter 4

The Employment Status of the Economically Active

This section focuses on the “economically active” persons- those who had employment over the previous 7 days.

While the vast majority of them were in categories A to F in Table 2.7, there were some small numbers who could be classified as “economically active” even though they were in categories H to N. Since including these small numbers in the analysis in this section would make the tables un-necessarily large with most cells having insignificant numbers it was decided to focus on those in employment who were in categories A and B in Table 3.2.

Emp. Status Last 7 Days	Numbers			Hor Perc.		Vert.Perc		
	Rural	Urban	All	Rural	Urban	Rural	Urban	All
A Wage earner	56472	85329	141801	40	60	35	54	45
B Salary earner	9051	36778	45828	20	80	6	23	14
C Employer	1131	2391	3522	32	68	1	2	1
D Self-employed	57377	20758	78135	73	27	36	13	25
E Family worker	33094	10196	43290	76	24	21	7	14
F Community Worker	2216	1346	3562	62	38	1	1	1
All	159341	156797	316139	50	50	100	100	100

The largest category are Wage-earners (45%), with the Self-Employed comprising 25% and Salaried persons comprising 15%. Employees are therefore some 60% of all those who are economically active. Employers are only 1.1% of the economically active.

While 80% of the salaried persons are in the Urban sector and 20% in the rural areas, some 40% of Wage Earners are in the Rural sector.

The bulk of the Self-employed (some 73%) are in the rural sector and are cash-crop farmers or subsistence farmers.

An interesting category of workers are the Family Workers who comprise a moderate 14% of the economically active (virtually the same proportion as the number of salaried persons). The bulk of them (70%) are in the Rural sector. The incomes of Family Workers are usually much lower than those of other categories.

Table 4.2 gives the gender break-down of the Economically Active. While Females are some 30% of the Economically Active, they are a higher 42% of all Family Workers, but 37% of Salary Earners. Females are also a lower 24% of the Self-employed.

	Numbers			Hor Perc.		Vert.Perc		
	Female	Male	All	Female	Male	Female	Male	All
A Wage earner	38004	103797	141801	26.8	73.2	40.3	46.8	44.9
B Salary earner	17025	28804	45828	37.1	62.9	18.1	13.0	14.5
C Employer	1064	2458	3522	30.2	69.8	1.1	1.1	1.1
D Self-employed	18896	59238	78135	24.2	75.8	20.0	26.7	24.7
E Family worker	18122	25168	43290	41.9	58.1	19.2	11.3	13.7
F Community Worker	1205	2357	3562	33.8	66.2	1.3	1.1	1.1
All	94316	221822	316139	29.8	70.2	100.0	100.0	100.0

Table 4.3 gives the ethnic break-down of the Economically Active. Fijians are relatively under-represented amongst Wage-earners (40% compared to 55% for Indo-Fijians), under-represented amongst Employers (20% as opposed to 69% for Indo-Fijians).

	Fijian	Indo-Fij	Others	Rotuman	All
	A Wage earner	57364	78472	4275	1690
B Salary earner	25206	17100	2670	852	45828
C Employer	711	2418	392		3522
D Self-employed	47512	27381	2906	336	78135
E Family worker	33987	7255	1408	641	43290
F Community Worker	2729	543	291		3562
All	167509	133169	11942	3519	316139
	Hor %				
A Wage earner	40.5	55.3	3.0	1.2	100.0
B Salary earner	55.0	37.3	5.8	1.9	100.0
C Employer	20.2	68.7	11.1	0.0	100.0
D Self-employed	60.8	35.0	3.7	0.4	100.0
E Family worker	78.5	16.8	3.3	1.5	100.0
F Community Worker	76.6	15.2	8.2	0.0	100.0
All	53.0	42.1	3.8	1.1	100.0
	Vert %				
A Wage earner	34.2	58.9	35.8	48.0	44.9
B Salary earner	15.0	12.8	22.4	24.2	14.5
C Employer	0.4	1.8	3.3	0.0	1.1
D Self-employed	28.4	20.6	24.3	9.6	24.7
E Family worker	20.3	5.4	11.8	18.2	13.7
F Community Worker	1.6	0.4	2.4	0.0	1.1
All	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

Consequently, some 59% of Indo-Fijians are Wage Earners and only 13% salary earners.

An interesting feature of Rotuman economically active is the considerably higher 24% of their group who are Salary Earners, while a negligible proportion were Employers or Community Workers. On the other hand, some 18% of Rotumans were Family Workers and only 10% Self-employed.

Table 4.3 gives the divisional distribution of the Economically Active by Employment Status.

	Central	Eastern	Northern	Western	All
A Wage earner	59257	2691	17956	61897	141801
B Salary earner	28230	571	2461	14565	45828
C Employer	1414	51	192	1865	3522
D Self-employed	25790	4333	21385	26626	78135
E Family worker	18911	8079	11058	5242	43290
F Community Worker	1307	1948	44	263	3562
All	134909	17674	53097	110459	316139
	Hor %				
A Wage earner	42	2	13	44	42
B Salary earner	62	1	5	32	62
C Employer	40	1	5	53	40
D Self-employed	33	6	27	34	33
E Family worker	44	19	26	12	44
F Community Worker	37	55	1	7	37
All	43	6	17	35	43

The majority of the Economically Active are in the Central Division (43%) and in the Western Division (35%). Salary earners are far more concentrated in the Central Division (62%) than elsewhere.

One of the more difficult definitions is to differentiate between those who are in “formal sector” employment and those who are in the “informal sector”. Given the existing data fields for the EUS, the easiest definition of formal sector employment may be by payment of FNPF. However, there are many employed persons (such as sole traders) who do not pay FNPF, but are very much operating in the formal economy, associated for example with being registered for tax purposes.¹³

A broader definition might also include the responses to the question on the registration or licensing of the employer in any of their economic activities. It is unclear, however, how accurate this response may be.¹⁴

¹³ Future EUS may find it useful to add questions on tax registration.

¹⁴ Many employees are unlikely to know whether their employer is registered or licensed, with the “authorities” whether central government or local government.

But then also, there are many persons working for “licensed” or “registered” employers or are licensed and registered persons, such as street vendors and hawkers, who would be classified as working in the “informal” sector.

Table 4.4 gives the break-down of workers by firstly whether they paid FNPF or not, and secondly, whether the business or work they were employed in (for any of their work activity) was Registered or Licensed.

Overall, only 43% of the Labour Force paid FNPF- 94% of Salary Earners, but only 60% of Wage Earners, and an even lower 32% of Employers. Extremely low 5% of Self-employed, Family Workers, or Community Workers, paid FNPF. A quite large 68% of employers did not pay FNPF.

Virtually all of those who paid FNPF were recorded as working for a registered/licensed employer (although 2742 thought they were not).

Emp.Status Last 7D	Not paying FNPF			Paying FNPF			All Fiji
	Not Reg	Reg	All	Not Reg	Reg	All	
Wage earner	11878	44273	56151	961	83811	84772	140923
Salary earner	272	2396	2668	355	42672	43027	45695
Employer	291	2099	2390	38	1094	1132	3522
Self-employed	47652	26089	73741	913	2701	3614	77355
Family worker	32656	8157	40813	457	1069	1527	42339
Community Worker	2114	1017	3131		181	181	3312
All	94864	84030	178894	2724	131528	134252	313146
	Horizontal Percentages						
Wage earner	8	31	40	1	59	60	100
Salary earner	1	5	6	1	93	94	100
Employer	8	60	68	1	31	32	100
Self-employed	62	34	95	1	3	5	100
Family worker	77	19	96	1	3	4	100
Community Worker	64	31	95	0	5	5	100
All	30	27	57	1	42	43	100

Of interest are those who were recorded as not paying FNPF and who thought their employers were not licensed or registered, and who would most probably be defined as working in the “Informal Sector”¹⁵.

They comprised 30% of all the Labour Force, representing some 94,864 workers. They also comprised 77% of the Family Workers, 64% of the Community Workers, and 62% of the Self-employed. There were some 11878 Wage Earners in this category.

These workers would be the absolute minimum numbers of those in the informal sector. It may be noted that some 56151 Wage Earners thought they were not paying FNPF¹⁶, while 44,273 of

¹⁵ When answered by an employer, this would refer to their own registration or licensing.

them stated they worked for Registered/Licensed establishments. If their view of the registration/licensing of their employers is correct, then the authorities have at least one formal link to their place of employment. It may be useful for organisations like the FNPF to investigate these links.

It is worth noting that there were also an estimated 2668 salaried persons not paying FNPF.

In dollar terms, Table 4.5 gives a rough estimate of the annual incomes of those who did not pay FNPF.¹⁷

While overall some 41% of estimated Total Incomes did not pay FNPF, a large proportion of these would comprise subsistence people not earning cash incomes (mostly in the “Self-employed” category).

Emp. Status L7D	No FNPF	Paid FNPF	All	Perc. Not Paying
Wage earner	284	666	950	30
Salary earner	74	841	915	8
Employer	73	45	118	62
Self-employed	515	82	597	86
Family worker	157	20	177	89
Comm. Worker	27	3	30	89
All	1130	1657	2787	41

However, 30% of income earned by Wage Earners did not pay FNPF, amounting to a potential \$46 millions of FNPF contributions (Table 4.6). There is also an estimated potential \$25 millions from Family Workers, and \$12 million from Salary Earners and Employers.

Presumably some proportion of the self-employed do earn cash incomes and could also pay FNPF, some proportion of the potential \$82 millions in contributions.

Table 4.6 suggests that FNPF could well be receiving more than \$100 millions extra in contributions each year, if all potential contributors were brought into their net.

Emp. Status L7D	Potential FNPF	Est. FNPF	Total Potential
Wage earner	46	107	152
Salary earner	12	134	146
Employer	12	7	19
Self-employed	82	13	96
Family worker	25	3	28
Comm. Worker	4	1	5
All	181	265	446

¹⁶ It is possible that some may not have been aware that FNPF was being deducted from their pay-packets and deposited in their FNPF accounts.

¹⁷ These incomes are very rough estimates derived from total incomes aggregated from income ranges for Activities 1, 2 and 3 (see Chapter 6). While most of the income ranges have identifiable mid-points, the top brackets could not be so defined (for income over \$150,000) and an arbitrary value of \$150,000 was used.

Chapter 5

Time Worked

The 2004-05 EUS has a number of different sections with questions on the time that persons worked.

In the section on economic activity over the previous 7 days, there is a question on the approximate total number of hours worked in the week (Question 3.5). Then in the sections on economic activity over the previous 12 months, there is a question on the approximate number of hours worked per day and the approximate number of days worked in the year on what the respondents considered to be their main activity (Activity 1)¹⁸ These questions are then repeated for other work - Activity 2 and Activity 3.¹⁹

These questions are analysed in this section as well as the questions on how many hours per day, and days per year the person would have been available to work “had the work been available”. The analysis and the tables in this chapter have an important bearing on the analysis of unemployment as there is much evidence of significant under-employment during each time period, for some categories of workers.

Hours Worked Last 7 Days

	0 to 10	10 to 19	20 to 29	30 to 39	40 +	All
A Wage earner	15341	4440	5897	27223	88801	141702
B Salary earner	2753	688	730	11639	30019	45828
C Employer	517	31	298	410	2266	3522
D Self-employed	12588	11952	16606	15508	21480	78135
E Family worker	16638	10842	9440	3134	3237	43290
F Comm. Worker	1195	189	989	294	896	3562
All	49032	28141	33961	58208	146698	316040
	hor %					
A Wage earner	10.8	3.1	4.2	19.2	62.7	100.0
B Salary earner	6.0	1.5	1.6	25.4	65.5	100.0
C Employer	14.7	0.9	8.5	11.6	64.3	100.0
D Self-employed	16.1	15.3	21.3	19.8	27.5	100.0
E Family worker	38.4	25.0	21.8	7.2	7.5	100.0
F Comm. Worker	33.5	5.3	27.8	8.2	25.1	100.0
All	15.5	8.9	10.7	18.4	46.4	100.0

Table 5.1 gives the hours worked by Employment Status.

¹⁸ Questions 2.6 and 2.5 respectively.

¹⁹ Questions 2.14, 2.13, 2.21 and 2.20 respectively.

For Wage Earners, Salary Earners and Employers, more than 60% were in the category 40 hours per week or more. It is unfortunate that this category was not further differentiated.²⁰

Nevertheless, at the low end of the scale, it is clear that an extremely large 63% of Family Workers worked less than 20 hours per week and 38% less than 10 hours per week. Some 33% of Community Workers also worked less than 10 hours per week. 31% of the Self-employed also worked less than 20 hours per week. Even amongst Wage Earners, some 13% worked less than 20 hours per week, suggesting the importance of part-time casual labour.

There is clearly a very serious degree of underemployment in the Fiji Labour Force. If some rough assumptions were made about the normal length of full time work per week (say between 40 and 45 hours), then the equivalent of between 23% and 29% of the currently employed Labour Force would be deemed to be “effectively unemployed”.²¹ The corresponding effective unemployment would be between 39% and 48% for Community Workers, and between 52% and 62% for Family Workers. Thus the reported 4.6% percent of aggregate unemployment in Fiji is clearly a gross under-estimate, if the significant underemployment is taken into account.

Another perspective on the degree of under-employment is given by the Pay FNPF criterion, with non-payment suggesting the strong possibility of being in the informal sector. (Table 5.2).

Thus only 47% of those who did not pay FNPF, did 30 or more hours of work in the preceding 7 days, contrasting with 88% of those who paid FNPF.

On the other hand, some 35% of those who did not pay FNPF, did less than 20 hours of work, compared to only 9% of those who did pay FNPF.

Pay FNPF	0 to 10	10 to 19	20 to 29	30 to 39	40 +	All
No	38387	24855	30516	30770	54367	178894
Yes	9853	2641	2858	27109	91749	134210
All	48240	27496	33374	57879	146116	313104
			Hor %			
No	21	14	17	17	30	100
Yes	7	2	2	20	68	100
All	15	9	11	18	47	100

Table 5.3 gives the Rural/Urban disaggregation of hours worked by those who paid FNPF and those who did not. Of those who did not pay FNPF, some 41% in the Urban areas worked more than 40 hours per week, while only 25% in the Rural areas did so.

²⁰ This is a result of a fundamental design weakness in the EUS question, which was based on the previous EUS conducted by the Bureau more than twenty years ago. For there to be more meaningful analysis via means, the 40+ category should have been further broken down to 40-44, 45-49, 50-54, and 55+.

²¹ These two estimates by the consultant are associated with a 40 hour week and a 45 hour week.

Given the sharp differences between those who paid FNPf and those who did not, simple disaggregation by rural and urban areas may be quite misleading.

Similarly, ethnic disaggregations can be also misleading. Table 5.4 gives the ethnic

disaggregation of the economically active. Fijians have a much lower percentage (39%) of persons working 40 hours or more, compared to the overall aggregate of 46% and the 55% for Indo-Fijians.

Conversely, Fijians have some 31% who work less than 20 hours per week, as compared to say 17% of Indo-Fijians.

These are aggregate figures which do not reflect the greater ethnic uniformity when Employment Status is taken into account.

Region	0 to 10	10 to 19	20 to 29	30 to 39	40 +	All
Did not Pay FNPf						
Rural	22	16	20	17	25	100
Urban	21	10	12	17	41	100
Paid FNPf						
Rural	8	2	4	21	65	100
Urban	7	2	1	20	70	100

Ethnicity	0 to 10	10 to 19	20 to 29	30 to 39	40 +	All
Fijian	31080	20155	22312	27889	66072	167509
Indo-Fijian	16061	6858	9612	27019	73520	133070
Others	1349	690	1745	2541	5617	11942
Rotuman	541	438	292	759	1489	3519
All	49032	28141	33961	58208	146698	316040
Hor %						
Fijian	18.6	12.0	13.3	16.6	39.4	100.0
Indo-Fijian	12.1	5.2	7.2	20.3	55.2	100.0
Others	11.3	5.8	14.6	21.3	47.0	100.0
Rotuman	15.4	12.5	8.3	21.6	42.3	100.0
All	15.5	8.9	10.7	18.4	46.4	100.0

Thus Table 5.5 gives the Hours worked by ethnicity, for Wage Earners only. It can be seen that the distribution of the economically active is far more homogenous amongst the ethnic groups, than is indicated by the previous table (although there is still a slightly higher percentage of Indo-Fijians in the 40 hours or more category).

	0 to 10	10 to 19	20 to 29	30 to 39	40 +	All
Fijian	11.3	3.3	5.0	18.6	61.8	100.0
Indo-Fijian	10.8	2.7	3.7	19.4	63.4	100.0
Others	0.9	9.3	3.1	24.9	61.9	100.0
Rotuman	21.9	2.9	0.0	13.1	62.1	100.0
All	10.8	3.1	4.2	19.2	62.7	100.0

Distinct ethnic differences are evident however when the Hours Worked is examined for the Employers category. Table 5.6 indicates that only 28% of Fijian employers are recorded as working more than 40 hours per week in contrast to 88% of Others, and 71% of Indo-Fijian employers.

At the other end, some 21% of Fijian employers recorded themselves as working less than 20 hours, while 17% of Indo-Fijian employers did so, and zero percent of Others.

Ethnicity	0 to 10	10 to 19	20 to 29	30 to 39	40 +	All
Fijian	146		60	303	202	711
Indo-Fijian	371	31	238	58	1721	2418
Others				49	343	392
All	517	31	298	410	2266	3522
	Hor %					
Fijian	20.6	0.0	8.4	42.6	28.4	100.0
Indo-Fijian	15.3	1.3	9.9	2.4	71.1	100.0
Others	0.0	0.0	0.0	12.5	87.5	100.0
All	14.7	0.9	8.5	11.6	64.3	100.0

Hours Worked Per Day in Main Activity (Activity 1) over previous 12 months

A bit more of a disaggregation at the top end of the time scale is provided by the 12 months work section of the questionnaire. Table 5.7 has fairly similar patterns to that indicated by the previous tables, although the modes have changed for all categories.

	1 to 2	3 to 4	5 to 6	7 to 8	9 or >	All
A Wage earner	1960	5398	11698	88526	38460	146041
B Salary earner	366	633	1144	37121	9620	48884
C Employer	314	251	376	1350	972	3263
D Self-employed	7736	26492	27814	21285	8378	91704
E Family worker	9461	16563	8274	2553	1106	37957
F Community worker	461	1341	345	87		2235
All	20298	50678	49651	150922	58535	330084
	Hor %					
A Wage earner	1	4	8	61	26	100
B Salary earner	1	1	2	76	20	100
C Employer	10	8	12	41	30	100
D Self-employed	8	29	30	23	9	100
E Family worker	25	44	22	7	3	100
F Community worker	21	60	15	4	0	100
All	6	15	15	46	18	100

Thus for Wage Earners, Salary Earners and Employers, the peaks in frequency are at hours 7 to 8 per day. Some 26% of Wage Earners work 9 or more hours per day.

For Family Workers and Community Workers, the modes are at 3 to 4 hours per day, while that for Self-employed is at 5 to 6 hours.

Tables 3.1 and 3.2 (Appendix 3) reveals that there are few ethnic differences in the hours worked by Wage Earners and Salary Earners.

Table 3.3 (Appendix 3) records the interesting fact that amongst Employers working 9 hour or more, 85% of Others²² were in this category, compared to 29% for Indo-Fijians, and only 7% for Fijian employers.

Table 5.8 indicates that there are significant ethnic differences amongst the Self-Employed working 9 hours or more per day- 30% for Rotumans, 18% for Indo-Fijians, 14% for Others, and only 5% for Fijians.

Table 5.8 Hours worked per day by Self-Employed (over previous 12 months)

	1 to 2	3 to 4	5 to 6	7 to 8	9 or >	All
Fijian	9	33	33	20	5	100
Indo-Fij	7	21	25	30	17	100
Others	7	18	35	26	14	100
Rotuman	0	0	29	41	30	100
All	8	29	30	23	9	100

Table 5.9 gives the Rural: Urban disaggregation of hours worked. While the modes for both are at 7 to 8 hours, Urban workers have a much higher 25% working 9 hours or more compared to 10% for Rural workers.

Table 5.9 Hours Worked per Day Over 12 months (Rural: Urban)

Region	1 to 2	3 to 4	5 to 6	7 to 8	9 or >	All
Rural	12658	37443	37247	62644	16376	166367
Urban	7817	13251	12676	88388	42200	164332
All	20475	50694	49922	151032	58576	330699
	Hor %					
Rural	8	23	22	38	10	100
Urban	5	8	8	54	26	100
All	6	15	15	46	18	100

Appendix tables 3.7 to 3.12 indicate that this pattern of Urban workers working longer hours per day is replicated for all categories of Employment Status.

