CHAPTER 5

DEVELOPMENT, PERFORMANCE AND PRACTICES

5.1 Introduction

This chapter discusses the major development issues of the Lomaivuna Scheme. These include the composition of the leaseholders, farming performance, growing patterns, labour inputs, outputs and returns, marketing and sources of assistance. The farmers were asked to provide data for the period from 1988 to the time of the survey (February - April).

The leaseholders have managed to survive some very turbulent years during which commercial production was unsatisfactory. Overton (1988, 70) states that a leaseholder's life is comparable to that of village subsistence producers. Problems were caused by natural disasters (cyclones, destructive winds, heavy rainfall, drought of 1977 and flooding), debts still owed to the support agencies, soil degradation, declining fertility and unstable supervisory management.

Assisting the leaseholders are the Extension Staff and the DAF Office in Nausori. This is in the form of technical advice, provision of seeds, marketing arrangement and dealing with the bureaucracy or loan agencies. The DAF's 'crop production loan' provided a maximum of \$200.00 worth of farm inputs at unspecified low interest rates (Chandra 1983, 40). Much of that had to be written off as part of the bad debts of over \$50,000.00 by 1984 (DAF File). Today, most of the institutional farm credit is derived from the FDB (Chandra 1983, 39). This is provided at subsidized rates of interest ranging between 8 -13.5% (FDB 1988, 4), depending on types of assistance.

The present farmers cultivate on a yearly basis depending on arranged quotas (formerly of taro but of ginger only today) and marketability of other crops. They seemed determined to make the best of the land for greater economic returns and personal satisfaction.

5.2 Survival Rate

From the beginning, the management had been lax in encouraging farmers to stay on in Lomaivuna. The only known policy restriction was that which required farmers not to leave the scheme during the first two years (1963 - 64) of settlement (NAF File). Their right to sell, lease or sub-lease has remained in force after that. The Fijian leaseholders have decreased but the paucity and incompleteness of data have made it hard to present a detailed analysis. The leasehold subdivisions are given in Figure 5.1 (also refer to Table 3.2).



Figure 5.1 : Lomaivuna Scheme Subdivisions

Note that the above map does not contain recent changes which which could have been made for further subdivisions.Furthermore an account of the leasehold distribution is given in Table 5.1.The presence of estimated figures is due to the haphazard state of the scrutinized sources.

1965	183	4	2	5	9	-	203
1977	168	20*	2	4*	9*	9*	212
1978	167	21*	2	4*	9*	9	212
1985	174	23	2	-	4*	9*	212
1988	172	25*	2	-	4*	9	212
1989	167	30	2	-	4	9	212

Table 5.1 : Leasehold Distribution (* estimated)

Year Fijians Indians Chinese P/Euro Rotumans Others Total

[Agency Files and Overton (1987 and 1988)]

The analysis is incomplete and inconsistent, indicative of the monitoring and recording system the management had. This implies the low priority given to efficient record-keeping (data collection and evaluation). Comparatively, overseas-funded projects (Yalavou and Uluisaivou Beef Cattle Projects or the Rewa and Navua Rice Projects) are better managed and organized. Recently established locally-funded schemes such as that of Seaqaqa Cane Farming are also better organised and monitored today. However, the fact remains that insufficient data records have negated the purpose of this analysis. Complementary data are not available anywhere else to the knowledge of the researcher (best possible sources have been exhausted).

5.2.1 Overall Scheme Composition

On the whole, the 1989 (NLTB) and 1965 (Overton, 1987 and NAF, 1989) records are the most consistent (refer Table 5.1). It shows that 203 of the 212 blocks are individually owned by farming households (also refer to Table 5.2). The rest are held by various bodies/institutions such as the Salvation Army, the two schools (secondary and primary) and the Lands Department. The latter's four blocks are used for facilitating the Extension administration, postal agency, nursing station and the residences. In fact the other institution-held leaseholds such as that for the Salvation Army were meant for farming but today, not much is done on the land. Table 5.2 below shows the households and the population of Lomaivuna.

Table 5.2: Leaseholds, Households and Population

<u>Particulars</u>	<u>Fijians</u>	<u>Others</u>	Total
		•	
Sample Households			
1989	80	-	80
Farming Households			
1989	167	36	203
Total Households*	183	36	219
Sample Total Pop.	491	-	491
Total Pop.*	1,212	187	1,399

NB :*1986 Census

(BSF, Suva and Field Survey, 1989)

About 79% of the total leaseholds are Fijian-held but of the remainder, the Indo-Fijians own 14% (refer Table 5.1). Fijian, Rotuman and Part-European held blocks have declined by about 12%, 44% and 100% respectively during the scheme's 26-year period. Numerically, the Fijians have the highest withdrawal rate, about twice that for all other races.Of the total individual lease-holders, the pioneer settlers make up about 37% (Overton 1988, 31).

The scheme provides a living for about 219 households with a population of 1,399 (BSF, 1989). The numerical dominance of the Fijians is the direct result of the initial LDA policies (see Chapter 3). They make up about 87% of the Lomaivuna Scheme population. The people who work there (Extension service, etc) are mostly Fijians too.

5.2.2 Sale of Farms

The DAF File indicated changes in leaseholdership of farms at the average rate of three per year between 1970 and 1977. The highest on record were in 1974 - 75 when fifteen farmers left the scheme. It can be assumed that cyclones (nearly one every year between 1972 - 76) and related disasters could have contributed to this. In 1973 an NLTB survey (see Chapter 3) noted that the only twenty individual titleholders were negotiating to sell off. The tendency to withdraw had been noticed fairly early , notably after 1965 (NAF File). Overton (1988, 74) states that the sale of farms is attributed to the

immediate good returns it brought to the leaseholders and not the failure of the farming enterprises. Unfortunately the DAF had no record of such sales, but it mentioned that farms and properties were sold very cheaply (see Chapter 3).

5.2.3 Absenteeism

The LDA and subsequently, the DAF tried to monitor and control the situation but staff shortage meant that it could not be done efficiently. Today its practice is rife with about 6 - 10% of the farms belonging to absentee-titleholders (NLTB record, Nausori). This is comparable to the 4% revealed by the field survey. Apart from the 21 leaseholders who were temporarily absent between 1971 - 1977, 11 absences were noted in a 1967 DAF survey. Their households, who remained at Lomaivuna undertook subsistence farming supplemented by the householders' off-farm labour earnings. These farmers returned to Lomaivuna once the DAF threatened to declare their blocks vacant because of the lack of commercial production. Generally Fijians have a tendency to prefer quick returns. Presumably this may help to explain their interest in paid-employment (as urban or even rural workers).

Absentee-owners should be seen as an integral part of rural society, for their role in the local economy is significant (Overton 1988, 76). Most of them are usually rich urban-based bureaucrats or businessmen. Their holdings in the scheme are normally, a small portion of their properties and wealth. With the profitable returns from the sale of farms and the increasing

demand for land, the number of absentee-leaseholders is expected to increase in the future. Confidently this can be surmised if the landholders' agitation, the fast approaching lease-expiry time and possible termination of lease are considered too.

5.2.4 Land Accumulation

The NLTB records (1989) indicate the presence of some farmers with more than one leasehold. Generally the second is leased out privately in return for farm produce and rarely cash. Accumulation is a practice known to the management authorities. Even the NLTB and the DAF knew of the case about Lomaivuna settlement committee members being involved in the re-allocation of vacant blocks (refer Chapter 3).

Overton (1988, 74) reveals that it is more common in Waibau where there has always been weaker official control of the settlement. Thirty eight blocks are held by only twenty individuals (average of 1.9 block per titleholder). Dual/multiblock ownership caters for growing families with members operating second plots but remaining within the household. Overton states that this has resulted from agronomic imperatives rather than widespread capitalistic accumulation. In Lomaivuna, the growth of ginger farming has stimulated interest in the land resulting in the current trend of urban bureaucrats and entrepreneurs holding individual titles on absentee status.

5.3 The Fijian Leaseholders

In looking at the composition of the Fijian farmers in Lomaivuna, the researcher has held the view that the original farmer-selection process was biased towards particular provinces or regions. Although the LDO of 1961 (refer Chapter 3) had provided the basic criteria, those which were used in picking the settlers are unknown. Intentionally or otherwise, the foundation of the current composition of Lomaivuna leaseholders had been set from the very start (the original selection process). Bayliss-Smith et al. (1988, 131) mentioned that it is doubtful that this was the explicit objective of the scheme, but it does give some insight into the favouring of Eastern Fiji in policy-making. Bureaucratic patronage to individuals of the same village, district or province is still very prevalent today in various areas of society.