Table 5.10 gives the gender disaggregation of hours worked. Overall, Males have a higher percentage working 9 hours or more. Rough estimates of the means suggests that Males work about 11% longer hours per day on their main Employment activity.²³

Table 5.10 Hours Worked per Day Over 12 months (Female/Male)

Sex	1 to 2	3 to 4	5 to 6	7 to 8	9 or >	All
Female	11384	19866	11838	45293	14066	102447
Male	8914	30812	37813	105629	44469	227637
All	20298	50678	49651	150922	58535	330084
	Hor %					
Female	11	19	12	44	14	100
Male	4	14	17	46	20	100
All	6	15	15	46	18	100

²² It is likely that Chinese employers are likely to be dominating this category.

²³ The data on household chores indicate that Females work far more hours per day than Males.

Days Worked per Year Over Previous 12 months in Main Activity

Table 5.11 gives the days worked over the previous 12 months, indicating great variation amongst the categories.

Usual Activity	<50	50-99	100-149	150-199	200-249	250-299	>300	All	Means
Wage earner	5165	5919	6601	15064	19676	59204	34412	146041	246
Salary earner	288	436	771	1291	5564	29712	10823	48884	272
Employer	188	133	64	640	61	939	1238	3263	248
Self-employed	5950	8930	12084	20233	18798	14788	10922	91704	193
Family worker	4722	7228	9011	7566	3455	3126	2848	37957	149
Comm. worker	443	660	294	85	130	540	82	2235	142
FT HH Duties					148			148	225
FT student	110	85	31	165			76	467	142
All	16866	23392	28857	45044	47831	108308	60400	330699	223
	Hor %								< 100
Wage earner	4	4	5	10	13	41	24	100	8
Salary earner	1	1	2	3	11	61	22	100	1
Employer	6	4	2	20	2	29	38	100	10
Self-employed	6	10	13	22	20	16	12	100	16
Family worker	12	19	24	20	9	8	8	100	31
Comm. worker	20	30	13	4	6	24	4	100	49
FT HH Duties	0	0	0	0	100	0	0	100	0
FT student	24	18	7	35	0	0	16	100	42
All	5	7	9	14	14	33	18	100	12

Thus while Wage Earners, Salary Earners, Employers had Means²⁴ well over 200 days per year, the Family Workers had a mean of only 149 days, while Community Workers had a mean of only 142 days. Fully 31% and 49% respectively worked less than 100 days per year.

Thus not only do these two categories of workers work fewer hours per day, but also fewer days in the year. Both would need to be taken into account to estimate a more accurate extent of “under-employment” in the economy.

Table 5.12 gives the distribution of workers by both Hours per Day and Days Per Year. It may be seen that most workers who work fewer hours per day also work fewer days per year. Using the mid-points of the ranges for Hours Worked and Days Worked Per Year²⁵ and making assumptions about the number of hours worked per day and days per year worked by a “full-time worker” it is possible to roughly estimate the effective number of “person years” employed.

²⁴ The means are roughly estimated using the mid-points of each of the ranges, and a value of 325 arbitrarily used for the >300 days category.

²⁵ For 9 and Over hours, a value of 10 hours is arbitrarily used.

While there were some 330,699 persons supposedly working in Activity 1, it is clear, looking at the hours per day worked, and the days per year worked in Activity 1, that there is considerable underemployment, if it is assumed that a full-time worker ought to be working 8 hours per day, and 240 days per year.²⁶

Days per year	Hours Per Day					All
	1 to 2	3 to 4	5 to 6	7 to 8	9 or >	
A less than 50 days	5007	4906	1648	3632	1674	16866
B 50 to 99 days	4955	8900	3690	4318	1530	23392
C 100 to 149 days	3309	11899	6108	4832	2709	28857
D 150 to 199 days	1754	11685	16210	11731	3665	45044
E 200 to 249 days	1463	7146	11888	22744	4590	47831
F 250 to 299 days	1774	3586	6899	72166	23883	108308
G 300 or more days	2213	2572	3480	31609	20526	60400
All	20475	50694	49922	151032	58576	330699

While it would be possible to calculate a “rate of under-employment” from the above table, this would not be a correct procedure. Many of those engaged in Activity 1 are also engaged in Activity 2, and some additionally in Activity 3. Table 5.13 gives the number of persons (a total of 128,218 persons) who had worked in Activity 2, by the number of hours per day worked.

Days in Activity 2	1 to 2	3 to 4	5 to 6	7 to 8	9 or >	All
< 50	15906	10279	3092	2981	1398	33657
50 to 99	14705	18006	4546	2671	1006	40934
100 to 149	4862	11998	6810	2902	919	27492
150 to 199	2882	5156	4630	2681	780	16129
200 to 249	441	1593	1168	694	303	4198
250 to 299	547	951	577	537	392	3004
> 300	1164	326	255	553	507	2805
All	40506	48308	21079	13019	5306	128218

Table 3.13 in the Appendix, gives the numbers of workers who worked in both Activity 1 and Activity 2.²⁷

Table 5.14 gives the number of persons (some 52,156) who also worked in a third activity-Activity 3 by the number of hours worked per day, and the number of days worked per year.

²⁶ If out of the 260 available working days per year (52 weeks at 5 days per week), 10 days are deducted for annual leave and 10 days for public holidays, then the effective days per year would amount to 240 days.

²⁷ Some of the data is unusual in that for reasonable numbers of persons, the numbers of days worked in Activity 2 is higher than the numbers of days worked in their “Main Activity” (Activity 1).

Table 5.13 Persons Working in Activity 2 (by hours per day worked and days per year worked)

Days in Activity 3	1 to 2	3 to 4	5 to 6	7 to 8	9 or >	All
< 50	8695	8207	2896	1609	1138	22545
50 to 99	6729	7215	2489	1293	346	18072
100 to 149	2879	2106	1217	763	227	7192
150 to 199	690	1036	328	69		2123
200 to 249	389	358	97	31		876
250 to 299	230	330	84	87	58	789
> 300	337	188			36	561
All	19948	19441	7112	3852	1804	52156

Using the mid-points of the hour ranges, the number of days worked in each activity, an assumed full-time working day of 8 hours, it is possible to calculate for each worker, the effective “full-time working days” worked altogether in Activity 1, 2 and 3.

Table 5.14 gives the ethnic distribution of persons by the numbers of days effectively worked. It can be seen that only 52% of the total 330,925 persons could be said to be working the full year-62% of Others, 61% of Indo-Fijians, 45% of Fijians and 43% of Rotumans.

A very large 20 percent worked less than the equivalent of a 100 days.²⁸ In that category were 26% of Rotumans, 25% of Fijians, and 14% of Indo-Fijians and Others.

While these ethnic differences may be important,

over-reporting of time and days worked may also be a partial explanatory factor.²⁹

Table 5.14a Effective Working Days in Activities 1, 2 and 3 (by ethnicity)

Work Days	Fijian	Indo-Fij	Others	Rotuman	All
0 to 49	18380	7633	538	448	26999
50 to 99	26360	10788	1237	615	39000
100 to 149	3473	15544	7307	892	465
150 to 199	20359	11542	499	195	32596
200 to 249	17293	16333	1491	557	35673
> 249	78525	84481	7698	1745	172450
All	176460	138085	12355	4024	330925
Vertical Percentage					
0 to 49	10	6	4	11	8
50 to 99	15	8	10	15	12
100 to 149	2	11	59	22	0
150 to 199	12	8	4	5	10
200 to 249	10	12	12	14	11
> 249	45	61	62	43	52
All	100	100	100	100	100

²⁸ From the large numbers of persons whose working days totaled far more than 365 days, that there is some degree of over-reporting the number of hours worked, and the number of days worked in the year in each of the three activities.

²⁹ A higher percentage of Indo-Fijians (12%) and Others (10%) reported total effective days worked of over 350 days, compared to 8% of Fijians and 5% of Rotumans.

Assuming also that a full year of work requires 240 full-time working days of 8 hours, it is possible to roughly estimate the “effective under-employment” of workers. Table 5.14b gives the estimated values for Effective Under-employment, Formal Unemployment and the Labour Force (from Chapter 12), and the total estimated “Effective unemployment” which also takes into account the significant under-employment that exists in the Fiji economy.

It is evident that the Effective Under-employment (75,676) is far more substantial than is indicated by the formal figures for Unemployment (15693). While the formal rate of national unemployment is a mere 4.7% of the Labour Force, the Effective Under-employment rate is a large 22.5% of the Labour Force.

The Total Effective Unemployment (sum of Effective Under-employment and Formal Unemployment) then becomes a very high 91,369³⁰ – some 27% of the Labour Force.

	Fijian	Indo-Fij	Others	Rotuman	All
Effective Under-employment	49567	22946	2008	1155	75676
Formal Unemployment	6782	8330	496	85	15693
Effective Unemployment	56349	31276	2504	1240	91369
Labour Force	176303	143173	12724	3691	335890
	Percentages				
% Under-Employment	28.1	16.0	15.8	31.3	22.5
% Formal Unemployment	3.8	5.8	3.9	2.3	4.7

While Indo-Fijians had the higher rate of formal Unemployment (5.8%) compared to the lower 3.8% for Fijians, the relativities are reversed once underemployment is taken into account.

Fijians and Rotumans had the highest rate of Effective Unemployment (32% and 34% respectively), while Indo-Fijians had 22% and Others 20%.

³⁰ Note that these are not actual persons who are unemployed, but “person equivalents” made up of larger numbers of under-employed persons.

Table 5.15 gives the Employment Status in Activity 2, given their Employment Status in Activity 1 (given from the Usual Activity table). Thus of the 43,792 Wages Earners in Activity 1 who also had Activity 2, the largest numbers were working additionally as Family Workers and Self-employed. Of the 49,620 self-employed who did additional work, the majority of the additional work was also in Self-employment although a large number also became Family Workers.

Usual Activity	Wage earner	Salary earner	Employer	Self-employed	Family worker	Community worker	All
Wage earner	8423	653	228	14800	17571	2117	43792
Salary earner	1133	813	101	4445	7197	2500	16188
Employer	145	38	102	316	182	115	897
Self-employed	4756	346	349	25095	16382	2692	49620
Family worker	1392	287		3139	8001	3522	16341
Comm.worker	299			209	354	281	1143
FT HH Duties					113		113
FTstudent					124		124
All	16148	2137	779	48003	49924	11227	128218

A reasonable number of Family Workers became Self-employed and Community Workers, with a smaller number becoming Wage Earners.

Appendix Table 3.14 gives the Employment Status of Activity 3, given their Employment Status in the Usual Activity. Again, the bulk of the third activity is as Family Workers, Self-employed and Community Workers, in that order. There is also a reasonable number of Wage Earning work.

Available for Additional Work

Usual Activity	1 to 2	3 to 4	5 to 6	7 to 8	9 or >	All
Wage earner	2947	4936	2464	4269	422	15039
Salary earner	1574	2214	420	678	107	4993
Employer	87	27	75	337		527
Self-empl	1941	3335	1943	2812	49	10079
Family work	313	1842	528	1586	76	4345
Comm.work			92	192		284
All	6862	12354	5523	9874	654	35266
Hor %						
Wage earner	20	33	16	28	3	100
Salary earner	32	44	8	14	2	100
Employer	17	5	14	64	0	100
Self-employed	19	33	19	28	0	100
Family work.	7	42	12	37	2	100
Comm.worker	0	0	32	68	0	100
All	19	35	16	28	2	100

Table 5.16 gives a profile of the 35,266 workers who stated they were available for further work, by the number of hours per day they were willing to work.

Table 5.17 gives a profile of the 35,266 workers who stated that they were available for additional work. Some 5400 workers stated that they were available to work for more than 250 days per year.

Undoubtedly, these would fundamentally take on paid work were it available even though they are classified by the EUS as currently employed..

Not surprising, given the earlier data on days being worked, 28% of these Family Workers, and 33% of these Community Workers stated they were available for more than 250 days. There were also more than 2000 Wage earners and 1300 Salary Earners.

Table 5.17 Persons Available for Additional Work (by Usual Activity and days available)

Usual Activity	< 50	50 to 99	100 to 149	150 to 199	200 to 249	250 to 299	> 300	All
Wage earner	6030	3227	1910	1304	474	1514	580	15039
Salary earner	2469	1525	278	152	86	353	129	4993
Employer	27	299		33		133	35	527
Self-empl	2696	2753	2186	608	498	810	528	10079
Family work.	1151	757	792	421		1143	82	4345
Comm.worker		47	49	94		51	43	284
All	12372	8607	5215	2612	1058	4004	1398	35266
Hor %								
Wage earner	40	21	13	9	3	10	4	100
Salary earner	49	31	6	3	2	7	3	100
Employer	5	57	0	6	0	25	7	100
Self-emp.	27	27	22	6	5	8	5	100
Family work.	26	17	18	10	0	26	2	100
Comm.worker	0	16	17	33	0	18	15	100
All	35	24	15	7	3	11	4	100

Table 5.18 gives the numbers of persons stating they were available for further work by the numbers of hours per day and days per year.

Just counting those available more than 250 days and more than 7 to 8 hours per day gives at least 3194 actual persons who could be said to be available full time for the whole year if work was available. Converting the entire matrix in Table 5.18 into the equivalent of full time (8 hours per day and 250 days per year) persons available for further work, results in an apparent availability of 10,391 person years, amongst workers.

Table 5.18 Persons available for more work by hours and days available

Hours Available	< 50	50 to 99	100 to 149	150 to 199	200 to 249	250 to 299	> 300	All
1 to 2 hours	4284	1578	207	271	133	179	210	6862
3 to 4 hours	5411	3473	1536	424	265	900	345	12354
5 to 6 hours	1037	1546	1504	543	318	449	124	5523
7 to 8 hours	1506	1853	1834	1272	342	2398	669	9874
9 or more	134	157	135	101		78	49	654
All	12372	8607	5215	2612	1058	4004	1398	35266

Chapter 6

Incomes

The EUS obtains data on incomes in a number of different sections: income for work during the Last 7 days gives the gross weekly income; while the sections on work over the previous 12 months gives gross annual income for Activities 1, 2 and 3.

Incomes over Previous 7 Days

Table 6.1 indicates that some 64% of all the workers earned less than \$120 per week., 99% of Community Workers, 98% of family workers, 72% of the Self-employed and 66% of the Wage Earners.

	to \$29	to \$59	to \$89	to \$119	to \$149	to \$199	to \$249	to \$299	\$300 +	All
Wage earner	5986	21023	36526	30594	22066	16915	3586	1925	3083	141702
Salary earner	36	290	1538	2485	3734	7358	7241	5729	17417	45828
Employer	321	236	89	236	45	735	242	236	1382	3522
Self-employed	15512	16827	14456	10002	5284	5664	3651	1332	5408	78135
Family worker	29717	8556	2514	1691	330		176	125	180	43290
Comm Worker	3375		64	72	51					3562
All	54947	46931	55188	45079	31510	30672	14895	9347	27471	316040
	Hor %									
Wage earner	4.2	14.8	25.8	21.6	15.6	11.9	2.5	1.4	2.2	100.0
Salary earner	0.1	0.6	3.4	5.4	8.1	16.1	15.8	12.5	38.0	100.0
Employer	9.1	6.7	2.5	6.7	1.3	20.9	6.9	6.7	39.2	100.0
Self-employed	19.9	21.5	18.5	12.8	6.8	7.2	4.7	1.7	6.9	100.0
Family worker	68.6	19.8	5.8	3.9	0.8	0.0	0.4	0.3	0.4	100.0
Comm Worker	94.8	0.0	1.8	2.0	1.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
All	17.4	14.8	17.5	14.3	10.0	9.7	4.7	3.0	8.7	100.0

Only 25% of Employers and 9% of Salary Earners earned below \$120 per week.

Table 6.2 gives the distribution of earnings by gender. A slightly higher 69% of the Female workers earned below \$120 per week, compared to 62% of the Males. In the middle income levels, the proportions of males was higher than that for Females, but the percentages equalized at the upper end of the scales.

	To 29	to 59	to 89	to 119	to 149	to 199	to 249	to 299	300 +	All
Female	21817	15662	16730	10924	6971	6656	4023	3014	8519	94316
Male	33130	31269	38458	34155	24539	24016	10873	6333	18952	221724
All	54947	46931	55188	45079	31510	30672	14895	9347	27471	316040
	Hor %									
Female	23.1	16.6	17.7	11.6	7.4	7.1	4.3	3.2	9.0	100.0
Male	14.9	14.1	17.3	15.4	11.1	10.8	4.9	2.9	8.5	100.0
All	17.4	14.8	17.5	14.3	10.0	9.7	4.7	3.0	8.7	100.0

Table 6.3 gives the distribution of earnings by Payment of FNPF. While only 5% of those who paid FNPF earned less than \$60 per week, the percentage was 52% of those who did not pay FNPF. Indeed, some 83% of those who did not pay FNPF, earned less than \$120 per week. An extremely large proportion of these workers would be below the poverty line for Fiji.

Pay FNPF	To 29	to 59	to 89	to 119	to 149	to 199	to 249	to 299	300 +	All
No	52612	41098	34412	21082	8585	8092	4510	1869	6635	178894
Yes	1209	5415	20245	23645	22644	22525	10301	7478	20748	134210
All	53821	46512	54658	44727	31229	30617	14811	9347	27383	313104
	Hor %									
No	29	23	19	12	5	5	3	1	4	100
Yes	1	4	15	18	17	17	8	6	15	100
All	17	15	17	14	10	10	5	3	9	100

Table 6.4 gives the distribution of earnings by ethnicity, with generally similar distributions. Fijians had a slightly higher proportion of persons earning less than \$120 per week (68%) compared to the 61% for Indo-Fijians, 52% for Others and much smaller 38% for Rotumans.

Appendix tables 4.1 (Wage Earners), 4.2 (Salary Earners), 4.3 (Family Workers) and 4.4 (Community Workers) indicate the distribution of earnings by ethnicity becomes far more homogenous when disaggregated by these main occupation variables.

Table 6.5 however indicates that for Employers only, a much higher percentage of Fijians earn below \$120 per week (56%) compared to Indo-Fijians (20%) and 0% for Others. On the other hand, much higher percentages of Other employers (79%) and Indo-Fijian employers (52%) earn more than \$200 per week in contrast to a lower 39% for Fijian employers.

Table 6.6 indicates similar trends for the Self-Employed: higher proportion earning less than \$120 per week for Fijians (82%) compared to 55% for Indo-Fijian employers, and a smaller 6% earning above \$200 per week compared to 26% for Indo-Fijians.

Table 6.4 Gross Earnings Over Last 7 Days (by ethnicity)

	to \$29	to 59	to 89	to 119	to 149	to 199	to 249	to 299	300 +	All
Fijian	39880	25296	25913	22930	16068	14527	7120	4486	11288	167509
Indo-Fij	11410	19964	28133	21085	14189	14326	6946	4139	12877	133070
Others	3411	1044	994	746	700	1218	559	550	2720	11942
Rotuman	247	627	147	318	552	600	270	171	585	3519
All	54947	46931	55188	45079	31510	30672	14895	9347	27471	316040
	Hor %									
Fijian	23.8	15.1	15.5	13.7	9.6	8.7	4.3	2.7	6.7	100.0
Indo-Fij	8.6	15.0	21.1	15.8	10.7	10.8	5.2	3.1	9.7	100.0
Others	28.6	8.7	8.3	6.2	5.9	10.2	4.7	4.6	22.8	100.0
Rotuman	7.0	17.8	4.2	9.0	15.7	17.1	7.7	4.9	16.6	100.0
All	17.4	14.8	17.5	14.3	10.0	9.7	4.7	3.0	8.7	100.0

Table 6.5 Gross Earnings of Employers Over Last 7 Days (by ethnicity)

	to 29	to 59	to 89	to 119	to 149	to 199	to 249	to 299	300 +	All
Fijian	139	38	89	133		35	46		231	711
Indo-Fij	182	198		103	45	618	196	194	883	2418
Others						82		42	268	392
All	321	236	89	236	45	735	242	236	1382	3522
	Hor %									
Fijian	19.5	5.4	12.6	18.6	0.0	4.9	6.5	0.0	32.5	100.0
Indo-Fij	7.5	8.2	0.0	4.3	1.8	25.5	8.1	8.0	36.5	100.0
Others	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	20.9	0.0	10.7	68.4	100.0
All	9.1	6.7	2.5	6.7	1.3	20.9	6.9	6.7	39.2	100.0

Table 6.6 Gross Earnings of Self-employed Over Last 7 Days (by ethnicity)

	to 29	to 59	to 89	to 119	To 149	to 199	to 249	to 299	300 +	All
Fijian	10572	12394	9642	6429	2852	2632	947	543	1502	47512
Indo-Fijian	2727	4192	4635	3447	2412	2865	2663	789	3650	27381
Others	2160	46	179	126	20	167	40		167	2906
Rotuman	53	195							89	336
All	15512	16827	14456	10002	5284	5664	3651	1332	5408	78135
	Hor %									
Fijian	22.3	26.1	20.3	13.5	6.0	5.5	2.0	1.1	3.2	100.0
Indo-Fijian	10.0	15.3	16.9	12.6	8.8	10.5	9.7	2.9	13.3	100.0
Others	74.3	1.6	6.2	4.3	0.7	5.8	1.4	0.0	5.7	100.0
Rotuman	15.6	57.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	26.4	100.0
All	19.9	21.5	18.5	12.8	6.8	7.2	4.7	1.7	6.9	100.0

Gross Income Over Previous 12 months

Table 6.7 gives the Gross Annual Income reported for Activities 1, 2 and 3. Some 40% of all persons earned less than \$3000 in their main activity (Activity 1), rising to 75% for Activity 2 and 70% for Activity 3.

Table 6.7 Gross Annual Income for Activities 1, 2 and 3

Income pa (\$)	Numbers			Percent		
	Activity 1	Activity 2	Activity 3	Activity 1	Activity 2	Activity 3
A 0 to \$2999	132300	103309	49027	40	75	70
B 3000 to 4999	61159	14442	6644	18	11	9
C 5000 to 6999	44544	7348	4990	13	5	7
D 7000 to 9999	42210	7114	4322	13	5	6
E 10000 to 14999	25686	2203	2453	8	2	3
F 15000 to 19999	12711	1051	974	4	1	1
G 20000 to 29999	6128	836	743	2	1	1
H 30000 to 39000	2138	378	235	1	0	0
I 40000 to 49000	1182	165	212	0	0	0
J 50000 to 99999	1726	320	282	1	0	0
K 100000 to 150000	717	85	161	0	0	0
L 150000 +	198	45	83	0	0	0
All	330699	137295	70126	100	100	100
< \$3000	132300	103309	49027	40	75	70
> \$3000	198398	33986	21098	60	25	30

Table 6.8 gives the incomes for Activity 1 by ethnicity. Fijians have almost half their workers earning less than \$3000 in Activity 1 and Rotumans with 37%. Indo-Fijians have the lowest proportion earning less than \$3000 per year with 29%.

Income range (\$)	Fijian	Indo-Fij	Others	Rotuman	All
A 0 to 2999	86883	39815	4124	1478	132300
B 3000 to 4999	26976	32108	1825	250	61159
C 5000 to 6999	20203	22948	1020	373	44544
D 7000 to 9999	20107	20024	1393	686	42210
E 10000 to 40000	20665	21732	3204	1062	46663
F > 40000	1513	1345	790	175	3822
All	176347	137972	12355	4024	330699
Percent < 3000	49	29	33	37	40
Percent > 3000	51	71	67	63	60

Appendix tables 5.1 and 5.2 give the Persons earning incomes for Activities 2 and 3 by ethnicity.

Table 6.9 gives the incomes of persons in Activity 1 by Urban/Rural. What stands out is that some 50% of rural persons earn less than \$3000 per year in Activity 1, compared to 30% of Urban persons.

The rural share of the lowest income bracket is a high 62% which steadily declines as the incomes rise, to be 11% at incomes above \$40,000 per year.

Appendix tables 5.3 and 5.4 give similar data for Activity 2 and Activity 3.

Table 6.10 gives the persons and incomes for Activity 1 by gender. Some 49% of all Females earn less than \$3000 per year, compared to 36% of Males.

Income 1 R	Rural	Urban	All	% Rural
A 0 to 2999	85710	46591	132300	65
B 3000 to 4999	31231	29928	61159	51
C 5000 to 6999	19117	25427	44544	43
D 7000 to 9999	17648	24562	42210	42
E 10000 to 14999	7901	17785	25686	31
F 15000 to 19999	3225	9486	12711	25
G 20000 to 39000	1102	7164	8266	13
H > 40000	433	3390	3822	11
All	166367	164332	330699	50
Perc. < 3000	52	28	40	

Income 1 R	Female	Male	All	% Fem
A 0 to 2999	50714	81586	132300	38
B 3000 to 4999	16381	44778	61159	27
C 5000 to 6999	10662	33882	44544	24
D 7000 to 9999	9789	32420	42210	23
E 10000 to 14999	7471	18215	25686	29
F 15000 to 19999	4251	8460	12711	33
G 20000 to 39000	2549	5717	8266	31
H > 40000	815	3007	3822	21
All	102632	228067	330699	31
Perc < \$3000	49	36	40	

Table 6.11 gives the divisional distribution of persons and incomes. The Eastern division has the highest percentage (73%) of those earning below \$3000, although the Central Division has the highest national

share of this low income group (46%). Appendix tables 5.7 and 5.8 which give the divisional distribution of persons by

Income 1 R	Central	Eastern	Northern	Western	All
A 0 to 2999	60015	14121	25373	32790	132300
B 3000 to 4999	21861	1781	9591	27926	61159
C 5000 to 6999	16545	1517	7481	19001	44544
D 7000 to 9999	17940	1196	7801	15274	42210
E 10000 to 14999	12459	474	2747	10006	25686
F 15000 to 19999	6418	129	1497	4667	12711
G 20000 to 39999	5293	202	488	2283	8266
H > 40000	2604	61	206	952	3822
All	143137	19480	55184	112898	330699
Perc < \$3000	42	72	46	29	40
Share of <3000	45	11	19	25	100

Activities 2 and 3, indicate that Central Division seems to give more opportunities for secondary activities at the higher income levels.

Table 6.12 indicates that the Central Division has an increasing share of

Income 3 R	Central	Eastern	Northern	Western	All
Share of Activity 1	43	6	17	34	100
Share of Activity 2	57	12	15	16	100
Share of Activity 3	68	18	8	5	100

supplementary activities – 44% of Activity 1, rising to 58% of Activity 2 and 69% of Activity 3. This would be indicative probably of much greater and more diverse employment opportunities available there.

Unusually, the Eastern Division also indicates an increasing share of supplementary activities, while both the other two divisions' share of secondary activities decline.

Chapter 7

Industry: Last 7 Days

This chapter gives the employment of persons by major industrial classification, over the Last 7 Days.

Table 7.1 indicates the overall even distribution of working persons. As would be expected, the largest percentage is still in Agriculture, Forestry and Fishing (with 28%) followed by 21% in Hotel, Retail and Restaurants and 20% in Community, Social and Personal Services. Overall, some 49% are in the Rural areas.

Industry Last 7D Name	Rural	Urban	All	% of Total	% Rural
1 AgrForFishing	74316	15207	89523	28	83
2 Mining&Quarrying	1199	2023	3222	1	37
3 Manufacturing	20516	22572	43088	14	48
4 Electricity & Water	744	1764	2508	1	30
5 Construction	5897	11054	16951	5	35
6 Hotel, Retail, Restaurants	30657	35386	66044	21	46
7 Transport, Storage, Communication	6210	16340	22550	7	28
8 Finance, Real Estate, Business	1868	8352	10219	3	18
9 Comm., Social and Personal Services	17837	44099	61936	20	29
All	159243	156797	316040	100	50

Table 7.2 indicates that while 30% of the workforce were Female, the share was a larger 41% in Community, Social and Personal Services and the Hotel, Retail, Restaurants sector.

Industry Last 7D Name	Female	Male	All	% Fem.
1 AgrForFishing	19996	69527	89523	22
2 Mining&Quarrying	176	3046	3222	5
3 Manufacturing	14192	28896	43088	33
4 Electricity & Water	167	2341	2508	7
5 Construction	808	16142	16951	5
6 Hotel, Retail, Restaurants	27092	38951	66044	41
7 Transport, Storage, Communication	2878	19673	22550	13
8 Finance, Real Estate, Business	3480	6740	10219	34
9 Community, Social and Personal Services	25528	36408	61936	41
All	94316	221724	316040	30

Table 7.3 indicates the expected very large proportions of workers in Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries (96%) who did not pay FNPF. However, there were also large proportions in Manufacturing (48%), 50% in Hotel, Retail and Restaurants, and 50% in Construction. There were some 20% in Finance, Real Estate and Business, who did not pay FNPF.

	No FNPF	Paid FNPF	All	% Not Paying
AgrForFishing	85083	3603	88686	96
Mining&Quarrying	136	3086	3222	4
Manufacturing	20469	22206	42675	48
Electricity & Water	40	2467	2508	2
Construction	8385	8539	16924	50
Hotel, Retail, Restaurants	32593	32854	65447	50
Transport, Storage, Communication	10894	11462	22356	49
Finance, Real Estate, Business	2053	8124	10177	20
Community, Social and Personal Services	19242	41869	61111	31
All	178894	134210	313104	57

Table 7.4 indicates that by 2004-05, the Indo-Fijian share of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries had declined to 25%, with the majority 70% being Fijians. Indo-Fijians had a larger than their national share of 42% in Construction (69%), Transport, Storage and Communication (63%), and 51% in Finance, Real Estate and Business.

Industry Last 7D Name	Fijian	Indo-Fij	Others	Rotuman	All
1 AgrForFishing	62896	22563	3493	571	89523
2 Mining&Quarrying	1672	1259		290	3222
3 Manufacturing	16995	25090	912	90	43088
4 Electricity & Water	1366	909	93	140	2508
5 Construction	4911	11667	332	41	16951
6 Hotel, Retail, Restaurants	32186	30435	2592	831	66044
7 Transport, Storage, Communication	7538	14112	678	222	22550
8 Finance, Real Estate, Business	4069	5196	645	310	10219
9 Comm., Social and Personal Services	35876	21839	3198	1023	61936
All	167509	133070	11942	3519	316040
Hor %					
1 AgrForFishing	70	25	4	1	100
2 Mining&Quarrying	52	39	0	9	100
3 Manufacturing	39	58	2	0	100
4 Electricity & Water	54	36	4	6	100
5 Construction	29	69	2	0	100
6 Hotel, Retail, Restaurants	49	46	4	1	100
7 Transport, Storage, Communication	33	63	3	1	100
8 Finance, Real Estate, Business	40	51	6	3	100
9 Comm., Social and Personal Services	58	35	5	2	100
All	53	42	4	1	100

Table 7.5 gives the distribution of Gross Weekly Earnings by industry and income bands. By the simple criterion of earning less than \$120 per week, the most poorly paid industries are Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries with 90% of workers earning below \$120 per week, followed by Manufacturing (with 69%), Hotel, Retail and Restaurants (67%) and Construction with 60%.

Industry	0 to \$29	30 to 59	60 to 89	90 to 119	120 to 149	150 to 199	200 to 249	250 to 299	300 +	All	< \$120
1 AgrForFishing	40698	21848	11848	6166	3836	2454	1103	251	1320	89523	80560
2 Mining&Quarrying			165	333	701	1288	378	26	331	3222	498
3 Manufacturing	3637	8974	9981	7099	5212	3515	1610	745	2316	43088	29690
4 Electricity & Water		44		530	321	918	368	165	162	2508	574
5 Construction	141	838	4526	4630	2635	2373	581	390	835	16951	10135
6 Hotel, Retail, Restaurants	4595	9318	16509	13853	6492	7627	2251	1264	4135	66044	44275
7 Transport, Storage, Comm.	282	790	3807	4408	2499	3684	2011	1462	3606	22550	9288
8 Finance, Real Estate, Business	359	236	1037	1481	1534	1080	750	528	3216	10219	3112
9 Comm., Social and Pers Services	5235	4884	7316	6578	8280	7732	5844	4516	11550	61936	24014
All	54947	46931	55188	45079	31510	30672	14895	9347	27471	316040	202146
	Hor %										
1 AgrForFishing	45	24	13	7	4	3	1	0	1	100	90
2 Mining&Quarrying	0	0	5	10	22	40	12	1	10	100	15
3 Manufacturing	8	21	23	16	12	8	4	2	5	100	69
4 Electricity & Water	0	2	0	21	13	37	15	7	6	100	23
5 Construction	1	5	27	27	16	14	3	2	5	100	60
6 Hotel, Retail, Restaurants	7	14	25	21	10	12	3	2	6	100	67
7 Transport, Storage, Comm.	1	4	17	20	11	16	9	6	16	100	41
8 Finance, Real Estate, Business	4	2	10	14	15	11	7	5	31	100	30
9 Comm. Social and Pers. Services	8	8	12	11	13	12	9	7	19	100	39
All	17	15	17	14	10	10	5	3	9	100	64

Distribution of Wage Earners only is given by Table 7.6. Again, it can be seen that some 92% of those in the Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries earned less than \$120 per week and 65% of them also earned less than \$60 per week. Some 74% of those in Manufacturing, 62% of those in Construction and 60% of wage earners in Community, Social and Personal Services also earned less than \$120 per week. 25% of Wage Earners in Manufacturing earned less than \$60 per week.

Table 7.6 Distribution of Wage Earners Only (by Gross Income Per Week)

Industry Last 7D Name	0 to 29	30 to 59	60 to 89	90 to 119	120 to 149	150 to 199	200 to 249	250 to 299	300 +	All	< \$120
1 AgrForFishing	3430	5381	2825	805	469	555	83			13548	12441
2 Mining&Quarrying			165	333	675	1261	327			2762	498
3 Manufacturing	714	6977	8471	6299	4230	2316	532	365	491	30394	22460
4 Electricity & Water				530	321	811	116	84		1863	530
5 Construction		564	3396	4019	2420	2077	233	37	95	12841	7979
6 Hotel, Retail, Restaurants	321	3020	11370	9264	5248	4328	751	289	389	34978	23974
7 Transport, Storage, Commun.	163	746	3060	3407	1908	2011	514	407	737	12952	7375
8 Finance, Real Estate, Business	33	146	993	1228	1157	731	130	41	247	4706	2401
9 Comm, Social and Personal Serv.	1326	4190	6247	4709	5636	2825	899	703	1125	27659	16471
All	5986	21023	36526	30594	22066	16915	3586	1925	3083	141702	94128
	Hor %										
1 AgrForFishing	25	40	21	6	3	4	1	0	0	100	92
2 Mining&Quarrying	0	0	6	12	24	46	12	0	0	100	18
3 Manufacturing	2	23	28	21	14	8	2	1	2	100	74
4 Electricity & Water	0	0	0	28	17	44	6	5	0	100	28
5 Construction	0	4	26	31	19	16	2	0	1	100	62
6 Hotel, Retail, Restaurants	1	9	33	26	15	12	2	1	1	100	69
7 Transport, Storage, Commu.	1	6	24	26	15	16	4	3	6	100	57
8 Finance, Real Estate, Business	1	3	21	26	25	16	3	1	5	100	51
9 Comm, Social and Personal Serv.	5	15	23	17	20	10	3	3	4	100	60
All	4	15	26	22	16	12	3	1	2	100	66

Table 7.7 gives the distribution of the Self-Employed, the largest proportions of whom are bunched to the left. Virtually all industries had more than 50% earning less than \$120 per week, Agriculture having more than 82%, Hotel, Retail and Restaurants with 73% and Construction with 61%.

Table 7.7 Distribution of Family Workers by Income Bands (Gross Income per week)											
Industry Last 7D Name	0 to 29	30 to 59	60 to 89	90 to 119	120 to 149	150 to 199	200 to 249	250 to 299	300 +	All	< 120
1 AgrForFishing	11111	9445	6924	4313	3169	1580	669	251	1101	38563	31794
3 Manufacturing	850	1260	1335	653	799	668	838	218	507	7127	4098
5 Construction	45	273	880	569	107	267	220	194	320	2876	1768
6 Hotel, Retail, Restaurants	2853	5277	4385	3146	703	1752	903	469	1951	21440	15661
7 Transport, Storage, Commun.	119	45	397	868	333	979	764	123	741	4371	1429
8 Finance, Real Estate, Business	253	57	44	164			123	34	276	951	518
9 Comm, Social and Pers. Services	280	470	489	288	173	417	133	43	511	2805	1527
All	15512	16827	14456	10002	5284	5664	3651	1332	5408	78135	56796
Hor %											
1 AgrForFishing	29	24	18	11	8	4	2	1	3	100	82
3 Manufacturing	12	18	19	9	11	9	12	3	7	100	57
5 Construction	2	10	31	20	4	9	8	7	11	100	61
6 Hotel, Retail, Restaurants	13	25	20	15	3	8	4	2	9	100	73
7 Transport, Storage, Comm.	3	1	9	20	8	22	17	3	17	100	33
8 Finance, Real Estate, Business	27	6	5	17	0	0	13	4	29	100	54
9 Comm., Social and Pers. Services	10	17	17	10	6	15	5	2	18	100	54
All	20	22	19	13	7	7	5	2	7	100	73

Table 7.8 gives the income distribution of perhaps the most vulnerable of groups of workers – the 42,479 Family Workers- of whom 98% earned less than \$120 per week. Most industries, had more than 95% earning less than \$120 per week: the only exceptions being Transport, Storage and Communications (with 56%) and Finance, Real Estate and Business (with 63%).

Industry Last 7D Name	0 to 29	30 to 59	60 to 89	90 to 119	120 to 149	200 to 249	250 to 299	300 +	All	< \$120
1 AgrForFishing	25993	7021	1934	959	198	176		88	36369	35907
3 Manufacturing	1916	491	47						2454	2454
5 Construction	96		41						137	137
6 Hotel, Retail, Restaurants	1258	974	432	571	41			93	3369	3235
7 Transport, Storage, Communications				62	49				111	62
8 Finance, Real Estate, Business	72				43				115	72
9 Community, Social and Personal Services	383	70	60	99			125		736	611
All	29717	8556	2514	1691	330	176	125	180	43290	42479
	Hor %									
1 AgrForFishing	71	19	5	3	1	0	0	0	100	99
3 Manufacturing	78	20	2	0	0	0	0	0	100	100
5 Construction	70	0	30	0	0	0	0	0	100	100
6 Hotel, Retail, Restaurants	37	29	13	17	1	0	0	3	100	96
7 Transport, Storage, Communications	0	0	0	56	44	0	0	0	100	56
8 Finance, Real Estate, Business	63	0	0	0	37	0	0	0	100	63
9 Community, Social and Personal Services	52	9	8	13	0	0	17	0	100	83
All	69	20	6	4	1	0	0	0	100	98

Chapter 8

Occupations

Table 8.1 gives the rural: urban distribution of the major Occupation categories currently in use in the Bureau. The Rural sector has the expected large proportion of those working in Agriculture and Fisheries.

Occupation L7D name	Numbers			% Rur	Vertical %		
	Rural	Urban	All		Rural	Urban	All
1 Senior Officials & Managers	4814	11843	16658	29	3	8	5
2 Professionals	5993	14581	20573	29	4	9	7
3 Technicians & Assoc Professionals	6191	13112	19303	32	4	8	6
4 Clerks	5592	15480	21071	27	4	10	7
5 Service Workers and Shop and Market Sales	10905	23221	34126	32	7	15	11
6 Skilled Agriculture & Fishery Workers	67971	13963	81934	83	43	9	26
7 Craft & Related Workers	16888	23316	40204	42	11	15	13
8 Plant & Machine Operators and Assemblers	8559	17252	25811	33	5	11	8
9 Elementary Occupations	32331	24030	56360	57	20	15	18
All	159243	156797	316040	50	100	100	100

Table 8.2 gives the gender break-down of the major Occupations. While 30% of the labour Force, Females are relatively more represented in clerical jobs (where they comprise 58%), Professionals (44%) and Service Workers (41%). Males are relatively more represented in Craft and Related Workers, and Plant and Machine Operators.

Occupation L7D name	Numbers			% Fem.	Vertical %	
	Female	Male	All		Fem	Male
1 Senior Officials & Managers	4525	12133	16658	27	5	5
2 Professionals	8950	11624	20573	44	9	5
3 Technicians & Assoc Professionals	6291	13012	19303	33	7	6
4 Clerks	12205	8866	21071	58	13	4
5 Service Workers and Shop and Market Sales	13917	20208	34126	41	15	9
6 Skilled Agriculture & Fishery Workers	17900	64034	81934	22	19	29
7 Craft & Related Workers	7645	32559	40204	19	8	15
8 Plant & Machine Operators and Assemblers	4405	21407	25811	17	5	10
9 Elementary Occupations	18478	37882	56360	33	20	17
All	94316	221724	316040	30	100	100

Table 8.3 gives the breakdowns of the Occupations by Payment of FNPF. Of those not paying FNPF 44% were in the skilled Agriculture and Fisheries workers (of whom 96% did not pay FNPF), and 24% were in Elementary Occupations. Of the Craft and Related Workers, some 47% did not pay FNPF, also did not some 45% of Plant and Machine Operators and Assemblers.