5.3.1 Provincial Distribution

The DAF File (dated 12/07/78) , on the objectives of the Lomaivuna Scheme only mentioned the 'provision of land for the landless' without specifying priority of selection to any particular section of society (supported by the provisions of the LDO of 1961). It is assumed that selection should have been on a 'first come first serve basis' provided the application for resettlement was genuine, that is, each selected individual met the necessary criteria. However, the LDA's policy of encouraging Fijians into the commercial sector through resettlement seems to

contradict the LDO provisions. If that was the initial intention, then the Government should have specified it in the Ordinance.

Spate (1959, 11) had already noted the inequity of land distribution amongst the Fijian landowning units. This tended to support the LDA's settler-selection system. The question is why more settlers were picked initially from Lau Province since any argument relating to low land-man ratio also qualified some other provinces. Table 5.3 below tries to analyse the leaseholders by provinces and periods of entry into the scheme.

Table 5.3 Leaseholders' Origin and Entry

<u> Drigin</u>	Total	<u>1960s</u>	<u>1970s</u>	<u>1980s</u>	<u>Total Pop</u> .	<u>Ratio</u> .
----------------	-------	--------------	--------------	--------------	--------------------	----------------

Lau	49	35	6	6 '	15,000*	1:3
Rewa	6	1	1	1	54,000*	1:90
Other						
Provinces	25	6	-	-	261,000*	1:104
Total	80	16	6	6	300,000*	1:41
2 6	-	20	7	7	-	-

NB: 1986 Census

(BSF 1989, LDA, NLTB and DAF Files, Overton 1987 and 1988, and Field Study 1989)

5.3.1.1 Lau Province: Of the 14 provinces, Lau is one of the smallest in land area and population, being made up of small

islands. Land shortage has been a growing problem due to rising population density, poor soils and the emphasis on copra production. Other factors are the great distance to the main island (major government offices, urban markets and services) and transportation problems. Its very high emigration rate (probably the highest in Fiji) to the larger islands could have helped to minimize the land problem but also reduce able-bodied individuals to help out at home. In fact, it is widely acknowledged in Fiji that the Government has provided more assistance and development programmes to particular provinces or regions since independence (see 5.3).

Of the total Fijian leaseholders, Lauans make up about 61% and most of them are pioneer settlers. Surprisingly some of them entered the scheme from the urban areas (especially Suva) and assumably, while in wage employment. This selection preference is hard to understand since no explanation can be found in management files. The assumption is that both the Government and the LDA believed that certain places should be given settlement priorities. This is based on the argument that being in the outer islands, this would bring more of them into the mainstream of the commercial sector. It is unacceptable when considered in the light of profitable sources of income (as copra) existing in that region at that point in time.

5.3.1.2 Rewa Province: With the smallest land area, Rewa has been densely populated with 7? persons per sq. km. as contrasted to Lau's 29 (1956 Census). Rewa's population was nearly twice that of Lau (Chandra 1983, 16). It has a difficult deltaic

environment with marshland and mangrove swamps, and is flood prone with transportation problems.

Although it is near the urban areas (therefore employment opportunities), this province's land shortage is aggravated by the encroachment of urban expansion on the coastal edges of the Suva-Nausori industrial corridor. If the settlement of landless Fijians had been the underlying objective, Rewans should have been given greater priorities for resettlement.

Table 5.3 shows that Rewa leaseholders only make up less than 6% of the Fijian total, over eight times less than Lau Province. Without any recorded supporting evidence, any assumption would certainly point to the presence of a strong political dimension in the initial selection process. With independence and selfgovernment approaching, what better way to prepare than to encourage the movement of support groups to other parts of the country. This assumption is comparable to the Javanization of outer Indonesia via the Transm:gration programme.

5.3.1.3 Other Provinces: Table 5.3 shows that these provinces are satisfactorily represented with an average of two leaseholders from each province. However, the survey revealed that Tailevu and Lomaiviti have the same number of leaseholders as Rewa. As these other provinces are better endowed with land than Rewa, one is curious as to whether the selection panel had worked according to a set of criteria. The imbalance in the leaseholding distribution is further clarified when the number of settlers per province is compared to the provincial population (refer to Table 5.3). The ratio for Lau Province is not only thirteen times greater than that for the whole survey but is more than thirty times greater than Rewa's, and more still than for the other provinces. One is forced to question where the logic lies when considered in the light of relevant basic selection criteria for tackling land distribution inequity.