Occupation L7D name	Paying FNPF			Hor % Not Paying	Vert.%	
	No	Yes	All		No FNPF	Pay FNPF.
1 Senior Officials & Managers	7846	8699	16544	47	4	6
2 Professionals	4027	16354	20381	20	2	12
3 Technicians & Assoc Professionals	4378	14756	19134	23	2	11
4 Clerks	1868	19132	20999	9	1	14
5 Service Workers and Shop and Market Sales	10372	23574	33945	31	6	18
6 Skilled Agriculture & Fishery Workers	77833	3291	81124	96	44	2
7 Craft & Related Workers	18806	20822	39629	47	11	16
8 Plant & Machine Operators and Assemblers	11579	13986	25565	45	6	10
9 Elementary Occupations	42186	13597	55782	76	24	10
All	178894	134210	313104	57	100	100

Table 8.4 gives the ethnic distribution of the major occupation groups. By and large, the shares of each Occupation group are as at the National level (53% Fijians, 42% Indo-Fijians, 4% Others and 1% Rotumans) with a few exceptions.

	Fijian	Indo-Fij	Others	Rotuman	All
1 Senior Officials & Managers	41	51	7	1	100
2 Professionals	47	42	9	2	100
3 Technicians & Assoc Professionals	55	35	8	2	100
4 Clerks	41	54	4	1	100
5 Service Workers and Shop and Market Sales	49	47	3	1	100
6 Skilled Agriculture & Fishery Workers	73	22	4	1	100
7 Craft & Related Workers	42	55	1	2	100
8 Plant & Machine Operators and Assemblers	28	70	2	1	100
9 Elementary Occupations	56	42	2	1	100
All	53	42	4	1	100

Fijians are more represented in Agriculture and Fisheries (73%); Indo-Fijians are relatively more represented in Plant and Machine Operators (70%), Craft and Related Workers (55%), Clerks (54%) and Senior Officials and Managers (51%).

The Others are more heavily represented in the top 3 Occupation groups- Senior Officials and Managers, Professionals, and Technicians and Associated Professionals.

While 32% of all the employed earned less than \$60 per week, a very large 66% of all Agriculture and Fisheries workers did so, with 87% of them earning less than \$120 per week.

Some 43% of those in Elementary occupations were earning less than 60 per week, and 84% less than \$120 per week. These two categories of workers are without doubt amongst the poorest in the country.

Table 8.5 Distribution of Income (by Major Occupations and Income Bands) (\$ pw)

Occupation L7D name	\$0 to 59	60 to 119	120 to 199	> 200	All
1 Senior Officials & Managers	11	10	20	60	100
2 Professionals	8	14	15	62	100
3 Technicians & Assoc Professionals	18	15	24	43	100
4 Clerks	3	30	45	22	100
5 Service Workers and Shop and Market Sales	13	50	26	10	100
6 Skilled Agriculture & Fishery Workers	66	21	9	4	100
7 Craft & Related Workers	22	42	27	9	100
8 Plant & Machine Operators and Assemblers	10	48	29	13	100
9 Elementary Occupations	43	41	13	3	100
All	32	32	20	16	100

Table 8.6 gives the percent of each group earning less than \$60 per week. Fijians had the highest aggregate percentage (39%) compared to 24% for Indo-Fijians. Both ethnic groups had very large proportions of those in Agriculture earning less than \$60 per week (69% and 52% respectively), but Indo-Fijians had a very high 53% of all those in Elementary Occupations in this relatively poor category.

Table 8.6 Percentage of Each Ethnic Group earning Less than \$60 per week

Occupation L7D name	Fijian	Indo-Fij	Others	Rotuman	All
1 Senior Officials & Managers	15	6	17	0	11
2 Professionals	11	5	7	0	8
3 Technicians & Assoc Professionals	25	8	12	0	18
4 Clerks	4	4	0	0	3
5 Service Workers and Shop and Market Sales	9	17	36	21	13
6 Skilled Agriculture & Fishery Workers	69	52	92	94	66
7 Craft & Related Workers	35	13	0	6	22
8 Plant & Machine Operators and Assemblers	7	11	10	0	10
9 Elementary Occupations	36	53	37	46	43
All	39	24	37	25	32

Table 8.7 indicates that a much higher 40% of women earn less than \$60 per week, compared to 29% of Males. The gaps are even wider in Agriculture, with 85% of women earning less than \$60 pw, compared to 61% of men, 72% of women Craft and Related workers, compared to only 10% of men.

Table 8.7 Percentage of Gender Groups Earning Less than \$60 pw

Occupation Group	Female	Male	All
1 Senior Officials & Managers	28	4	11
2 Professionals	5	10	8
3 Technicians & Assoc Professionals	16	18	18
4 Clerks	5	1	3
5 Service Workers and Shop and Market Sales	24	6	13
6 Skilled Agriculture & Fishery Workers	85	61	66
7 Craft & Related Workers	72	10	22
8 Plant & Machine Operators and Assemblers	36	4	10
9 Elementary Occupations	46	42	43
All	40	29	32

On the other hand, only 5% of Female Professionals earn less than \$60 per week compared to 10% of men in this category.

In most other categories, Females have higher proportions in the Occupational groups than Males: Plant and Machine Operators (36% and 4%), Service and Sales Workers (24% and 6%), and Senior Officials and Managers (28% of Females and 4% of Males).

Chapter 9

Transport: Mode, Distance Traveled and Time Taken

Table 9.1 gives the major mode of transport for all workers over the previous 7 Days.³¹ While some 42% of all workers walk to work³², a very close 39% take the Bus and only 8% use their own car. The Appendix tables indicate that, despite their high profile, less than 1% use Minibuses.

Some 55% of Wage Earners take buses, 28% Walk to work, 7% have their own car, and only 4% have transport by a Company car.

Mode simplified	Wage earner	Salary earner	Employer	Self-employed	Family worker	Comm. Worker	All
A Own	10085	8466	1240	4028	994	144	24956
B Company car	5659	2628	79	338	111		8815
C Bus	75904	21701	489	13644	3813	1318	116869
D Other Paying	4658	2372	50	1842	318	113	9352
H Walking	38787	7193	1013	45376	32241	1590	126201
J Others	3340	1628	375	8422	2414	283	16463
All	138434	43988	3245	73651	39890	3448	302655
	Vertical Percentage						
A Own	7	19	38	5	2	4	8
B Company car	4	6	2	0	0	0	3
C Bus	55	49	15	19	10	38	39
D Other Paying	3	5	2	3	1	3	3
H Walking	28	16	31	62	81	46	42
J Others	2	4	12	11	6	8	5
All	100	100	100	100	100	100	100

Of Salary earners, a very large 49% also take the bus, but 19% have their own car, and only 16% walk to work. Of Employers, 38% use their own car, 31% walk, but a significant 15% also use the bus. As may be expected (given the predominance of farmers) some 61% of the Self-employed walk to work, as also do 80% of the Family Workers.

Table 9.2 indicates that while the average³³ distance traveled is 5.3 km, that for Buses is 11.3 km, with virtually all categories of Employment Status having the higher average (Community Workers have 18.2 km). Interestingly, the average distance traveled by own cars is only 2.4 km.

³¹ The tables in this chapter amalgamated some of the modes of transport where there were very low percentages of utilization. Appendix 6 gives some of the finer details for those interested.

³² This includes 1% of those who cycle.

³³ These are weighted averages which can be more than 10% different from Simple Averages..

Mode	Wage earner	Salary earner	Employer	Self-employed	Family worker	Comm. Worker	All
A Own	2.5	2.8	2.5	1.8	1.1	2.0	2.4
B Company car	2.9	2.7	2.5	1.6	0.3		2.7
C Bus	10.0	10.1	7.2	12.6	9.9	18.2	10.3
D Other Paying	2.8	2.6	2.0	2.3	3.2	2.0	2.7
H Walking	1.3	0.9	0.8	1.3	1.1	0.7	1.2
J Others	1.9	1.5	0.3	1.1	0.8	0.0	1.2
All	6.5	6.2	2.4	3.6	2.0	7.7	5.3

Table 9.3 is a table of total “person km” traveled by workers. Thus Buses provide 82% of all distance traveled, and this percentage rises to 92% were only motorized travel taken into account. Personal cars and other paid means of transport, while extremely heavy users of the roads, provide disproportionately low proportions of total travel required for work purposes.

Table 9.4 gives the (weighted) Average Time taken for each worker by Employment Status.

	Wage earner	Salary earner	Employer	Self-employed	Family worker	Comm. Worker	All	Vert. %
A Own	25171	23433	3234	7515	1198	287	60839	4
B Company car	15546	7304	193	446	49		23538	1
C Bus	826221	227515	4143	176579	38885	26983	1300328	82
D Other Paying	13477	6559	100	4377	999	260	25772	2
H Walking	54718	6376	802	60841	38568	1335	162639	10
J Others	4126	1481	152	11308	2044	0	19110	1
All	939258	272668	8624	261067	81744	28865	1592226	100

While the national average is 20 minutes, Bus travelers took 30 minutes, followed by walking with 14 minutes, company car (12 minutes) and Own car (10 minutes). These would need to multiply by 2 to obtain total time taken traveling per day.

Mode	Wage earner	Salary earner	Employer	Self-employed	Family worker	Comm. Worker	All
A Own	10	11	6	12	11	8	10
B Company car	12	11	4	4	2		12
C Bus	31	30	26	32	21	20	30
D Other Paying	12	14	5	11	10	6	12
H Walking	13	7	5	17	16	12	14
J Others	17	15	2	17	17	0	16
All	22	20	8	19	16	14	20

Employers, on average have the lowest amount of time taken, with 8 minutes only one way.

Table 9.5 gives the mode of travel by ethnicity. Fully 51% of Fijians walk compared to 31% of Indo-Fijians³⁴; 34% of Fijians use the Bus, compared to 45% of Indo-Fijians.

Reflecting the greater ownership of means of transport, a higher percentage of Indo-Fijians (12%) use their own cars, compared to only 5% of Fijians.

Mode simplified	Fijian	Indo-Fij	Others	Rotuman	All
A Own	7363	15303	2027	264	24956
B Company car	2964	5114	539	199	8815
C Bus	53685	58294	3898	991	116869
D Other Paying	3926	4865	508	53	9352
H Walking	80413	40053	4280	1455	126201
J Others	10729	5183	330	220	16463
All	159080	128813	11582	3181	302655
	Vert %				
A Own	5	12	17	8	8
B Company car	2	4	5	6	3
C Bus	34	45	34	31	39
D Other Paying	2	4	4	2	3
H Walking	51	31	37	46	42
J Others	7	4	3	7	5
All	100	100	100	100	100

³⁴ While this difference is largely due to the subsistence nature of rural Fijian work, there are naturally health implications due to the resulting difference in exercise.

Chapter 10

Job Satisfaction and Dis-satisfaction

The EUS had a number of questions on the job satisfaction of workers. Some 18% of all the workers were not satisfied with their work. Some 58% of all the dis-satisfied workers were Wage Earners, while the Self-employed and Family Workers comprised the next two biggest groups with 16% each of all the dis-satisfied workers.

	No	Yes	All	% No
Wage earner	32398	108922	141320	23
Salary earner	4527	41264	45791	10
Employer	308	3164	3472	9
Self-employed	8836	69248	78084	11
Family worker	8894	34396	43290	21
Community Worker	604	2958	3562	17
All	55568	259952	315520	18

Within each occupation, the highest percentage of those not satisfied were Wage Earners (23%), while Family Workers were not too far behind with 21%. The most satisfied were Employers of whom only 9% indicated that they were not satisfied. Table 10.2 explores the reasons for dis-satisfaction.³⁵ By far the most important reason (with 63%) was Low Income.

	Wage Earner	Salary Earner	Employer	Self-employed	Family Worker	Comm. Worker	All
A Income too low	77	55	38	54	27	24	63
B Not enough hours	5	1	27	0	1	0	3
C Does not use skills	1	5	0	4	4	12	2
D Overqualified	2	6	0	1	0	7	2
E Under-qualified	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
F Work. conditions (OHS)	3	5	0	0	0	0	2
G Too far	3	5	0	0	6	0	3
H Too difficult	3	2	0	6	2	0	3
I Sexual harassment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
J Inadequate tools	0	5	0	1	2	0	1
K No training opportunity	2	3	0	1	3	30	2
L Other	2	13	35	9	1	12	4
M Looking for paid work	1	1	0	24	54	14	13
All	100	100	100	100	100	100	100

This is probably on the low side, since 54% of Family Workers gave “Looking for Paid Work” as their major reason for dis-satisfaction.³⁶ Amongst Wage Earners, some 77% thought that their incomes were too low, and interestingly, also 55% of the Salaried persons.

³⁵ The zeros indicate a percentage less than 0.5.

³⁶ Probably, most of this group also thought their existing income was on the low side.

Table 10.3 indicates that in aggregate, there was not much difference between Males and Females, and Rural and Urban.

However, amongst the Self-Employed, 14% of Females were dis-satisfied compared to 11% of the Males; 26% of Male Family Workers were dissatisfied compared to 13% of Females. In Community Workers, 29% of Females were dis-satisfied compared to only 11% of Males.

While the Rural and Urban workers in aggregate had fairly even proportion dis-satisfied, the urban Self-employed, Family Workers and Community Workers were all more likely to be dis-satisfied than their Urban counterparts. The reverse held for Rural Salary Earners, of whom 14% were dis-satisfied compared to 9% for Urban Salary earners.

Table 10.3 % Dis-satisfied with Job
(by gender, Rural/Urban)

	Female	Male	Rural	Urban
Wage earner	24	23	24	22
Salary earner	9	10	14	9
Employer	6	10	7	10
Self-employed	14	11	10	15
Family worker	13	26	18	29
Comm. Worker	29	11	13	24
All	17	18	17	19

Table 10.4 indicates that workers in the Central (22%) and Eastern (21%) divisions had higher rates of dis-satisfaction than those in the Northern and Western divisions (15% and 14% respectively). There were opposite trends when differentiating by Employment Status.

Thus Wage Earners had higher rates of dis-satisfaction in the Central and Northern divisions.

Salary Earners were relatively more dis-satisfied in the Eastern divisions, Self-Employed in the Eastern Divisions, and Family Workers and

Community workers in the Central division. Differences in labour market conditions (such as incomes and alternatives employment opportunities) may be relevant in explaining the differences.

Table 10.4 % Dis-satisfied with Job (by Division and Employment)

	Central	Eastern	Northern	Western	All
Wage earner	26	6	26	20	23
Salary earner	13	26	3	4	10
Employer	8	100	16	6	9
Self-employed	16	27	8	7	11
Family worker	28	20	12	11	21
Comm. Worker	28	10	0	18	17
All	22	19	15	14	18

Table 10.5 gives the rates of job dis-satisfaction by ethnicity and Employment Status.

Indo-Fijians, on aggregate, have a higher rate of dis-satisfaction (20%) compared to 16% for Fijians and only 4% for Rotumans. The higher rate for Indo-Fijians may be explained by the higher rate

for the largest group of workers in that community- Wage Earners- whose generally lower incomes are the major cause for dis-satisfaction. Fijians and Indo-Fijians have little differences for Salary Earners, Self-employed and Family Workers.

However, Fijian employers have almost twice (17%) the national rate of dis-satisfaction (9%), and much higher than all the other ethnic groups.

With incomes received being the most important consideration in job satisfaction, Table 10.6 indicates the expected down-ward trend for Fijians and Indo-Fijians, as incomes rise. The trend for Indo-Fijians is somewhat on a higher tier

at the lower income levels compared to Fijians, although they converge at the upper income levels.

Unusually, however, the results for Others and Rotumans suggest the reverse trend- rising dis-satisfaction as incomes rise although the results may not be statistically accurate.³⁷

Appendix tables 7.1 to 7.5 give greater details on reasons for job dis-satisfaction by various dis-aggregations.

	Fijian	Indo-Fij	Others	Rotuman	All
Wage earner	19	26	35	2	23
Salary earner	10	9	12	13	10
Employer	17	8	0		9
Self-employed	12	12	1	0	11
Family worker	21	22	25	0	21
Comm.Worker	13	17	52		17
All	16	20	19	4	18

Inc (\$ pw)	Fijians	Indo-F	Others	Rotumans	All
0 to 59	20	29	20	0	23
60 to 119	15	25	25	0	20
120 to 199	14	12	35	3	13
> 200	8	9	9	11	9
All	16	20	19	4	18

³⁷ The numbers of persons being categorized for this table for Rotumans and Others may not be sufficiently large to enable good averages.

Chapter 11

Employed But Not At Work

The 2004-05 EUS obtained data on workers who had a Job But Were Not At Work (JBNAW) over the Last 7 Days- what may be termed “Worker Absenteeism” .

Table 11.1 indicates that some 2.8% of all workers were absent from work over the previous 7 Days. The highest percentage was for Salary Earners (with 5.7%) followed by Employers (3.6%) and then Wage Earners (with 2.4%).

	Yes	No	All	Hor %.
A Wage earner	3432	138369	141801	2.4
B Salary earner	2598	43230	45828	5.7
C Employer	127	3395	3522	3.6
D Self-employed	1255	76879	78135	1.6
E Family worker	1310	41981	43290	3.0
F Community Worker		3562	3562	0.0
All	8723	307416	316139	2.8

Table 11.2 indicates that while the largest category of reasons was On Leave (31% of all workers), this was the reason given by 69% of the Salary Earners, but only 26% for Wage Earners and Employers. Virtually none of the Self-employed or Family Workers were on leave. These numbers probably indicate well the enjoyment (or lack of) of this benefit by workers.

	Sickness/ Injury	Leave	Changing jobs	Temporary Lay-off	Other	All
A Wage earner	789	898		687	1058	3432
B Salary earner	128	1796	49	84	541	2598
C Employer		33			94	127
D Self-employed	429			165	661	1255
E Family worker	645			41	624	1310
All	1992	2727	49	977	2978	8723
	Hor %					
A Wage earner	23	26	0	20	31	100
B Salary earner	5	69	2	3	21	100
C Employer	0	26	0	0	74	100
D Self-employed	34	0	0	13	53	100
E Family worker	49	0	0	3	48	100
All	23	31	1	11	34	100

Sickness/Injury was the reason given by 23% of the EBNW for being away from work- fully 49% of the Family Workers, 34% of the Self-employed and 23% of Wage Earners.³⁸

³⁸ The low incomes and part-time nature of this category of workers may well also be an explanatory factor.

Virtually none of the Employers and a very low 5% of the Salaried Earners were away because of Sickness/Injury.

While some 11% of these workers were away because of Temporary Lay-off or Layoff, this was the reason given by 20% of the Wage Earners who were Employed But Not At Work.

Some 52% of all the JBNAW paid FNPF, as also were 85% of those citing Leave,. Of those citing Sickness and Injury, 68% did not pay FNPF, while 63% of those on Temporary lay-off (Table 11.3).

Of those who did not pay FNPF, 32% cited Sickness and Injury, and 44% had other reasons for not being at work. Of those who did pay FNPF, 52% gave Leave and their reason, and only 14% cited Sickness or Injury.

Table 11.4 indicates that there were not many gender differences for having a JBNW. A somewhat lower 12% of this category were Females, as opposed to 28% of Males, while 36% of these Females reported Leave as the reason, while 29% of these Males did so.

There were few differences between the major ethnic groups for JBNW (Table 11.5).

Table 11.3 JBNAW by Employment Status (and FNPF payment)

Pay FNPF	Sickness/ Injury	Leave	Changing jobs	Temp. Lay-off	Other	All
No	1361	423		596	1833	4212
Yes	631	2305	49	344	1145	4474
All	1992	2727	49	940	2978	8686
Hor %						
No	32	10	0	14	44	100
Yes	14	52	1	8	26	100
All	23	31	1	11	34	100
Vert %						
No	68	15	0	63	62	48
Yes	32	85	100	37	38	52
All	100	100	100	100	100	100

Table 11.4 JBNAW by Employment Status (by gender)

Sector	Sickness/ Injury	Leave	Changing jobs	Temp. Lay-off	Other	All
Female	358	1058		297	1250	2963
Male	1634	1669	49	680	1728	5760
All	1992	2727	49	977	2978	8723
Hor %						
Female	12	36	0	10	42	100
Male	28	29	1	12	30	100
All	23	31	1	11	34	100

Table 11.5 JBNAW by ethnicity (Hor.%)

Ethnicity	Sickness/ Injury	Leave	Changing jobs	Temp. Lay-off	Other	All
Fijian	23	32	1	7	36	100
Indo-Fij	17	29	0	20	35	100
Others	32	68	0	0	0	100
Rotuman	60	11	0	0	28	100
All	23	31	1	11	34	100

Of the Others, 68% were on Leave, and 32% were away because of Sickness/Injury.

Table 11.6 gives the reasons for JBNAW by income bands. While 31% of all in this category cited Leave as the reason, 68% of those with incomes more than \$200 per week did so, and only 9% of those earning below \$90 per week.

	Sickness/ Injury	Leave	Changing jobs	Temp. Lay-off	Other	All
0 to 89	1377	381	0	599	1769	4126
90 to 199	579	841	0	378	587	2386
> 200	35	1505	49	0	622	2211
All	1992	2727	49	977	2978	8723
	Hor %					
0 to 89	33	9	0	15	43	100
90 to 199	24	35	0	16	25	100
> 200	2	68	2	0	28	100
All	23	31	1	11	34	100

The relativities were reversed for those who cited Sickness/Injury as the cause- 33% of those earning below \$90 per week, as opposed to a mere 2% of those earning Over \$200 per week.

Table 11.7 gives the Reason for JBNAW by industry. The largest number are for Community, Social and Personal Services, in which being on Leave had the largest share at 60%. Of those in Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries, Sickness and Injury had the largest share at 57% and 0% for Leave. In the Construction industry a large 40% were on Temporary Layoff.

Industry	Sickness/ Injury	Leave	Chang. jobs	Temp. Lay-off	Other	All
1 AgrForFishing	1042	60			734	1836
3 Manufacturing	226	199		195	190	809
5 Construction	99	216		408	289	1013
6 Hotel, Retail, Restaurants	190	202		47	605	1044
7 Transport, Storage, Comm.	166	149	49	127	261	752
8 Finance, Real Estate, Business	38	82		88	35	243
9 Comm., Social, Pers. Services	232	1818		112	864	3026
All	1992	2727	49	977	2978	8723
	Hor %					
1 AgrForFishing	57	3	0	0	40	100
3 Manufacturing	28	25	0	24	23	100
5 Construction	10	21	0	40	29	100
6 Hotel, Retail, Restaurants	18	19	0	5	58	100
7 Transport, Storage, Comm.	22	20	6	17	35	100
8 Finance, Real Estate, Business	16	34	0	36	14	100
9 Comm., Social, Pers. Services	8	60	0	4	29	100
All	23	31	1	11	34	100

Table 11.8 gives the distribution of persons with JBNAW by age groups.

Some 19% are in the Over 55 age group, with some 45% of them reporting absence because of Sickness/Injury as opposed to only 18% of those 15 to 55.

Only 23% of the Over 55 reported absence due to Leave, as opposed to 33% of the 15 to 55 group.

Age Grp	Sickness/ Injury	Leave	Chang. jobs	Temp. Layoff	Other	All
15 to 55	1263	2354	49	899	2535	7100
Over 55	729	374		78	442	1622
All	1992	2727	49	977	2978	8723
Hor %						
15 to 55	18	33	1	13	36	100
Over 55	45	23	0	5	27	100
All	23	31	1	11	34	100
Vert %						
15 to 55	63	86	100	92	85	81
Over 55	37	14	0	8	15	19
All	100	100	100	100	100	100

Chapter 12

The Unemployed, Job Search, and Alternative Activities

The EUS had a number of questions for the “unemployed” – defined by those who answered the question (Question 3.19) on reason for inactivity over the Last 7 Days as “Available for Work But No Work Available”. There were some 15,693 persons who were considered as unemployed by this section and on whom further questions were asked.

It should be noted that these unemployed are the absolute minimum number of unemployed, explicitly identified. The real number, as suggested in Chapter 2 is probably higher.

To provide the context for tables below, Table 12.1 first gives the formal rates of Unemployment, disaggregated by gender, Rural/Urban, Ethnicity and Division.

Table 12.1 Unemployment Rates (by gender, Rural/Urban, Ethnicity and Division)

	Number Unemployed	In Labour Force	Unemp. Rate (%)
Female	6158	103155	6.0
Male	9535	232735	4.1
Rural	5063	165645	3.1
Urban	10630	170245	6.2
Fijian	6782	176303	3.8
Indo-Fij	8330	143173	5.8
Others	496	12724	3.9
Rotuman	85	3691	2.3
Central	5692	143518	4.0
Eastern	101	17936	0.6
Northern	1563	55187	2.8
Western	8339	119249	7.0
All	15693	335890	4.7

Age Profile of Unemployed

Table 12.2 indicates that the bulk of the unemployed are mostly the youths between the ages of 18 and 30. While only 35% of the Labour Force, those aged 18 to 30 were 66% of the unemployed. Of note is that while those over 55 were 11% of the Labour Force, they were only 3% of the Unemployed.

Table 12.2 Unemployed (by age group)

Age Group	Perc. Unemp	Perc. Of Labour Force	Perc. Of Unempl.
< 18	7.6	2	3
18-30	8.8	35	66
31-55	2.4	52	27
> 55	1.4	11	3
All	4.6	100	100

The Unemployed were 7.6% of the work-force under 18, and 8.8% of those 18 to 30, while only 2.4% of those 31 to 55.

Table 12.3 gives the age profile of the unemployed, by various disaggregations.

Ethnically, all the Rotuman unemployed were between 18 and 30, while a slightly higher proportion (72%) of Fijians in this age group were unemployed, compared to 62% of Indo-Fijians and 57% of Others.

A slightly higher proportion (73%) of Female Unemployed were 18 to 30 year olds, compared to 62% for Males. Correspondingly, 31% of the Male Unemployed were between 30 and 55, compared to 22% for Females.

The Eastern and Western divisions had higher rates of youth unemployment (78% and 73% respectively) than the other two divisions. An unusually high 10% of the Unemployed in the Northern division were Over 55.

Table 12.3 Age Profile by Disaggregations

	< 18	18-30	31-55	> 55	All
Fijian	2	72	25	2	100
Indo-Fij	3	62	30	5	100
Others	20	57	23	0	100
Rotuman	0	100	0	0	100
Female	3	73	22	2	100
Male	4	61	31	4	100
Central	4	59	31	5	100
Eastern	0	78	22	0	100
Northern	6	54	31	10	100
Western	2	73	24	1	100
Rural	3	71	25	1	100
Urban	3	64	28	4	100
All	3	66	27	3	100

Period of Unemployment

Table 12.4 indicates that 40% of all the Unemployed were without a job for less than a year, another 40% for 1 to 2 years, and 16% for 3 or more years.

Females, who were some 39% of the Unemployed, generally tended to have a higher percentage Unemployed for 3 or more years (21%) compared to 13% for Males. However, a lower percentage of Females (37%) were also unemployed for less than 1 year, compared to 49% for Males.

The Rural: Urban patterns of unemployment are fairly similar, except that a much higher percentage (34%) of Rural unemployed had been without jobs for less than 3 months, compared to Urban unemployed (19%).

Table 12.4 Period of Unemployment (by gender)

Period Unemp.	Female	Male	All	Female	Male	All
0 to 3 months	1731	2026	3756	28	21	24
4 to 11 months	584	2627	3211	9	28	20
1 to 2 years	2573	3690	6263	42	39	40
3 or more years	1271	1192	2463	21	13	16
All	6158	9535	15693	100	100	100
Percent	39	61	100			

The percentages roughly equalize for period less than 1 year.

Amongst the Divisions, Central Division and Northern Division have 53% and 50% respectively who were unemployed for more than a year (Table 12.6).

Northern Division had the smallest proportion (5%) who had been unemployed for 3 years or more.

Table 12.5 Period of Unemployment (Rural/Urban)

	Numbers			Vert.%	
	Rural	Urban	All	Rural	Urban
0 to 3 m	1724	2033	3756	34	19
4 to 11 m	704	2506	3211	14	24
1 to 2 yrs	1988	4276	6263	39	40
3 or more yrs	647	1816	2463	13	17
All	5063	10630	15693	100	100

Unemployment Support

Table 12.7 gives some data on the source of support that the Unemployed received during their period of unemployment.

Table 12.6 Period of Unemployment (by division)

	Central	Eastern	Northern	Western	All
0 to 3 m	28	22	13	23	24
4 to 11 m	25	0	36	15	20
1 to 2 yrs	32	57	45	44	40
3 or more yrs	15	22	5	18	16
All	100	100	100	100	100
> 1 yr	53	22	50	38	44

For all the ethnic groups, by far the most important source of support was the Immediate Family. For Fijians, Relatives and Friends then came next (8%). For Indo-Fijians, Savings was the next important (9%) as well as Borrowings (4%) but both these sources were quite unimportant for the other ethnic groups.

Table 12.7 Source of Support During Unemployment

Support	Fijian	Indo-F	Others	Rotum.	All
Immediate family	87	82	94	100	85
Relatives/friends	8	3	6	0	5
Savings	4	9	0	0	6
Welfare	0	2	0	0	1
Redundancy package	1	0	0	0	0
Borrowings	0	4	0	0	2
Church	1	0	0	0	0
All	100	100	100	100	100

Looking For Work

Table 12.8 gives some of the disaggregations for the Unemployed who stated that they were actively Looking For Work.

Only 82% of the Unemployed stated that they were Looking for Work. The percentage Looking was slightly higher for Indo-Fijians (86%) compared to Fijians (78%); slightly higher for Females (85%) and Rural Unemployed (86%) compared to their counterparts.

Table 12.8 Percent of Unemployed Looking For Work (%)

Ethnicity	Percent
Fijian	78
Indo-Fij	86
Others	82
Rotuman	44
Female	85
Male	81
Rural	86
Urban	80
All	82

Method of Seeking Work

The most popular method of looking for work was through Friends and Relatives with 53% of all the Unemployed using this method (59% for Indo-Fijians and 47% for Fijians).³⁹

Some 44% answered ads (49% for Indo-Fijians and 36% for Fijians), while only 20% placed ads.⁴⁰ Some 37% visited employers looking for work (43% of Indo-Fijians and 27% of Fijians).

	Fijian	Indo-Fij	Others	Rotuman	All
Registered	22	21	40	44	22
Answered ads	36	49	58	0	44
Placed ads	23	17	40	0	20
Friends/Relatives	47	59	57	0	53
Visited Employers	27	43	35	0	36
Internet	9	8	13	0	8
Other	15	16	22	0	16
Unemployed	100	100	100	100	100

Occupations Sought

Table 12.10 indicates that the major occupations sought were Service Workers, Shop & Market Sales (28%) followed by Clerks (21%) and craft and Related Workers (21%). Elementary Occupations (9%) and Agriculture (1%) had little attraction for the unemployed.

	Fijian	Indo-Fij	Others	Rotuman	All
1 Legislators, Senior Officials & Managers	3	1	0	0	2
2 Professionals	6	5	16	0	6
3 Technicians & Assoc Professionals	4	4	0	0	4
4 Clerks	24	18	33	0	21
5 Service Workers and Shop and Market Sales	33	24	22	100	28
6 Skilled Agriculture & Fishery Workers	0	2	0	0	1
7 Craft & Related Workers	17	24	19	0	21
8 Plant & Machine Operators and Assemblers	5	13	9	0	9
9 Elementary Occupations	8	9	0	0	9
All	100	100	100	100	100
Numbers of persons seeking work	3226	4844	233	37	8342

There were some slight differences between the two major ethnic groups, with Fijians showing slightly higher preference for Service and Clerical work, while Indo-Fijians showed a slightly higher preference for Craft and Related Work, and for Plant and Machine Operators.

³⁹ The somewhat small numbers of respondents for Others and Rotumans probably makes their statistics in this Table unreliable.

⁴⁰ Even this seems somewhat on the high side given that newspapers appear to have very few ads looking for work.

Table 12.11 gives data on Occupations sought by gender and Rural/Urban differentiation. Females showed a predominant inclination towards Clerical (45%) and Clerical (34%) work.

Males were disposed towards Crafts (35%), Service (24%), Elementary Occupations (13%) and Plant and Machine Operators (9%)- with extremely small proportions for Agriculture and Clerical work.

	Female	Male	Rural	Urban
1 Legislators, Senior Officials & Managers	0	3	0	3
2 Professionals	10	3	3	7
3 Technicians & Assoc Professionals	3	5	2	5
4 Clerks	45	5	25	19
5 Service Workers and Shop and Market Sales	34	24	37	23
6 Skilled Agriculture & Fishery Workers	0	2	3	0
7 Craft & Related Workers	0	35	18	22
8 Plant & Machine Operators and Assemblers	7	11	6	11
9 Elementary Occupations	2	13	6	10
All	100	100	100	100
No seeking	3349	4993	2721	5621

While the Rural and Urban differences are not particularly pronounced, what is surprising is that a very small percentage of Rural Unemployed (a mere 3%) were interested in Agriculture related occupations. This pronounced lack of interest in agricultural occupations should be of concern to policy makers.

Suitability for Occupations Sought⁴¹

The job-seekers gave their opinions on their suitability and skills required for the occupations being sought. Some 78% thought that they had the necessary Job Experience, only 22% thought that they had the necessary Vocational and Technical Training, and a mere 13% thought that they had the general Education necessary for the jobs being sought (Table 12.12).

⁴¹ It needs to be kept in mind throughout this chapter that where there is considerable disaggregation taking place, then the sample size behind the weighted values in individual cells may be too small to give accurate results.

Table 12.12 Skills Stated to be Matching the Occupations Sought

Occupation sought	Experience	Training	Education	All
1 Legislators, Senior Officials & Managers	149	105	105	149
2 Professionals	404	148	54	472
3 Technicians & Assoc Professionals	241	89	89	347
4 Clerks	1165	613	430	1735
5 Service Workers and Shop and Market Sales	1578	319	127	2304
6 Skilled Agriculture & Fishery Workers	88			88
7 Craft & Related Workers	1580	422	145	1747
8 Plant & Machine Operators and Assemblers	728	85	42	782
9 Elementary Occupations	592	66	66	718
All	6525	1850	1059	8342
	Hor %			
1 Legislators, Senior Officials & Managers	100	71	71	100
2 Professionals	86	31	11	100
3 Technicians & Assoc Professionals	69	26	26	100
4 Clerks	67	35	25	100
5 Service Workers and Shop and Market Sales	68	14	6	100
6 Skilled Agriculture & Fishery Workers	100	0	0	100
7 Craft & Related Workers	90	24	8	100
8 Plant & Machine Operators and Assemblers	93	11	5	100
9 Elementary Occupations	82	9	9	100
All	78	22	13	100

Educational Attainment of Unemployed

Table 12.13 indicates that almost a half 47% of all the Unemployed had attained Senior Secondary or better.

This percentage

was even higher for Females (67%) than for Males (35%). Some 14% of the Unemployed had Certificates, Diplomas or degrees.

Table 12.13 Educational Attainment of the Unemployed (by gender)

	Numbers			Vert %		
	Female	Male	All	Female	Male	All
No Schooling	0	189	189	0	2	1
FJ or less	2035	5970	8004	33	63	52
Senior Secondary	3011	2242	5253	49	24	34
Cert/Diploma	923	887	1810	15	9	12
Degree	115	150	265	2	2	2
All	6084	9437	15521	100	100	100

Table 12.14 gives the distribution of the educational attainment of the Unemployed by ethnicity, with very similar patterns between the two major ethnic groups.

Indo-Fijian Unemployed have a slightly higher proportion of those with

Fiji Junior or less (57%) as opposed to 48% of Fijians, while the reverse is the case for those with Senior Secondary- Fijians with 39% as opposed to Indo-Fijians with 30%. This may be an indication of the higher drop-out rates amongst Fijians at secondary levels.

Own Initiatives

The Unemployed were queried whether they had attempted to initiate their own activity. Some 14% of all the Unemployed were attempting to do so for the first time, and a larger 30% were attempting for a Second time (Table 12.16).

There were some gender differences, with a larger proportion of Males having tried own activities for both the first and second times (18% and 31% respectively), compared to 8% and 28% for Females (Table 12.15).

There were no significant differences between the two major ethnic groups (Table 12.15)

Reason for Failure in First Activity

The Unemployed who had responded that they were attempting their own activity a second time, were asked to give reasons for the failure of their first activity.

Table 12.14 Educ. Attainment of the Unemployed (by ethnicity)

	Fijian	Indo-Fij	Others	Rotuman	All
No Schooling	0	2	0	0	1
FJ or less	48	55	45	0	52
Senior Secondary	39	30	30	44	34
Cert/Diploma	10	13	9	56	12
Degree	2	0	16	0	2
All	100	100	100	100	100
Number	150	35	80	0	265

Table 12.15 Initiating Own Activity (by gender)

	Females	Males	All
First Time	519	1743	2262
Second Time	1719	3001	4720
All	6158	9535	15693
	Percentage		
% First Time	8	18	14
% Second Time	28	31	30

Table 12.16 Initiating Own Activity (by ethnicity)

	Fijian	Indo-Fij	Others	Rotuman	All
First Time	950	1163	111	37	2262
Second time	1960	2648	111		4720
All	6782	8330	496	85	15693
	Percentages				
First Time	14	14	22	44	14
Second time	29	32	22	0	30

Table 12.17

Reasons for Failure of 1st Activity

Reason	Female	Male	All
Finance	101		101
Location	547	1164	1711
Other	590	637	1226
All	1238	1801	3039
	Vert %		
Finance	8		3
Location	44	65	56
Other	48	35	40
All	100	100	100

Location of their business was given by the majority of these respondents (56%), while Others reasons were 40%. Finance (i.e. lack of it) was given by a very small proportion (3%).

Table 12.17 indicates that a higher percentage (65%) of males gave Location as the reason for failure compared to Females (44%). The 8% who gave Finance as the reason for failure were all Females.

Table 12.18 indicates that roughly the same proportions of the ethnic groups gave the two reasons for failure in their first initiative.

Table 12.19 indicates that very low proportions of the Unemployed rejected job offers which were made to them- a mere 4%. Males (4%) were more likely to do so than Females (2%).

Fijians (6%) were somewhat more likely to reject job offers than Indo-Fijians (3%) and other ethnic groups. These numbers need to be treated cautiously because of the small numbers in the samples being analysed.

Reasons for rejection given by Males (small number) was that skills requirements of the jobs were too high, and that working conditions were unsuitable. Fijians only gave skills requirements as the explanation, while Indo-Fijians gave unsuitable working conditions as the reason.

Reason	Fijian	Indo-Fij	All
Finance	59	42	101
Location	603	1108	1711
Other	526	700	1226
All	1188	1850	3039
	Vert %		
Finance	5	2	3
Location	51	60	56
Other	44	38	40
All	100	100	100

	Percent
Females	2.2
Males	4.0
Fijian	6.0
Indo-Fijian	2.9
Others	0.0
Rotuman	0.0
All	4.0

Chapter 13

Internal Migration

Table 13.1 repeats Table 2.6 on percentages of the various populations who had stayed in their current location for more than or less than 5 years. Given the ongoing pattern of rural: urban migration, it is not surprising that a higher percentage of urban people (37%) had stayed for less than 5 years compared to 26% for the Rural population.

Table 13.1 Length of Stay Less than 5 Years (percent)

	Fijian	Indo-Fij	Others	Rotuman	All
Rural	28	23	18	21	26
Urban	38	35	41	26	37
All	33	30	34	24	31

Table 13.2 gives Joining Family as the most important reasons, suggesting that earlier migration of family income earners may preceded the current migration. Employment related causes comprised 21% of all the migration.

Table 13.2 Reason given for migration by those residing less than 5 years

Migration Reason	Numbers			Vertical %		
	Rural	Urban	All	Rural	Urban	All
A Be nearer employment	1457	5270	6727	3	5	4
A Better Employment	1075	1620	2695	2	2	2
A Job Transfer	2786	3927	6713	5	4	4
A Seeking Employment	1690	3176	4866	3	3	3
B Land lease expiry	6490	6493	12983	12	6	8
C Bought House	1435	7551	8985	3	7	6
C Cheaper Rent	473	4504	4977	1	4	3
D Education	1271	6626	7897	2	6	5
E Medical		328	328	0	0	0
F Family Problems	319	1175	1493	1	1	1
F For privacy	268	2929	3197	0	3	2
F Join family	30842	47286	78129	56	45	49
J Other reason	7095	14911	22006	13	14	14
All	55201	105797	160998	100	100	100
Employment related (A and B)	13498	20487	33985	60	21	13498

While 8% was attributed to the expiry of land leases, it is worth noting that there were roughly equal numbers in the rural and urban areas, who were there because of expiry of land leases over the previous five years. Some 9% of the migrants were associated with housing related causes (category C) while another 5% attributed education as the reason (6% in the urban areas and only 2% in the rural areas).

Note that 83 % of those who gave education as the reason were in the Urban areas.

Table 13.3 gives the Reason for Migration by Age Profile.

While 69% of all the migrants were in the age group 19 to 55, 81% gave reasons associated with employment.