5.3.2 Farmers' Background

The majority of leaseholders (about 73%) came directly from the villages. Those who have taken over the leaseholds from their parents make up about 3% while the balance is composed of former wage-labour employees (refer to Graph 5.1). Also found are former sugar-cane and cattle farmers, but the majority are copra producers (37%). Former paid-employees had either resigned, retired or just left to take up farming.



Graph 5.1 Sources of Income Before Lomaivuna

Key: A. Cattle C. Sugar-cane E. Yaqona
B. Unemployed D. Bananas ' F. Wood-carving
G. Root Crops

(Field Survey, 1989)

Most of the leaseholders are in their fifties or over (refer to Graph 5.2). Their ages range between 17 - 67 years (average of 42 years). The farmers in their forties and fifties make up about 78%. Others, over or below that age group, comprise 14% and 8% respectively. Not all the farmers in the upper age groups entered the scheme in the early 1960s. The presence of younger leaseholders is attributed to the transfer of titles within the households. About 5% of the leasehold titles have changed hands in this way (Field Survey, 1989). Graph 5.2 Age Groups of Leaseholders



(Field Survey, 1989)

In terms of social status, the majority are from the grass-root commoners. The low number of Fijians of chiefly origin in the scheme not only shows their low proportion of the Fijian population but the LDA's policy of excluding them altogether. It was assumed that being of chiefly origin and unused to heavy gardening work, they would not do well in Lomaivuna. Some high chiefs of chiefly villages were reluctant to allow their people (irrespective of traditional status) to enter the scheme. Graph 5.3 below shows a traditional-hierarchy pyramid of the leaseholders.



Graph 5.3 Traditional Roles and Status

NB: All are ordinary members of these clans (none of very important positions)

(Field Survey, 1989)

The high percentage from the Herald clan can be attributed to the assistance provided for resettlement through their closer association with traditional authority. It could also be coincidental since these Herald members came from different places and islands. The presence of a larger number from a particular group was, probably, not planned. Nevertheless, it can be anticipated that particular clans could have been favoured. It is hard to say that commoners were underrepresented since all clans below the chiefs, excluding the traditional 'mataqali' heads and their households, are usually regarded as commoners too. Another important point is that those who had declared themselves of chiefly status in the survey are not registered as such by the NLTB. Two arguments can be made; either they are not chiefs of recognised titles or the NLTB has the policy of not declaring them as such in their records. The researcher leans more to the former as more likely.

5.4 The Households

Anderson (1968, 15) describes the household in Fijian society as usually very large with the extended family either living or eating under the same roof. For the purpose of this study, family members (particularly sons and either married or unmarried) living away but contributing to the household incomes, are included. A large household has its advantages in socio-economic security and strength. It is bonded by the spirit of togetherness, cooperation in division of labour and production of domestic needs. However this depends on everyone giving a hand and contributing in the maintenance of household affairs.

Table 5.4 Household Analysis

Size of largest household	18
Size of smallest household	2
Average size of household	6
Average number of urban workers per	
household	1
Average number of regular remittance	
contributor	1
Number of household without urban employees	25

(Field Survey, 1989)

Contrary to traditional norm, household size in Lomaivuna, according to the survey average of approximately six, is not regarded as large. The members of the household include the leaseholder and his wife, their child(ren), grandchild(ren) and one or two relatives. As shown in Table 5.4, the households have an average of one wage/salary employee assisting through remittances. This is expected since they are obligated traditionally to help out. Some of them commute daily to their urban places of work using Lomaivuna as their base.

About 65% of the households have less than seven members. A low number of school-aged children is revealed by the survey (average of one per household) and 25% of the households have none at all. The arrival of relatives is usually welcomed, provided they help out in farming activities. The survey showed that these people make up an insignificant proportion (less than 1%). Household members in the urban areas visit occasionally to help out.

5.5 Motivational Factors

Spate (1959, 22) as well as other writers saw the Fijian lifestyle with its customs and traditions as one of the main drawbacks of Fijians' entry into the commercial world. They imply that the Fijians may never be free to advance by way of individual commercialization of available resources at their disposal if they continue to observe the economically unproductive components of their customs and traditions.

However, Overton (1988, 25) argues that the village accomodates both communal obligation and individual freedom. Daily village life is concerned with fulfilling both communal and domestic responsibilities. Overton (ibid, 27) states that some changes have occurred since the withdrawal of the regulation restricting outmigration from villages in 1948. Many people have aspired for a more western type of life. It has become more materialistic with money, sawn-timber/concrete/corrugated iron residence, exotic furnishings and possessions becoming very important. One aspires to be better than or comparable to his neighbour. 'Galala' farming, spontaneous in its origin, started in this way. Some commoners realized that a better position in life lay in the commercial sector. The village mode of life has changed considerably although the Fijians are still bound by family ties and traditional obligations. Factors which motivated Fijians from their familiar and secure village surrounding are many and varied. Overton (1988, 58) presented five motivational factors : higher living standard with enough cash in hand; a better life for raising children; personal satisfaction; independence or to be one's own boss with more time to do what one wants; and fewer obligations. Graph 5.4 illustrates the major motivational factors of individual leaseholders in Lomaivuna.



Graph 5.4 Motivation into Resettlement

- 1. Land security.
- 2. Commercial farming opportunities.
- 3. Better education for 7. Freedom of personal children.
- 4. Access to other job opportunities.

- 5. Closeness to urban centres.
- 6. Prospects of better life and future.
- expression and innovation.
- 8. Freedom from village life and obligations.

(Field Survey, 1989)

Land security seems to be the main motivational factor. More than 20% of the farmers gave it as their main reason for resettlement. This indicates the people's desire for their own piece of land, one which they can use without interference. Indirectly, this may show that commercial farming on their own `mataqali' land under `vakavanua' tenancy is not conducive to profit-making. It highlights the village, its commitments and obligations as constraints. The individual lease titles obtained through the scheme are their greatest achievement.

The next influential factor is the greater commercial farming opportunities the scheme provides which could not be satisfactorily achieved in the village. On the other hand, Overton (1988) states that village life can be manipulated for economic purposes. This has been done through development of cooperative societies (not so successful) and semi-commercial farming. The leaseholders, from their returns, have hoped to achieve other goals; a better education for children and a higher standard of living. For the majority (from the outlying islands), living closer to the urban centres and greater accessibility to other employment opportunities are a bonus. Only a small number (in the sample survey) have expanded satisfactorily into other farming activities.

A very minor proportion of the leaseholders consider their resettlement as a means of being emancipated from customs, traditions and the obligations of village life for individual freedom. Despite the distance from their villages, the influence of customs and traditions is still strong. The belief is held that for the sake of their children, these cannot be ignored.

They fear ostracization and the possible loss of rights and privileges. The recent up-surge of the traditionalists since the 1987 Military Coups and the growing political strength of the Council of Chiefs give support to this view.

The leaseholders still pay taxes to their own provincial councils, contribute to fund-raising and make occasional social visits to their villages. Meetings, funerals and other functions have to be attended whenever possible. The leaseholders take on extra obligations through closer relationships that have been developed amongst themselves. Being away from their own villages gives them the freedom to decide which traditional commitments one participates in. However when all traditional obligations (to the village and other farmers) are considered, their commitments seem to have little difference from those in the villages both financially and materially. In fact some are expected to contribute more.

5.6 Labour and Farm Equipment

In the scheme, the reciprocal labour of the village is unavailable. However there have been cases of group work especially in ginger farming. Its production is usually beyond the capabilities of small households. Furthermore the deadline and demand of the market place have to be met. Group labour by Lomaivuna farmers is restricted to combined household labour, normally of the same farming sector. The household remains the main source and relocation has helped to make the family a stronger economic unit than in the village.

.

:118

Heavy farming activities which take longer to complete require group labour. Apart from ginger production (harvesting, washing, packing and transporting), taro planting is another. The necessity of digging up and preparing whole taro garden plots in harvested areas is too much for a household, especially when cultivation is required to be done immediately. Generally absentee-leaseholders employ paid labour to do the farm work for them. Nearby village labour is hired occasionally. Overton (1988, 48 - 9) raised the importance of sharecropping as a means of reducing the labour problem. This is more common at Waibau than in Lomaivuna.

5.6.1 Household Labour

The field study was carried out on the assumption that the leaseholders did most of the work on their farms (more than anyone else). This is why the survey concentrated on finding out about the household members only in terms of sources of labour or assistance to the leaseholders. This and the weekly labour hours contributed by each household member are shown in Graph 5.5 below.