Of note is that of those who gave Education as the

reason, 17% were 6 to 13, 29% were 14 to 18 (compared to the 11% of their age groups in all the migrants), and 52% were in the 19 to 55 group. It would seem that tertiary education may be

even more important than primary and secondary education as reason for migration, especially since 83% of all the migrants for reason of education were in the urban areas.

Table 13.4 indicates that the patterns are similar amongst all the major

ethnic groups. A slightly higher proportion of Indo-Fijians (25%) gave Employment reasons for migration than Fijians (18%), while a slightly higher proportion of Fijians (7%) gave education as the reason for migration, compared to Indo-Fijians (3%).

Males were more likely to be migrants because of employment (29%) than Females (14%), while Females were more likely to migrate for Family related reasons (61%) compared to Males (41%). For other reasons, the gender differences were insignificant.

Table 13.6 gives the Employment Status of the 79152 Migrants⁴² before and after their migration.

Of those that maintained their occupations, Salary Earners were the most successful - 95% remained Salary Earners.

Of Wage Earners, 83% of Wage Earners remained so, while 8% became Self-employed and only 2% became Unemployed.

	0 to 5	6 to 13	14 to 18	19 to 55	> 55	All
Employment related	1	4	6	81	8	100
Housing related	2	8	6	76	8	100
Education	1	17	29	52	1	100
Medical	0	10	5	75	10	100
Family & Related	3	15	13	63	6	100
Other reason	2	6	6	80	7	100
All	2	11	11	69	6	100

	Fijian	Indo-Fij	Others	Rotuman	All
Employment rel.	18	25	18	13	21
Housing	7	10	7	21	9
Education	7	3	4	3	5
Medical	0	0	0	0	0
Family	53	50	55	41	51
Other Reason	15	12	16	22	14
All	100	100	100	100	100

	Female	Male	All
Employment rel.	14	29	21
Housing	8	10	9
Education	4	5	5
Medical	0	0	0
Family	61	41	51
Other Reason	13	15	14
All	100	100	100

⁴² These were the persons for whom Employment Status before and after migration was available.

Of Employers, only 39% remained as employers, while 35% became Wage Earners, and 24% became Self-employed.

Status Before Migration	Employment Status After Migration						All
	Wage Earner	Salary Earner	Employer	Self-employed	Family worker	Unemployed	
Wage Earner	27184	928	174	2576	1383	593	32838
Salary Earner	293	16489		50	367	211	17410
Employer	241	20	269	165			695
Self-employed	2727	102		5638	359	578	9405
Family worker	1072	91		464	12980	76	14683
Unemployed	1751	21	31	584	206	1529	4121
All	33269	17652	473	9476	15295	2987	79152
	Horizontal %						
Wage Earner	83	3	1	8	4	2	100
Salary Earner	2	95	0	0	2	1	100
Employer	35	3	39	24	0	0	100
Self-employed	29	1	0	60	4	6	100
Family worker	7	1	0	3	88	1	100
Unemployed	42	1	1	14	5	37	100
All	42	22	1	12	19	4	100

Of the previously Self-employed, only 60% remained so, while 29% became Wage Earners and 6% became Unemployed.

The bulk (88%) of Family Workers remained Family Workers.

And of the 4121 previously Unemployed, 42% became Wage Earners, 14% Self-employed, 19% Family Workers, and only 37% remained Unemployed.

Chapter 14

Household Chores

For the first time in the Bureau’s surveys, the 2004-05 EUS asked questions on the number of hours worked on household chores over the previous seven days: cooking, washing clothes, cleaning the compound, minding children, and other general chores. The data indicates a gross imbalance, with Females performing far more hours of household chores than Males.

Age Group	Female	Male	All	% Higher
0 to 9	0.1	0.0	0.1	147
10 to 19	2.3	0.6	1.4	297
20 to 59	13.5	1.7	7.5	683
Over 59	8.5	1.7	5.3	390
All	8.4	1.2	4.7	627

Thus Females on average⁴³ did 8.4 hours of cooking a week, some 627% more than the average of 1.2 hours done by Males.⁴⁴ At the 20 to 59 year age group, the average for Females is 13.5 hours, compared to a mere 1.7 hours for Males.

Age Group	Female	Male	All	% Higher
0 to 9	0.1	0.0	0.1	252
10 to 19	1.7	0.4	1.0	276
20 to 59	6.1	0.9	3.4	618
Over 59	3.7	1.0	2.4	253
All	3.9	0.6	2.2	535

Even at the 10 to 19 age group, Females did some 2.3 hours on average per week, compared to 0.6 hours of Males.

Table 14.2 indicates a similar pattern for washing clothes with Females spending almost 4 hours per week on average.

Age Group	Female	Male	All	% Higher
0 to 9	0.2	0.0	0.1	278
10 to 19	0.8	0.3	0.5	220
20 to 59	8.7	2.2	5.4	293
Over 59	2.1	0.6	1.4	270
All	5.1	1.3	3.2	295

Table 14.3 indicates that the differentials still exist when it comes to Child Care activities, but the differences are not as large as for Cooking or Washing Clothes.

Thus at the 20 to 59 age group, while Females spent 8.7 hours on average, Males spent 2.2 hours.

Table 14.4 gives the only household chore (cleaning the compound) at which Males (average 2.6 hours) exceeded Females (average 1.5 hours), but even then only by 42%. Females still did significant amounts of compound cleaning.

Age Group	Female	Male	All	% Higher
0 to 9	0.1	0.2	0.2	-37
10 to 19	0.9	1.5	1.2	-43
20 to 59	2.2	3.8	3.0	-41
Over 59	1.7	4.0	2.8	-57
All	1.5	2.6	2.1	-42

⁴³ All averages quoted in this chapter are weighted averages.

⁴⁴ In the tables in this chapter, “% Higher” refers to the Females percentage difference from the Males.

That difference is virtually neutralized by the amount of time spent on “Other Chores” in which Females again spent a higher 2.5 hours on average, compared to Males with 0.8 hours.

Age Group	Female	Male	All	% Higher
0 to 9	0.2	0.1	0.2	51
10 to 19	1.5	0.8	1.1	82
20 to 59	3.6	1.0	2.3	257
Over 59	2.4	1.1	1.8	125
All	2.5	0.8	1.6	207

The tables above are of course gender averages for all persons in the country-whether working in employment or not.

As such, it is important to examine the households chores by “Usual Activity” which also has the different categories of Employment Status, as is done by Table 14.6. Virtually the same differences are evident regardless of the employment status of the two genders.

All Chores	Average Weighted Hours			Difference (Female-Male)	
	Female	Male	All	Hours	Percent.
Usual Activity					
A Wage earner	24	8	12	16	191
B Salary earner	22	10	14	13	134
C Employer	21	7	10	14	196
D Self-employed	35	11	17	24	219
E Family worker	35	14	25	21	156
F Community worker	35	13	30	22	162
H Retired/pensioner	17	9	12	8	98
I Handicapped	2	4	3	-2	-52
K Not looking for work	31	5	14	26	489
L FT Household Duties	40	30	40	10	32
N Full-time student	5	2	4	2	89
T NAS/school age	0	1	1	0	-40
U Unemployed/looking	24	9	15	16	180
V Unemployed/Stopped looking	22	5	15	17	305
All	22	7	14	15	230

Female Wage Earners, Salary Earners and Employers worked between 21 and 24 hours per week, as opposed to their Male counterparts who only worked 7 to 10 hours per week. Interestingly, these hours are quite similar to both Female and Male Unemployed (categories U and V in Table 14.6).

Amongst the Self-employed, Family Workers and Community Workers, Females worked 35 hours per week, as opposed to between 11 and 14 hours for the Males. Female Retired persons did almost twice as much as the Males (17 hours and 9 hours respectively).

Quite significantly, Females on full-time household duties did 40 hours per week on all household chores, compared to the 30 hours done by males.

Equally interesting is that Female full-time students did 5 hours per week on household chores, while Males did only 2 hours. This would no doubt impinge on the time that female and male students have available for sports, and study.⁴⁵

Overall, throughout the whole country, Females did 15 hours more household chores than Males, whether they are working or not. On the other hand rough estimates⁴⁶ of average hours worked by Males and Females in their paid employment indicate a difference of only about 4 hours.

Taking paid employment together with household chores results in Females still working some 10 hours per week more than Males. This cannot but have an impact on the time available to Females to expend on other activities such as career development, sports and other leisure activities.

It is evident therefore, that one of the primary causes of gender inequalities in the quality of life, originates in the grossly unequal amounts of time that Females have to devote to household chores, compared to Males.

Table 14.7 gives some idea of the ethnic differences. In totality, Indo-Fijian Females have the highest difference- they do 330% more household chores than Males, compared to the 182% difference for Fijians and 158% for others.

These ethnic relativities are present for all categories of "Usual Activity".

Thus the Female: Male difference for Indo-Fijian Wage Earners is 266% compared to 124% for

Usual Activity	Fijians	Indo-Fij	Others	Rotumans
A Wage earner	124	266	128	128
B Salary earner	104	213	195	53
C Employer	301	228	-20	
D Self-employed	171	361	234	
E Family worker	149	201	41	171
F Community worker	83	347	767	
H Retired/pensioner	75	110	-100	
L FT Household Duties	22	46	62	
N Full-time student	71	134	87	72
T NAS/school age	-79	-100		
U Unemp./looking	166	200	232	
V Unemp/Stopped looking	308	318	34	70
All	182	330	158	211

Fijians; the corresponding percentage are 213% and 104% for Salary Earners. Perhaps the lowest differences are for those on Full-time Household duties where the Indo-Fijian differential is only 46% compared to the 22% for Fijians.

It may be noted that the differential for Indo-Fijian full-time students (134%) is around twice that for Fijians (71%), Others (87%) and Rotumans (72%). The patterns of uneven burdens of household chores clearly begin at the school-ages, and continue into adult-hood.

⁴⁵ It is quite likely that males devote on average, more time to on sports, hence the time available for study for male students will be correspondingly less.

⁴⁶ Because the EUS coded the numbers of hours worked in ranges, it is not possible to calculate exact averages.

Appendices: Additional Tables

Appendix 1 EUS Demographics

Table 1.1 Population Estimate from EUS weights

AGE	Fijian	Indo-Fij	Others	Rotuman	All
0-4	46068	20519	2567	980	70134
5-9	53782	27859	2905	969	85515
10-14	47777	34128	2466	1050	85420
15-19	41803	34355	3072	1332	80562
20-24	40387	37116	2999	1043	81546
25-29	35804	32662	2017	758	71241
30-34	30289	24304	2266	620	57480
35-39	29833	26445	2375	742	59395
40-44	27087	25605	2235	686	55613
45-49	20947	24450	1407	466	47270
50-54	16667	19121	1622	588	37998
55-59	15162	14750	1008	587	31506
60-64	8249	10335	867	274	19724
65-69	6503	6153	505	139	13301
70-74	5372	4770	276	78	10496
75-79	3033	1474	438	195	5140
80-84	1471	1047	116	97	2732
85-89	1212	640	124	97	2073
90-94	309	415			724
95-99		83			83
All	431753	346231	29267	10702	817952

Table 1.2 Highest Educational Attainment

Ed Attainment	Fijians	Indo-F	Others	Rotumans	All
A No Schooling	59146	38896	3321	1196	102558
B C1 to C3	51330	37035	2477	1119	91962
C C4 to C7	70527	57642	3659	1548	133376
D C8 to F3	89680	72987	6520	1471	170657
E Fiji Junior	51127	38624	2912	1307	93970
F FSC	32005	22889	2531	1160	58585
G FSLC	39645	34130	2617	1240	77633
H NZUE/F7/Foundation	9605	13525	1027	615	24771
I Local Certificate/Diploma	23944	23572	2180	916	50612
J Overseas Certif/Diploma	679	1265	660	0	2605
K Degree	2953	4685	1018	81	8738
L Postgraduate degree	670	908	306	48	1932
M Other Qualification	442	73	39	0	554
All	431753	346231	29267	10702	817952

Appendix Tables

Table 1.3a Length of Stay

Length of Stay	Fijian	Indo-Fij	Others	Rotuman	All
A Less than 3 months	13244	7452	846	548	22090
B 3 months to 12 months	33284	22497	2036	335	58152
C 12 months to 2 years	27724	20690	2477	916	51807
D 2 years to 5 years	66524	51966	4485	741	123716
E 5 years to 10 years	84452	58092	4890	2580	150014
F More than 10 years	206525	185533	14533	5582	412173
All	431753	346231	29267	10702	817952
Less than 5 years	140776	102605	9844	2540	255764

Table 1.3b Length of Stay (%)

Length of Stay	Fijian	Indo-Fij	Others	Rotuman	All
A Less than 3 months	3	2	3	5	3
B 3 months to 12 months	8	6	7	3	7
C 12 months to 2 years	6	6	8	9	6
D 2 years to 5 years	15	15	15	7	15
E 5 years to 10 years	20	17	17	24	18
F More than 10 years	48	54	50	52	50
All	100	100	100	100	100
Less than 5 years	33	30	34	24	31
More than 5 years	67	70	66	76	69

Table 1.4 Length of Stay (Rural Areas)

Length of Stay	Fijian	Indo-Fij	Others	Rotuman	All
A Less than 3 months	5818	2966	376	292	9452
B 3 months to 12 months	14984	5671	570	78	21303
C 12 months to 2 years	11628	6833	218	537	19215
D 2 years to 5 years	29643	22784	553	315	53294
E 5 years to 10 years	40602	21895	2014	1309	65820
F More than 10 years	122537	104131	5451	3180	235299
All	225211	164281	9181	5711	404384

Table 1.5 Length of Stay (Urban Areas)

Length of Stay	Fijian	Indo-Fij	Others	Rotuman	All
A Less than 3 months	7426	4486	470	256	12639
B 3 months to 12 months	18300	16826	1466	257	36849
C 12 months to 2 years	16096	13857	2259	379	32591
D 2 years to 5 years	36881	29182	3932	426	70421
E 5 years to 10 years	43850	36197	2876	1271	84194
F More than 10 years	83988	81402	9082	2402	176874
All	206541	181950	20086	4991	413568

Appendix Tables

Appendix 2 Hours worked (Last 7 Days)

Table 2.1 Hours worked by Wage Earners: number of persons (by ethnicity)

Ethnicity	0 to 10	10 to 19	20 to 29	30 to 39	40 +	All
Fijian	6469	1905	2859	10697	35433	57364
Indo-Fij	8463	2089	2907	15241	49673	78373
Others	40	396	131	1063	2644	4275
Rotuman	369	49		222	1050	1690
All	15341	4440	5897	27224	88801	141702

Table 2.2 Hours worked by Salary Earners (by ethnicity)

Ethnicity	0 to 10	10 to 19	20 to 29	30 to 39	40 +	All
Fijian	1935	349	272	6351	16299	25206
Indo-Fij	736	183	410	4213	11559	17100
Others	47	157	48	538	1881	2670
Rotuman	35			537	280	852
All	2753	688	730	11639	30019	45828
	Hor %					
Fijian	7.7	1.4	1.1	25.2	64.7	100.0
Indo-Fij	4.3	1.1	2.4	24.6	67.6	100.0
Others	1.7	5.9	1.8	20.2	70.4	100.0
Rotuman	4.1	0.0	0.0	63.0	32.9	100.0
All	6.0	1.5	1.6	25.4	65.5	100.0

Table 2.3 Hours worked by Family Workers (Last 7 days)

Ethnicity	0 to 10	10 to 19	20 to 29	30 to 39	40 +	All
Fijian	13410	8945	7124	2187	2320	33987
Indo-Fij	2592	1702	1330	827	804	7255
Others	551		694	120	43	1408
Rotuman	84	195	292		70	641
All	16638	10842	9440	3134	3237	43290
	Hor %					
Fijian	39.5	26.3	21.0	6.4	6.8	100.0
Indo-Fij	35.7	23.5	18.3	11.4	11.1	100.0
Others	39.1	0.0	49.3	8.5	3.1	100.0
Rotuman	13.1	30.4	45.6	0.0	10.9	100.0
All	38.4	25.0	21.8	7.2	7.5	100.0

Appendix Tables

Table 2.4 Hours worked by Community Workers (Last 7 days)

Ethnicity	0 to 10	10 to 19	20 to 29	30 to 39	40 +	All
Fijian	1060	100	790	75	705	2729
Indo-Fij	134		49	219	140	543
Others		89	151		51	291
All	1195	189	989	294	896	3562
	Hor %					
Fijian	38.9	3.7	28.9	2.7	25.8	100.0
Indo-Fij	24.7	0.0	9.0	40.4	25.9	100.0
Others	0.0	30.6	51.9	0.0	17.5	100.0
All	33.5	5.3	27.8	8.2	25.1	100.0

Table 2.5 Hours worked Last 7 days (by gender)

Sex	0 to 10	10 to 19	20 to 29	30 to 39	40 +	All
Female	18488	8940	10375	17498	39016	94316
Male	30544	19202	23585	40710	107683	221724
All	49032	28141	33961	58208	146698	316040
	hor %					
Female	19.6	9.5	11.0	18.6	41.4	100.0
Male	13.8	8.7	10.6	18.4	48.6	100.0
All	15.5	8.9	10.7	18.4	46.4	100.0

Table 2.6 Hours Worked Last 7 Days (by Age Group)

Age Group	0 to 10	10 to 19	20 to 29	30 to 39	40 +	All
14 and Under	208	441	139		234	1022
15 to 55	39952	22375	27521	52930	136764	279541
Over 55	8872	5326	6301	5278	9700	35477
All	49032	28141	33961	58208	146698	316040
	Hor %					
14 and Under	20.4	43.2	13.6	0.0	22.9	100.0
15 to 55	14.3	8.0	9.8	18.9	48.9	100.0
Over 55	25.0	15.0	17.8	14.9	27.3	100.0
All	15.5	8.9	10.7	18.4	46.4	100.0

Appendix Tables

Appendix 3 Hours Worked per Day (over the previous 12 months)

Table 3.1 Wage Earners Only

Ethnicity	1 to 2	3 to 4	5 to 6	7 to 8	9 or >	All
Fijian	1395	2195	5557	35835	14937	59919
Indo-Fij	564	2794	5840	49130	22176	80504
Others		165	263	2660	839	3928
Rotuman		244	37	901	508	1691
All	1960	5398	11698	88526	38460	146041
	Hor %					
Fijian	2	4	9	60	25	100
Indo-Fij	1	3	7	61	28	100
Others	0	4	7	68	21	100
Rotuman	0	14	2	53	30	100
All	1	4	8	61	26	100

Table 3.2 Salary Earners Only

Ethnicity	1 to 2	3 to 4	5 to 6	7 to 8	9 or >	All
Fijian	366	284	340	20373	5500	26863
Indo-Fij		173	705	13444	3569	17891
Others		141	99	2508	454	3203
Rotuman		35		796	96	926
All	366	633	1144	37121	9620	48884
	Hor %					
Fijian	1	1	1	76	20	100
Indo-Fij	0	1	4	75	20	100
Others	0	4	3	78	14	100
Rotuman	0	4	0	86	10	100
All	1	1	2	76	20	100

Table 3.3 Employers Only

Ethnicity	1 to 2	3 to 4	5 to 6	7 to 8	9 or >	All
Fijian	163	42	177	269	46	696
Indo-Fij	152	209	200	1032	643	2235
Others				49	283	332
All	314	251	376	1350	972	3263
	Hor %					
Fijian	23	6	25	39	7	100
Indo-Fij	7	9	9	46	29	100
Others	0	0	0	15	85	100
All	10	8	12	41	30	100

Appendix Tables

Table 3.4 Self Employed

Ethnicity	1 to 2	3 to 4	5 to 6	7 to 8	9 or >	All
Fijian	5444	19656	19203	11591	2920	58815
Indo-Fij	2053	6241	7380	8714	4923	29311
Others	239	596	1161	882	463	3340
Rotuman			70	97	72	239
All	7736	26492	27814	21285	8378	91704

Table 3.5 Family Workers

Ethnicity	1 to 2	3 to 4	5 to 6	7 to 8	9 or >	All
Fijian	6131	13592	6391	1721	537	28372
Indo-Fij	2877	1912	1070	698	526	7083
Others	174	378	647	133	43	1375
Rotuman	279	681	167			1127
All	9461	16563	8274	2553	1106	37957
	Hor %					
Fijian	22	48	23	6	2	100
Indo-Fij	41	27	15	10	7	100
Others	13	27	47	10	3	100
Rotuman	25	60	15	0	0	100
All	25	44	22	7	3	100