Graph 5.5 (i) H/hold Labour (ii) Labour Hours (1988-9)

A. sons B. wives C. daughters D. relatives

(Field Survey, 1989)

The leaseholders' sons provide most of the labour force (about 41%) as compared to the farmers' wives (36%) and daughters (20%). The heavier tasks such as clearing vegetation, digging and planting are usually done by the males. The amount of work put in by the females (wives and daughters) is higher despite their other responsibilities (child care, cooking, washing and other household work). The contribution of relatives (23%) is high although they only make up a small proportion of the labour source (2.9%). On a commercial basis, household labour input is negligible, with most of them not working longer hours on the farm as one would expect (refer to Graph 5.5).

An average of about 5 (males), 3 (females) and 4 hours (relatives) a day of manual labour contribution to the leaseholders (Field Survey, 1989) is unsatisfactory commercially. An important point about females is that in coastal regions and outlying islands where most of these households came from, it is uncommon for them to work on the farm. This has changed in Lomaivuna probably through their desire to adapt to the situation in order to do better. Also not common in the village is working on the farm daily for longer hours which has changed slightly in Lomaivuna. For a type of farming where the activities are no different from those in village agriculture, everyone tries to assist whenever possible.

Table 5.5 shows the types of farming activities and division of labour in the household. The figures in the columns rank the activities (i.e. 1 for most important to 6 for least important). Division of labour is based on sex and age. Those who are free and uncommitted help out in the more common farm activities as weeding and clearing. Transport and marketing are usually the responsibilities of the leaseholder and his wife. Occasionally even the younger children assist on the farm but their contribution is insignificant compared to the others.

Farm	Adult	L/holder	s' Adult	Male
Activities	<u>Sons</u>	Wives	Daughters	Relatives
Clear, prepare land	1 1	3	5	5
Dig and plant	2	5	3	3
Weed and clear	3	1	l	1
Fertilize and spray	, 4	4	4	4
Harvest	5	2	2	2
Transport and marke	et 6	6	6	6
Poultry and Piggery	/unin	nportant	for most p	eople)

Table 5.5 Division of Labour, 1988 - 89

(Field Survey, 1989)

5.6.2 Tools and Equipment

Similar to most developing countries, the farmers rely on manual labour and simple gardening tools. In Fiji the only possible exception are in sugar-cane and rice farming which are partially mechanized. In Lomaivuna even bullock or horse-drawn ploughs are not common. The mixed farming character of the scheme, small size of average cultivated area (refer to Table 5.6), fairly low fluctuating returns and high maintenance costs make mechanized equipment uneconomical for use. Tractors are seldom hired for farm work. Electrical water pumps are used only for washing ginger during the harvesting season. The farmer pays for the service in either cash or fuel and a service charge. A few farmers had purchased rotary-hoes which later, had broken down and discarded through poor maintenance and mishandling. The most common implements are cane knives, digging forks, spades, long spades, a few wheel barrows (recently), wooden sticks for planting taro and some carpentary tools. A few have chain-saws which are mostly for hire. Since cattle or wild pigs are seldom a problem, fencing is not necessary. Many farmers mark their boundaries by planting trees.

5.7 Crops and their Viability

The scheme has a history of crop changes; from the aborted rubber production plan to bananas, taro, pineapples then ginger. Today ginger is the prestigious crop but individual farmers emphasize different crops. In spite of that, traditional staples (cassava, taro and sweet potatoes) also figure prominently in the farming pattern. So far the Extension Service has not been able to introduce a viable crop with long-term profitability and marketability. With the current support of the Government through the present Development Plan on ginger production, the farmers are hopeful and optimistic about the future. Table 5.6 shows the importance of ginger as a source of income in relation to others in terms of number of farmers involved and average cultivated area.

Sources of	Number of		Average
Income	Leaseholders	00	<u>Area (ha)</u>
Ginger	25	33	0.12
Cassava	23	29	0.36
Taro	20	25	0.22
(Handicraft e	tc) 4	5	-
Pineapple	3	4	0.18
'Yaqona'	2	2	0.18
Watermelon	2.	1	0.4
(Piggery)	- 	l	-

Table 5.6 Main Sources of Income, 1988 - 9

NB: Minor sources excluded (Field Survey, 1989)

5.7.1 Ginger

Totally produced in the Central Division, Lomaivuna is one of the main producing areas. With a current consolidated position as a significant industry, ginger is the third largest crop export-earner in Fiji. It is also the largest employer of farm labour on a unit area basis (DAF, 1989). The Government has helped in the development of domestic markets as the NMA and import-export firms. Enlarging the market system has increased production and sale of immature, premature and mature ginger. The shorter-producing period of the first two types is an advantage (see 5.8.1). However problems which are still of concern to the Extension Service and leaseholders are the high cost of labour inputs, processing inefficiency, declining land productivity and soil fertility.