Table 3.6 Community Workers

Ethnicity	1 to 2	3 to 4	5 to 6	7 to 8	9 or >
Fijian	411	732	227	43	1412
Indo-Fij	50	432	119	45	645
Others		177			177
All	461	1341	345	87	2235
	Hor %				
Fijian	29	52	16	3	100
Indo-Fij	8	67	18	7	100
Others	0	100	0	0	100
All	21	60	15	4	100

Appendix Tables

Table 3.7 Hours Worked per Day Over 12 months: Wage Earners

Region	1 to 2	3 to 4	5 to 6	7 to 8	9 or >	All
Rural	951	2481	6855	36363	10981	57631
Urban	1009	2917	4843	52162	27479	88410
All	1960	5398	11698	88526	38460	146041
	Hor %					
Rural	2	4	12	63	19	100
Urban	1	3	5	59	31	100
All	1	4	8	61	26	100

Table 3.8 Hours Worked per Day Over 12 months: Salary Earners

Region	1 to 2	3 to 4	5 to 6	7 to 8	9 or >	All
Rural	154	96	567	7807	1549	10175
Urban	212	537	577	29314	8070	38709
All	366	633	1144	37121	9620	48884
	Hor %					
Rural	2	1	6	77	15	100
Urban	1	1	1	76	21	100
All	1	1	2	76	20	100

Table 3.9 Hours Worked per Day Over 12 months: Employers Only

Region	1 to 2	3 to 4	5 to 6	7 to 8	9 or >	All
Rural	139	76	273	472		959
Urban	175	175	103	878	972	2304
All	314	251	376	1350	972	3263
	Hor %					
Rural	14	8	28	49	0	100
Urban	8	8	4	38	42	100
All	10	8	12	41	30	100

Table 3.10 Hours Worked per Day Over 12 months: Self-employed

Region	1 to 2	3 to 4	5 to 6	7 to 8	9 or >	All
Rural	5306	21414	23035	16175	3293	69223
Urban	2430	5078	4778	5110	5085	22481
All	7736	26492	27814	21285	8378	91704
	Hor %					
Rural	8	31	33	23	5	100
Urban	11	23	21	23	23	100
All	8	29	30	23	9	100

Appendix Tables

Table 3.11 Hours Worked per Day Over 12 months: Family Workers

Region	1 to 2	3 to 4	5 to 6	7 to 8	9 or >	All
Rural	5726	13021	6369	1827	552	27495
Urban	3735	3542	1905	726	553	10462
All	9461	16563	8274	2553	1106	37957
	Hor %					
Rural	21	47	23	7	2	100
Urban	36	34	18	7	5	100
All	25	44	22	7	3	100

Table 3.12 Hours Worked per Day Over 12 months: Community Workers

Region	1 to 2	3 to 4	5 to 6	7 to 8	9 or >	All
Rural	306	355				660
Urban	156	986	345	87		1574
All	461	1341	345	87		2235
	Hor %					
Rural	46	54	0	0	0	100
Urban	10	63	22	6	0	100
All	21	60	15	4	0	100

Table 3.13 Days worked in Activity 2 (by days worked in Activity 1)

Activity2/ Activity 1	Days < 50	50 to 99	100 to 149	150 to 199	200 to 249	250 to 299	> 300	All
Days < 50	4370	2259	748	249	290	19	155	8089
50 to 99	4242	5687	1624	933	313	433	46	13278
100 to 149	2452	6330	5894	1238	581	292	286	17073
150 to 199	3574	7526	7400	5954	462	708	403	26027
200 to 249	3710	5826	5222	2545	1013	344	159	18819
250 to 299	11444	8877	3899	3860	1080	965	685	30811
> 300	3752	4430	2591	1350	460	243	1070	13895
All	33543	40934	27379	16129	4198	3004	2805	127992

Table 3.14 Usual Activity and Employment Status in Activity 3

Usual Activity	Wage earner	Salary earner	Employer	Self- employed	Family worker	Community worker	All
Wage earner	1548	180		3525	6930	2324	14507
Salary earner	182	188	56	515	1183	2169	4293
Employer			136		133	155	425
Self-empl.	1238	340	58	7488	9692	5733	24550
Family work.	936	158		1047	4479	1379	7999
Comm.worker					320	61	382
All	3905	866	250	12576	22739	11821	52156

Appendix Tables

Appendix 4 Gross Earnings Over the Last 7 Days

Table 4.1 Gross Earnings of Wage Earner Over Last 7 Days (by ethnicity)

	to \$29	to \$59	to \$89	to \$119	to \$149	to \$199	to \$249	to \$299	>\$300	All
Fijian	2850	6136	13557	13635	10405	7758	1409	654	961	57364
Indo-Fij	3026	14184	22196	16268	10522	8016	1683	1088	1389	78373
Others	110	611	695	483	587	692	322	134	641	4275
Rotuman		91	77	208	552	449	173	49	91	1690
All	5986	21023	36526	30594	22066	16915	3586	1925	3083	141702
	Hor %									
Fijian	5.0	10.7	23.6	23.8	18.1	13.5	2.5	1.1	1.7	100.0
Indo-Fij	3.9	18.1	28.3	20.8	13.4	10.2	2.1	1.4	1.8	100.0
Others	2.6	14.3	16.3	11.3	13.7	16.2	7.5	3.1	15.0	100.0
Rotuman	0.0	5.4	4.6	12.3	32.7	26.6	10.2	2.9	5.4	100.0
All	4.2	14.8	25.8	21.6	15.6	11.9	2.5	1.4	2.2	100.0

Table 4.2 Gross Earnings of Salary Earners Over Last 7 Days (by ethnicity)

	to \$29	to \$59	to \$89	to \$119	to \$149	to \$199	to \$249	to \$299	>\$300	All
Fijian	36	126	746	1321	2611	4103	4542	3262	8460	25206
Indo-Fij		164	757	987	1080	2827	2405	1970	6909	17100
Others				137	42	277	197	374	1644	2670
Rotuman			35	40		151	97	123	405	852
All	36	290	1538	2485	3734	7358	7241	5729	17417	45828
	Hor %									
Fijian	0.1	0.5	3.0	5.2	10.4	16.3	18.0	12.9	33.6	100.0
Indo-Fij	0.0	1.0	4.4	5.8	6.3	16.5	14.1	11.5	40.4	100.0
Others				5.1	1.6	10.4	7.4	14.0	61.6	100.0
Rotuman			4.1	4.7		17.8	11.4	14.4	47.6	100.0
All	0.1	0.6	3.4	5.4	8.1	16.1	15.8	12.5	38.0	100.0

Table 4.3 Gross Earnings of Family Workers Over Last 7 Days (by ethnicity)

	to \$29	to \$59	to \$89	to \$119	to \$149	to \$199	to \$249	to \$299	>\$300	All
Fijian	23642	6602	1864	1341	200		176	27	135	33987
Indo-Fij	4980	1225	495	280	131			98	46	7255
Others	901	387	120							1408
Rotuman	195	341	35	70						641
All	29717	8556	2514	1691	330	0	176	125	180	43290
	Hor %									
Fijian	69.6	19.4	5.5	3.9	0.6	0.0	0.5	0.1	0.4	100.0
Indo-Fij	68.6	16.9	6.8	3.9	1.8	0.0	0.0	1.3	0.6	100.0
Others	64.0	27.5	8.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Rotuman	30.4	53.2	5.5	10.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
All	68.6	19.8	5.8	3.9	0.8	0.0	0.4	0.3	0.4	100.0

Appendix Tables

Table 4.4 Gross Earnings of Community Workers Over Last 7 Days (by ethnicity)

	to \$29	to \$59	to \$89	to \$119	to \$149	to \$199	to \$249	to \$299	>\$300	All
Fijian	2641		16	72						2729
Indo-Fij	494		49							543
Others	240					51				291
All	3375		64	72	51					3562
	Hor %									
Fijian	96.8		0.6	2.6						100.0
Indo-Fij	91.0		9.0							100.0
Others	82.5		0.0			17.5				100.0
All	94.8		1.8	2.0	1.4					100.0

Appendix Tables

Appendix 5 Gross Earnings over the Previous 12 months

Table 5.1 Persons earning Incomes for Activity 2 (by ethnicity)

	Fijian	Indo-Fij	Others	Rotuman	All
A 0 to 2999	74241	24097	3462	1509	103309
B 3000 to 4999	7531	5335	1576		14442
C 5000 to 6999	4112	3070	165		7348
D 7000 to 9999	3531	3218	365		7114
E 10000 to 14999	1228	633	243	99	2203
F 15000 to 19999	389	412	251		1051
G 20000 to 29999	278	520	38		836
H 30000 to 39999	153	187	38		378
I 40000 to 49999	96	31	38		165
J 50000 to 99999	102	112	106		320
K 100000 to 150000	47		38		85
L 150000 +	45				45
All	91752	37615	6321	1607	137295
Percent < 3000	81	64	55	94	75
Percent > 3000	19	36	45	6	25

Table 5.2 Persons earning Incomes for Activity 3 (by ethnicity)

Income 3 R	Fijian	Indo-Fij	Others	Rotuman	All
A 0 to 2999	38071	8518	1730	708	49027
B 3000 to 4999	4029	2260	355		6644
C 5000 to 6999	3512	1428	50		4990
D 7000 to 9999	2753	1369	160	41	4322
E 10000 to 14999	1443	735	201	73	2453
F 15000 to 19999	389	335	251		974
G 20000 to 29999	185	520	38		743
H 30000 to 39000	20	137	77		235
I 40000 to 49000	143	31	38		212
J 50000 to 99999	64	112	106		282
K 100000 to 150000	123		38		161
L 150000 +	83				83
All	50814	15445	3044	823	70126
Percent < 3000	75	55	57	86	70
Percent > 3000	25	45	43	14	30

Appendix Tables

Table 5.3 Incomes and Persons in Activity 2 (by Rural/Urban)

Income 2 R	Rural	Urban	Grand Total	%
A 0 to 2999	63977	39332	103309	62
B 3000 to 4999	8713	5729	14442	60
C 5000 to 6999	3821	3526	7348	52
D 7000 to 9999	4050	3064	7114	57
E 10000 to 14999	330	1873	2203	15
F 15000 to 19999		1051	1051	0
G 20000 to 39999	88	1126	1214	7
H > 40000	0	616	616	0
All	80979	56316	137295	59
% less than 3000	79	70	75	

Table 5.4 Incomes and Persons in Activity 3 (by Rural/Urban)

Income 3 R	Rural	Urban	Grand Total	%
A 0 to 2999	34343	14684	49027	70
B 3000 to 4999	3048	3596	6644	46
C 5000 to 6999	2001	2989	4990	40
D 7000 to 9999	1752	2570	4322	41
E 10000 to 14999	636	1817	2453	26
F 15000 to 19999		974	974	0
G 20000 to 39999	0	978	978	0
H > 40000	0	738	738	0
All	41781	28345	70126	60
% less than \$3000	82	52	70	

Table 5.5 Incomes and Persons in Activity 2 (by gender)

Income 2 R	Female	Male	All	% Fem
A 0 to 2999	27919	75390	103309	27
B 3000 to 4999	2705	11736	14442	19
C 5000 to 6999	1114	6233	7348	15
D 7000 to 9999	1023	6091	7114	14
E 10000 to 14999	529	1674	2203	24
F 15000 to 19999	187	865	1051	18
G 20000 to 39999	299	915	1214	25
H > 40000	238	378	616	39
All	34013	103282	137295	25
Perc < \$3000	82	73	75	

Appendix Tables

Table 5.6 Incomes and Persons in Activity 3 (by gender)

Income 3 R	Female	Male	All	% Fem
A 0 to 2999	14684	34343	49027	30
B 3000 to 4999	1368	5276	6644	21
C 5000 to 6999	828	4162	4990	17
D 7000 to 9999	704	3619	4322	16
E 10000 to 14999	520	1932	2453	21
F 15000 to 19999	187	787	974	19
G 20000 to 39999	255	723	978	26
H > 40000	238	500	738	32
All	18784	51342	70126	27
Perc < \$3000	78	67	70	

Table 5.7 Incomes and Persons in Activity 2 (by Divisions)

Income 2 R	Central	Eastern	Northern	Western	All
A 0 to 2999	60015	14121	25373	32790	132300
B 3000 to 4999	21861	1781	9591	27926	61159
C 5000 to 6999	16545	1517	7481	19001	44544
D 7000 to 9999	17940	1196	7801	15274	42210
E 10000 to 14999	12459	474	2747	10006	25686
F 15000 to 19999	6418	129	1497	4667	12711
G 20000 to 29999	3621	98	488	1922	6128
H 30000 to 39999	1672	104		362	2138
I 40000 to 49999	746		48	389	1182
J 50000 to 99999	1213	26	128	359	1726
K 100000 to 150000	518		31	168	717
L 150000 +	127	35		36	198
Grand Total	143137	19480	55184	112898	330699
% share	43	6	17	34	100

Table 5.8 Incomes and Persons in Activity 3 (by Divisions)

Income 3 R	Central	Eastern	Northern	Western	All
A 0 to 2999	31980	11379	2765	2903	49027
B 3000 to 4999	4191	348	1662	442	6644
C 5000 to 6999	3459	458	822	251	4990
D 7000 to 9999	3374	330	617		4322
E 10000 to 14999	2057	313	40	43	2453
F 15000 to 19999	974				974
G 20000 to 29999	743				743
H 30000 to 39000	235				235
I 40000 to 49000	212				212
J 50000 to 99999	251		31		282
K 100000 to 150000	161				161
L 150000 +	83				83
Grand Total	47720	12829	5937	3639	70126

Appendix Tables

Appendix 6 Mode of Transport (in detail)

Table 6.1 Mode of Transport (by Employment Status)

Mode of Travel	Wage earner	Salary earner	Employer	Self-employed	Family worker	Comm. Worker	All
A Own	10085	8466	1240	4028	994	144	24956
B Company car	5659	2628	79	338	111		8815
C Bus	75904	21701	489	13644	3813	1318	116869
D Minibus	1059	239		99	41		1437
E Taxi	2063	2033		1370	168	65	5698
F Paying/Other Car	1368	53	50	200	59	49	1779
G Other Commercial	169	47		173	49		437
H Walking	37957	7193	1013	44933	32010	1590	124696
I Cycling	831			443	231		1505
J Boat	656	368		2545	452		4022
K Other	1253	361	375	5771	1385	283	9430
Not Stated	1430	899		106	577		3011
All	138434	43988	3245	73651	39890	3448	302655
	Vert. %						
A Own	7.3	19.2	38.2	5.5	2.5	4.2	8.2
B Company car	4.1	6.0	2.4	0.5	0.3	0.0	2.9
C Bus	54.8	49.3	15.1	18.5	9.6	38.2	38.6
D Minibus	0.8	0.5	0.0	0.1	0.1	0.0	0.5
E Taxi	1.5	4.6	0.0	1.9	0.4	1.9	1.9
F Paying/Other Car	1.0	0.1	1.5	0.3	0.1	1.4	0.6
G Other Commercial	0.1	0.1	0.0	0.2	0.1	0.0	0.1
H Walking	27.4	16.4	31.2	61.0	80.2	46.1	41.2
I Cycling	0.6	0.0	0.0	0.6	0.6	0.0	0.5
J Boat	0.5	0.8	0.0	3.5	1.1	0.0	1.3
K Other	0.9	0.8	11.6	7.8	3.5	8.2	3.1
Not Stated	1.0	2.0	0.0	0.1	1.4	0.0	1.0
All	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

Appendix Tables

Table 6.2 Mode of Travel (by ethnicity)

Mode of Travel	Fijian	Indo-Fij	Others	Rotuman	All
A Own	7363	15303	2027	264	24956
B Company car	2964	5114	539	199	8815
C Bus	53685	58294	3898	991	116869
D Minibus	538	799	100		1437
E Taxi	2632	2733	281	53	5698
F Paying/Other Car	412	1241	127		1779
G Other Commercial	344	93			437
H Walking	79779	39183	4280	1455	124696
I Cycling	634	871			1505
J Boat	3829	54		139	4022
K Other	5067	4033	292	37	9430
Not Stated	1833	1096	38	43	3011
All	159080	128813	11582	3181	302655

Table 6.3 Average Distance Traveled (simple average)(km)

Mode of Travel	Fijian	Indo-Fij	Others	Rotuman	All
A Own	1.9	2.7	2.3	3.4	2.4
B Company car	2.7	2.7	2.8	3.3	2.7
C Bus	10.0	10.7	8.4	11.0	10.3
D Minibus	2.9	3.9	3.5		3.4
E Taxi	2.3	2.4	3.0	3.0	2.4
F Paying/Other Car	3.3	2.7	3.0		2.9
G Other Commercial	3.0	2.5			2.9
H Walking	1.3	1.1	0.9	1.1	1.2
I Cycling	1.5	1.4			1.5
J Boat	2.7	5.0		5.0	2.9
K Other	0.8	0.5	0.3	2.0	0.7
Not Stated		5.0			5.0
All	4.9	5.9	4.0	5.6	5.3

Appendix Tables

Table 6.4 Average Distance Traveled (simple average) (by mode and Employment Status)

Mode of Travel	Wage earner	Salary earner	Employer	Self-employed	Family worker	Comm Worker	All
A Own	2.5	2.8	2.5	1.8	1.1	2.0	2.4
B Company car	2.9	2.7	2.5	1.6	0.3		2.7
C Bus	10.0	10.1	7.2	12.6	9.9	18.2	10.3
D Minibus	3.7	2.5		4.0	4.0		3.4
E Taxi	2.4	2.6		2.0	3.0	1.0	2.4
F Paying/Other Car	2.8	1.0	2.0	3.0	5.0	4.0	2.9
G Other Commercial	2.3	5.0		3.5	1.0		2.9
H Walking	1.3	0.9	0.8	1.3	1.1	0.7	1.2
I Cycling	1.3			2.0	1.3		1.5
J Boat	3.8	3.0		2.6	3.0		2.9
K Other	1.1	0.5	0.3	0.7	0.3	0.0	0.7
Not Stated	5.0						5.0
All	6.5	6.2	2.4	3.6	2.0	7.7	5.3

Table 6.5 Average Distance Traveled and Time Taken (simple averages) (by rural/urban)

Mode of Travel	Distance Traveled			Time Taken		
	Rural	Urban	All	Rural	Urban	All
A Own	2.2	2.5	2.4	12.7	9.6	10.0
B Company car	2.1	2.8	2.7	9.4	11.3	11.2
C Bus	13.8	9.3	10.3	31.7	28.9	29.6
D Minibus	3.3	3.5	3.4	26.7	15.1	16.3
E Taxi	3.0	2.4	2.4	8.8	10.8	10.8
F Paying/Other Car	4.3	2.7	2.9	11.7	14.1	13.9
G Other Commercial	3.0	2.8	2.9	10.0	6.0	7.7
H Walking	1.3	1.1	1.2	15.2	10.5	13.3
I Cycling	1.4	1.5	1.5	15.0	9.2	11.6
J Boat	2.9	2.9	2.9	28.0	35.0	29.1
K Other	0.9	0.5	0.7	10.2	3.1	5.6
Not Stated	5.0		5.0	23.9	22.0	22.3
All	5.0	5.5	5.3	20.0	19.5	19.7

Appendix Tables

Appendix 7 Job Satisfaction Over last 7 Days

Table 7.1 Why Dis-satisfied With Job (by gender)

	Numbers			Vert. Percent	
	Female	Male	All	Female	Male
A Income too low	10083	24756	34839	63.7	62.2
B Not enough hours	570	1306	1876	3.6	3.3
C Does not use skills	346	802	1147	2.2	2.0
D Over-qualified	409	774	1182	2.6	1.9
E Under-qualified	26		26	0.2	0.0
F Working conditions (OHS)	327	942	1269	2.1	2.4
G Too far too travel	185	1592	1777	1.2	4.0
H Too difficult	278	1397	1675	1.8	3.5
I Sexual harassment	114		114	0.7	0.0
J Inadequate tools	183	362	545	1.2	0.9
K No training opportunity	513	735	1248	3.2	1.8
L Other	939	1474	2414	5.9	3.7
M Looking for paid work	1862	5636	7498	11.8	14.2
All	15835	39775	55610	100.0	100.0

Table 7.2 Why Dis-satisfied With Job (by rural/urban)

Why Dissatisfied	Numbers			Percent	
	Rural	Urban	All	Rural	Urban
A Income too low	16776	18063	34839	64.3	61.1
B Not enough hours	634	1242	1876	2.4	4.2
C Does not use skills	547	601	1147	2.1	2.1
D Overqualified	230	952	1182	0.9	3.3
E Under qualified		26	26	0	0.1
F Working conditions (OHS)	760	509	1269	2.9	1.7
G Too far	1167	610	1777	4.4	2.1
H Too difficult	741	934	1675	3.3	2.7
I Sexual harassment		114	114	0	0.4
J Inadequate tools	470	76	545	1.8	0.3
K No training opportunity	720	528	1248	2.7	1.8
L Other	613	1801	2414	2.3	6.2
M Looking for paid work	3933	3565	7498	12.8	14.1
All	26590	29019	55610	100	100