According to the Extension Service, ginger is a high-nutrient consumption crop causing soil decline and increasing reliance on fertilizers. In the long term, leaseholders may suffer if they do not manage and utilize their land rationally. Post-harvest losses during cleaning and transportation further reduce the output that reaches the market. Nematode damage during the growing season have been reduced through less use of diseased rhizomes, hot-water treatment of seeds and crop rotation. The DAF stated that this problem usually reduced the potential yield by up to 50% before 1978. Production is not easy as one hectare of mature ginger requires 750 man-days compared to 630 for immature ginger (DAF, 1989). The crop's future would look more promising with improved marketing, greater demand and better prices. Table 5.6 indicates that the average area devoted to ginger is still very small as determined by the quota-marketing system. This is illustrated in Graph 5.6 below.



Key:

Α.	Melons and Yams	D.	Yaqona	G.	Sweet Potatoes
в.	Pandanus (Voivoi)	E.	Pineapples	н.	Others
c.	Bananas	F.	Vegetables		

NB: For Lomaivuna in 1988 - 89 (Field Survey, 1989)

5.7.2 Root Crops

Taro, cassava and sweet potatces are the most important root crops but not much can be done to improve their production

,

without available markets to be exploited. Apart from the saturated domestic markets, external outlets are small and unreliable. Chandra (1983, 62 - 64) stated that there were 13,000 and 11,500 cassava and taro producers respectively in the Central Division alone in 1978. Nearly 50% of them are from Naitasiri Province, one of five provinces in the division. Over half of their crops are sold in the urban markets. Intensive production is unnecessary and farmers are reluctant (or cannot afford) to use fertilizers or insecticides in their cultivation. In the current Development Plan, the Government has encouraged the production of Samoan 'Tausala' taro variety for exports to New Zealand, United States and Australia 'in its agricultural programmes. In general root crops are grown for the domestic markets.

The farmers decide the type of cultivars for planting. These are chosen according to hardiness, dependability and palatability which affect marketability and prices. Root crops are vital for long-term security (compared tc ginger) and because they are not labour-intensive. Production has to be regulated also to prevent over-supply. There is rarely a supply slump on the domestic markets.

A major problem is the use of these crops for traditional obligations as gifts and ceremonies. Seldom are these out-flows accounted for and its impact on one's farming enterprise is not even considered or assessed. The practice of a diversified (mixed) cropping system by most farmers has helped to make crops available for weekly marketing. Nearly all the leaseholders rely on these crops, especially cassava and taro.

5.7.3 Other Crops

Bananas and pineapples are no longer feasible as important sources of income because of competition from specialist producers in Naitasiri, Tailevu, Namosi and Serua provinces. Furthermore the urban markets usually have enough supply with 'middleman' market-vendors act:ve in their sale as these crops normally remain good for quite some time. Some farmers are disinterested in these crops because they take up and monopolise a good part of their land for a longer period than most other crops. This reduces the farmers' choice of crops.

With minimal area being devoted to them, these two crops are grown on fringes to demarcate plots. Nevertheless pineapple is important to three farmers as their main source of income (refer to Table 5.6). 'Yaqona' (Piper <u>methysticum</u>) and water-melon are relatively recent sources of income. The former takes a longer time to mature (about 4 - 6 years), depending on the fertility of the soil. Water-melon, however, is more suitable for the lowland sandy soil. Provided in Table 5.7 is the total number of farmers that grow each crop.

5.8 Farming Patterns

For ginger and pineapples, farmers use techniques advised by the DAF extension officers. Little change has been made in the cultivation of traditional crops. For them the farming patterns

are no different from swidden agriculture practised in the villages.