Appendix Tables

Table 7.3 Of those Dis-satisfied with Job, Why Dis-satisfied (by FNPF Payment)

Why Dissatisfied	Paid FNPF			Vert. Percent	
	No	Yes	All	No	Yes
A Income too low	19357	15289	34646	66	57
B Not enough hours	903	865	1767	4	1
C Does not use skills	646	404	1050	2	3
D Overqualified	343	794	1137	3	0
E Under qualified	26		26	0	0
F Working conditions (OHS)	99	1171	1269	3	1
G Too far	941	835	1777	3	3
H Too difficult	1347	328	1675	3	2
I Sexual harassment	74	39	114	0	0
J Inadequate tools	189	357	545	1	1
K No training opportunity	722	525	1248	2	3
L Other	1356	957	2312	5	3
M Looking for paid work	5914	1222	7135	7	26
All	31916	22785	54701	100	100

Table 7.4 Why Dis-satisfied With Job (by Employment Status) (numbers)

Why Dissatisfied	Wage earner	Salary earner	Employer	Self -employed	Family worker	Comm. Worker	All
A Income too low	24861	2484	117	4793	2400	142	34797
B Not enough hours	1606	47	82	38	103		1876
C Does not use skills	207	230		313	322	75	1147
D Overqualified	787	252		57	42	45	1182
E Under qualified					26		26
F Work. conditions (OHS)	1060	209					1269
G Too far	1001	226			550		1777
H Too difficult	945	87		506	136		1675
I Sexual harassment	114						114
J Inadequate tools	76	218		112	139		545
K No training opportunity	562	122		115	265	183	1248
L Other	750	601	109	784	94	75	2414
M Looking for paid work	428	51		2118	4818	83	7498
All	32398	4527	308	8836	8894	604	55568

Appendix Tables

Table 7.5 Why Dis-satisfied With Job (by ethnicity)

Why Dissatisfied	Fijian	Indo-Fij	Others	Rotuman	All
A Income too low	14947	18721	1079	91	34839
B Not enough hours	498	1207	171		1876
C Does not use skills	688	384	75		1147
D Overqualified	190	897	41	54	1182
E Under qualified		26			26
F Working conditions (OHS)	614	283	372		1269
G Too far	880	897			1777
H Too difficult	743	892	40		1675
I Sexual harassment	39	74			114
J Inadequate tools	331	117	98		545
K No training opportunity	697	501	50		1248
L Other	915	1372	127		2414
M Looking for paid work	5784	1460	253		7498
All	26327	26831	2307	145	55610
	Vert. %				
A Income too low	56.8	69.8	46.8	62.7	62.6
B Not enough hours	1.9	4.5	7.4	0.0	3.4
C Does not use skills	2.6	1.4	3.3	0.0	2.1
D Overqualified	0.7	3.3	1.8	37.3	2.1
E Under qualified	0.0	0.1	0.0	0.0	0.0
F Working conditions (OHS)	2.3	1.1	16.1	0.0	2.3
G Too far	3.3	3.3	0.0	0.0	3.2
H Too difficult	2.8	3.3	1.7	0.0	3.0
I Sexual harassment	0.1	0.3	0.0	0.0	0.2
J Inadequate tools	1.3	0.4	4.2	0.0	1.0
K No training opportunity	2.6	1.9	2.2	0.0	2.2
L Other	3.5	5.1	5.5	0.0	4.3
M Looking for paid work	22.0	5.4	11.0	0.0	13.5
All	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

Appendix Tables

Appendix 8 Economically Inactive Persons

Table 8.1 Why Inactive (by gender)

	Female	Male	All	Perc. Female
A No work available	6084	9437	15521	39.2
B Working soon	2755	1476	4231	65.1
C Household duties	125861	2224	128086	98.3
D Student	114874	120217	235091	48.9
E Retired/Pensioner	5402	8704	14106	38.3
F Handicapped	1568	2151	3718	42.2
G Other	12280	11945	24225	50.7
Job/Not At Work	2963	5760	8723	34.0
All	271787	161913	433700	62.7

Table 8.2 Why inactive (by ethnicity)

	Fijian	Indo-Fij	Others	Rotuman	All
A No work available	6653	8286	496	85	15521
B Working soon	2140	1717	286	87	4231
C Household duties	53676	68863	4077	1469	128086
D Student	131444	92166	8267	3213	235091
E Retired/Pensioner	5552	7884	473	198	14106
F Handicapped	1385	2206	22	105	3718
G Other	12875	9316	970	1063	24225
Job/Not At Work	4908	3148	285	381	8723
All	218634	193589	14875	6602	433700
	Hor %				
A No work available	42.9	53.4	3.2	0.5	100.0
B Working soon	50.6	40.6	6.8	2.1	100.0
C Household duties	41.9	53.8	3.2	1.1	100.0
D Student	55.9	39.2	3.5	1.4	100.0
E Retired/Pensioner	39.4	55.9	3.3	1.4	100.0
F Handicapped	37.3	59.3	0.6	2.8	100.0
G Other	53.1	38.5	4.0	4.4	100.0
Job/Not At Work	56.3	36.1	3.3	4.4	100.0
All	50.4	44.6	3.4	1.5	100.0

Appendix Tables

Table 8.3 Why Inactive (by divisions)

	Central	Eastern	Northern	Western	All
A No work available	5666	101	1563	8191	15521
B Working soon	2942	161	528	599	4231
C Household duties	42342	3020	21774	60949	128086
D Student	97235	11264	37238	89354	235091
E Retired/Pensioner	3264	166	463	10214	14106
F Handicapped	1506	193	532	1486	3718
G Other	7028	1774	9412	6011	24225
Job/Not At Work	6426	869	476	951	8723
All	166409	17548	71986	177756	433700
	Hor %				
A No work available	36.5	0.6	10.1	52.8	100.0
B Working soon	69.5	3.8	12.5	14.2	100.0
C Household duties	33.1	2.4	17.0	47.6	100.0
D Student	41.4	4.8	15.8	38.0	100.0
E Retired/Pensioner	23.1	1.2	3.3	72.4	100.0
F Handicapped	40.5	5.2	14.3	40.0	100.0
G Other	29.0	7.3	38.9	24.8	100.0
Job/Not At Work	73.7	10.0	5.5	10.9	100.0
All	38.4	4.0	16.6	41.0	100.0

Table 8.4 Why Inactive (by rural/urban)

	Rural	Urban	All	% Rural	% Urban
A No work available	5063	10457	15521	32.6	67.4
B Working soon	1240	2991	4231	29.3	70.7
C Household duties	66924	61162	128086	52.2	47.8
D Student	114175	120916	235091	48.6	51.4
E Retired/Pensioner	6311	7795	14106	44.7	55.3
F Handicapped	2056	1662	3718	55.3	44.7
G Other	13893	10331	24225	57.4	42.6
Job/Not At Work	2636	6086	8723	30.2	69.8
All	212298	221401	433700	49.0	51.0

Annex A

The Sampling Methodology, Data Processing and Estimation Procedures

This annex explains the sampling methodology and provide an indication of how information gathered from the Employment/Unemployment Survey of 2004-2005 was captured and processed prior to the output of the final data set for analysis.

Sampling Design

The survey included all householders in conventional dwellings distributed in localities within the urban and rural sectors of the four administrative divisions namely Central, Eastern, Western and Northern.

The target population were Fiji Citizens and permit holders in conventional dwelling excluding those found in households of non-Fiji citizens, hospitals, prisons, hotels, temporary construction sites, boarding schools and similar institutions.

A sampling frame was constructed using the count of conventional households gathered from the listing stage for HIES 2002-2003 and information gathered from updates to EAs identified to have had significant changes in household numbers. In previous surveys the sample was drawn from a sampling frame taken from the immediate past census. This would not have been suitable for this survey, as the

last census was taken almost 10 years ago. Since then, there has been considerable rural: urban drift, while the urban boundaries have extended significantly in many areas, for example, along the Nadi and Lautoka corridor.

Table 1 lists the stratified sampling frame from which a number of EAs, the Primary Sampling Unit (PSU), were selected per stratum.

A sample of 3000 households was targeted using a two stage stratified systematic sampling. The first stage involved the selection of 300 EAs in proportion to the number of households in each stratum.

In the second stage, a random sample of 10 households within each identified EA was selected.

Table 1 Distribution of EAs and households by Strata

Stratum	# EAs	%	Hhlds	%
1 Central Urban	487	32.0	44156	28.4
2 Central Rural	133	8.7	15626	10.0
3 Eastern Urban	8	0.5	712	0.5
4 Eastern Rural	74	4.9	7182	4.6
5 West Urban	267	17.5	25898	16.6
6 West Rural	328	21.5	35741	23.0
7 North Urban	64	4.2	7281	4.7
8 North Rural	163	10.7	19116	12.3
Total	1524	100	155712	100

Table 2 Selection of EAs and Households

Stratum	No of EAs	Hh in Frame	EAs Selected	Hh Selected
1 Central Urban	487	44156	112	1120
2 Central Rural	133	15626	20	200
3 Eastern Urban	8	712	3	30
4 Eastern Rural	74	7182	9	90
5 West Urban	267	25898	64	640
6 West Rural	328	35741	47	470
7 North Urban	64	7281	17	170
8 North Rural	163	19116	28	280
Total	1524	155712	300	3000

This sample, including a reserve pool, was drawn from a list of households in the EA stratified by household size and ethnicity. Table 2 lists the distribution of the selected EAs and Households per stratum and frame count.

Estimation Procedure

Based on the sampling design and the stratified two stage systematic sampling procedure, the weights were calculated as follows. Let

- N_i = Total number of Households in i^{th} stratum in EUS Frame 2004
- N_{ij} = Total number of Households in i^{th} stratum/ j^{th} EA in EUS Frame 2004
- H_{ij} = Total number of Households in i^{th} stratum/ j^{th} EA during listing
- h_{ij}^{47} = Actual number of households surveyed in i^{th} stratum/ j^{th} EA
- n_{ij} = Number of EAs selected in i^{th} stratum

The probability of selection of the j th EA in the i th stratum is given by:

$$\frac{N_{ij} \times n_i}{N_i} \dots\dots\dots(1)$$

The probability for any household to be selected is given by:

$$\frac{h_{ij}}{H_{ij}} \dots\dots\dots(2)$$

Then the probability of selection of any household is obtained by multiplying (1) and (2):

$$\frac{N_{ij} \times n_i \times h_{ij}}{N_i \times H_{ij}} \dots\dots\dots(3)$$

The ‘weight’ is then given by the inverse of (3)

i.e.
$$W_{ij} = \frac{N_i \times H_{ij}}{N_{ij} \times n_i \times h_{ij}}$$

Or

$$\frac{(\text{No of Hhlds in } i^{th} \text{ Stratum } j^{th} \text{ EA - Frame}) \times (\text{No. of Hhlds in EA @ Listing})}{(\text{No of Hhlds in EA - Frame}) \times (\text{No. of Hhlds Surveyed}) \times (\text{No.of EAs in Stratum})}$$

Thus the Total Population Estimate becomes

$$\hat{Y} = \sum W_{ij} (y)$$

where W_{ij} = weight at i^{th} stratum/ j^{th} EA for population (y)

Conduct of the Survey

The listing at the second stage of the sample selection involved enumerators visiting all households in the selected PSU (primary Sampling Unit) gathering information on household demographics and some housing particulars.

⁴⁷ This number may be less than the expected 10 per EA because of rejections and incomplete returns.

From the list of households collected above, a stratified random sample of 10 households were identified for enumerators to administer the main questionnaire. In total there were 2906 households captured from a list of 300 EAS selected and the distribution per stratum is as follows in Table 3.

Stratum	No of EAs	%	No of HH	Resp. Hhlds
1 Central Urban	112	37.9	1120	1100
2 Central Rural	20	6.5	200	190
3 East Urban	3	1.0	30	30
4 East Rural	9	2.8	90	80
5 West Urban	64	22.0	640	640
6 West Rural	47	15.6	470	453
7 North Urban	17	6.2	170	179
8 North Rural	28	8.1	280	234
Grand Total	300	100.0	3000	2906

Data Processing.

Generally data processing for EUS 2004-2005 started in the field with emphasis on verifying the consistency of responses and making sure that data structure and counts corresponded with expected numbers. Each of the four stations was required to manage its own data collection through to data entry and editing phases before data was sent to the central workstation in Suva for final checks and compilation of the database.

Data Verification

Verification of information was done by enumerators on repeat household visits during the week allocated for completion of the main questionnaire. Checks on age and relationship of members of the household to the head were some of the initial tasks in making sure the respondents provided information with a highest acceptable degree of accuracy and consistency. For working employees, enumerators were able to access statements of emoluments and at times balance sheets for those involved in sale of goods and services.

Coding and Data Entry

Once the schedules were returned, coders tallied counts of population and households by ethnicity. Written responses were standardised. These tasks include coding the main occupation and industry of the employed and those involved in any economic activity including responses of those not in the labour force.

Separate data entry screens were used for the Schedule 1 – Listing, and Schedule 2 - Main schedule⁴⁸ using CPro, a survey data processing software. The data entry screens had built in skip patterns derived from the questionnaire, simplifying data entry and editing.

Editing

Some editing were done in the field and verified at coding stages. However a more thorough check involved printing all entered information and then verifying against field records item by item. This ensured that data gathered from the field was not lost in transition during data entry through to output. Consistency and structural checks on the data were part of the tasks carried out at the compilation stages of the final database. The calculated weight was assigned to each record at this edit stage.

Data frequencies on variables also provided an indication of the effectiveness of the data collection exercise, particularly in checking the required number of households to be visited per EA. Weighted frequencies further provided an indication of the accuracy of the data collection and monitoring survey processes as a whole.

⁴⁸ Annex B.

Tabulation

The estimates from the survey refer to population of Fiji Citizens and permit holders of the targeted population indicated above who lived in conventional dwellings or non-institutional households. Thus the population estimates will be lower than the usual demographic estimates.

It should be noted that all the survey estimates will be subject to their own sampling errors.

Given the limited resources, sample size and confidence in the sampling frame, the Bureau is of the view that the lowest reporting levels (the strata), provide best estimates where the expected variances of tabulated results are at acceptable levels of consistency and accuracy.

Annex B Variables in Main Questionnaire

SUBROUND	(id) Sub Round
BATCHNUM	(id) Batch Number
LOTNUM	(id) Lot Number
DIVISION	(id) Division
EA	(id) Enumeration Area
HHLDDNUM	(id) Household Number
PERSNUM	1.1 Person Number
RELAT	1.2 Relationship
ETHNICITY	1.3 Ethnicity
SEX	1.4 Sex
DOB	1.5 Date of Birth
DAY	1.5 Day
MONTH	1.5 Month
YEAR	1.5 Year
AGE	Age
MARSTAT	1.6 Marital Status
SCHOOLING	1.7 Schooling
ATTAINMENT	1.8 Attainment
QUALIFICATION_PURSUED	1.8 Qualification Pursued
TERTIARY	1.9 Tertiary Qualification
BRTHPLACE	1.10 Place of Birth
STAY	1.11 Length of Stay
PROV	Province of Previous Residence
TIKINA	Tikina in Previous residence
LOCALITY	Locality in Previous residence
CHORES	1.13 Hours of Hhld Chores
CHORESA	1.13 Cooking
CHORESB	1.13 b] Washing Clothes
CHORESC	1.13 c] Child Care
CHORESD	1.13 d] Gardening, Compound Cleaning, Grass Cut
CHORESE	1.13 e] Other [specify]
DISABLE ⁴⁹	1.14 Any Disability/Impairment
DISABILITY	Type of Disability
ACTIV12MONTHS	1.15 Activity in Last 12 Months
ACTIV12MONA	1.15 a] Work for Wages
ACTIV12MONB	1.15 b] Work in Family Business
ACTIV12MONC	1.15 c] Grow Food, catch fish, make article for
ACTIV12MOND	1.15 d] Grow Food, catch fish, make articles for
ACTIV12MONE	1.15 e] Unpaid Community Worker Fulltime
INACT12MON	1.16 Reason for Inactivity
OCCUP1	2.1 Main Occupation
OCC2	Major Division II
OCC3	Occupation
INDUS1	2.2 Industry
INDSUB	Sub Major Group
INDMAJ	Industry
REG1	2.3 Registered Company ?
EMPSTAT1	2.4 Employment Status
DAYSWRKD1	2.5 Days Worked
HRSWRKD	2.6 Hours Worked

⁴⁹ The questions on Disability were not accurately recorded and coded.

Annex B Listing of Variables in Questionnaire

OWN1	2.7 Do you Own Business
RENT1	2.7 [b] Renting/Leasing
ACTIV2	2.8 Second Activity
OCCUP2	2.9 Nature of Activity
OCCU3	Occupation
INDUS2	2.10 Industry
REG2	2.11 Registered/Licensed
EMPSTAT2	2.12 Employment Status
DAYSWRKD2	2.13 Days Worked
HRSWRKD2	2.14 Hours Worked
ACTIV3	2.15 Any Other Activity
OCCUP3	2.16 Nature of Activity
INDUS3	2.17 Industry
REG3	2.18 Registered/Licensed
EMPSTAT3	2.19 Employment Status
DAYSWRKD3	2.20 Days Worked
HRSWRKD3	2.21 Hours Worked
MOREWORK	2.22 Available for Additional Work
DAYSAVAIL	2.23 Days for Additional Work
HRSAVAIL	2.24 Hours for Additional Work
OCCUPAVAIL	2.25 Occupation preferred
TOTINC	2.26 Total Income
INCOME1	2.26 Q2.1 Income
INCOME2	2.26 Q2.9 Income
INCOME3	2.26 Q2.16 Income
FNPFPAY	2.27 FNPFC Contribution
FNPFEMP	2.28 Employer pays FNPFC
ACTIV7DAYS	3.1 Activity in Last 7 Days
ACTIVITY1	3.1 [a] Wages/Salary
ACTIVITY2	3.1 [b] Work in Family Business
ACTIVITY3	3.1 [c] Self Employed
ACTIVITY4	3.1 [d] Subsistence
ACTIVITY5	3.1 [e] Unpaid Community Work
OCC7DAYS	3.2 Main Occupation (Last 7 Days)
OCC7D3	3.2 Occupation 7 Days
INDUS7DAYS	3.3 Industry (Last 7 Days)
EMPSTAT7DAYS	3.4 Employment Status (7 Days)
HRS7DAYS	3.5 Total No. of Hours Worked
GWKLYINCOME	3.6 Gross weekly income
NOWORK7DAYS	3.7 Not at work last 7 Days
NOWORKREASON	3.8 Reason for No Work (7 Days)
OCCUP4	3.9 Occupation
INDUS4	3.10 Industry
EMPSTAT4	3.11 Employment Status
HRSWRKD4	3.12 No of Hrs Worked
GRINCOME	3.13 Gross Weekly Income
TRAVEL	3.14 Normal Travel to work
DISTANCE	3.15 Distance to workplace
TIMETRAVEL	3.16 Time to travel to work
SATISFIED	3.17 Satisfaction with Work
DISSATISFACTION	3.18 Reason for dissatisfaction
INACTIVITY	3.19 Reason for Inactivity
UNEMP7DAYS	4.1 How Long Not employed
SUPPORT	4.2 Main source of support
LOOKING	4.3 Actively Looking for work

Annex B Listing of Variables in Questionnaire

JOBTYPE	4.4 Preferred Job
SKILLS	4.5 Acquired skills
SEEK	4.6 What are you doing to find work
SEEK1	4.6 Registered as Unemployed
SEEK2	4.6 Answered Advertisements
SEEK3	4.6 Placed Advertisements
SEEK4	4.6 Checked with Friends/Relas
SEEK5	4.6 Checked with Employers
SEEK6	4.6 Other [Specify]
SEEK7	4.6 Internet
SEEK8	4.6 Initiate Own Account
SECOND_TIME	4.6 Second Time
FAILURE	4.6 Reason for Failure
OFFERS	4.7 Received Offers
REJECT	4.8 Why rejected Offer
MIGRATION	5.1 Main reason for migration
JOB	5.2 How long to find Better employment
OCCUPMIG	5.3 Occupation before migration
OCCUPNOW	5.4 Occupation after Migration
INDUSMIG	5.5 Industry before migration
INDUSNOW	5.6 Industry after migration
EMPSTATMIG	5.7 Employment Status before migration
EMPSTATUSNOW	5.8 Employment Status after migration
WEIGHT	Weight
GEO	Geographic Stratum