5.8.1 Ginger Farming

This crop requires closer attention and commitment for most of the year than other crops. The growing season begins in June -July when weeding and clearing are done. These are followed by the first and second digging to break up the soil with the application of poultry fertilizer. This work should be completed in August - September when farmers start hot-water treating their seeds. Planting begins in September with the application of NPK fertilizers. By the end of September, the plots are topdressed with Urea. Hilling, to form long rows of ginger plants, begins when the seedlings are about ten centimetres above ground. This continues for the next 4 - 7 months depending on the type of ginger in production.

Immature ginger takes six months to be ready for harvest compared to premature ginger (" months) or mature ginger (10 -12 months). Respectively the harvesting months are February, March - April and July - December. Despite the slightly lower prices, immature and premature ginger are preferred (shortergrowing periods).

5.8.2 Other Crops

While all root crops can be grown at any time of the year, it is still better to make preparation during the dry mid-year months for planting immediately before the wet season begins in October. This applies especially to taro for healthy growth and better productivity. The traditional schedule is: May - August (clearing, burning of debris and digging); September - December (planting); and August (harvesting). Maintenance and clearing of weeds are done throughout after taro is planted. In Lomaivuna, the farmers cultivate taro throughout the year to allow a continuous supply for marketing and the exploitation of the better off-season prices.

Cassava, the most commonly-grown crop is still cultivated in mounds with 4 - 5 cuttings each. However row planting is becoming popular, especially if grown in former pineapple or ginger plots. Cassava is probably the easiest to produce requiring less labour input, time for maintenance and takes a shorter time (4 - 5 months) to mature. Sweet potatoes, grown also in mounds and rows, only take 3 - 4 months to mature. Generally tree crops such as bananas, plantain, pawpaw, coconut palms, lemon and lime or orange are mainly grown for domestic use and ornamental purposes. This type of agro-forestry has always been a part of the traditional farming system.

5.8.3 Soil Erosion and Infertility

Soil in Fiji particularly on the hill slopes of wet eastern Viti Levu and other larger islands has moderate fertility. High rainfall prevents humus accumulation. Soil infiltration and surface drainage leach and remove nutrients reducing fertility. Lomaivuna has acidic humic latesols which can support a limited range of crops (DAF, 1989 and Chandra 1983, 11). Any misuse, over-use or abuse can lead to long-term infertility rendering it unusable economically. This has forced farmers to use the traditional methods of swidden agriculture, fallowing and crop rotation with limited fertilizers.

Freshly cleared areas are cultivated with the main crops for about two seasons (one for ginger to avoid nematode attacks) depending on crop productivity. Other crops are planted in later seasons on a rotational basis. A three-crop rotation is normal: ginger or taro in the first year; taro in the second or third year; cassava or sweet potatoes for another three years; and finally, the land is fallowed for about five years or more. The latter helps to recuperate soil fertility. The system or number of crops used is the farmer's prerogative.

5.9 Household Income

Income patterns help to explain farmer performance, potential for expansion through capital accumulation and individual capability to participate effectively in a competitive domestic

market economy. In Lomaivuna, other factors as the use of crops for traditional purposes, soil fertility and market saturation should also be considered. Furthermore individual farmers only produce crops which appeal to them. It is important to note that any minor discrepancy observed through comparative tallying analysis of Tables 5.7 - 5.13 on incomes, expenses or net returns is due to the cumulative impact of the decimal factor (the necessity to change figures to the nearest whole numbers). The popularity of each crop car be assessed from Table 5.7 below.

		\$'000	\$'000	\$1	000
	Number of	Total	Average	Ra	inge
Produces	Farmers	Income	Income	Low	High
Cassava	79	81.2	1.0	0.15	7.0
Taro	77	71.0	0.9	0.2	9.0
Ginger	75	53.6	0.7	0.3	1.5
S/Potatoes	28	9.0	0.32	0.15	0.5
Pineapples	23	12.7	0.55	0.1	2.5
Vegetables	s 19	2.9	0.15	0.1	0.3
Bananas	6	3.35	0.55	0.1	0.9
`Yaqona'	4	21.9	5.45	0.3	10.0
(Piggery)	2	9.2	4.6	1.2	8.0
(Poultry)	2	1.2	0.6	0.2	1.0
Yams	l	0.7			
Water melo	on 1	2.05			

Table 5.7 Produces and Estimated Returns, 1988-89

NB: non-farm excluded

(Field Survey, 1989)

Cassava, which is usually plentiful at the market, costs less but 'yaqona' (in great demand) is very profitable. Prices for other crops are not as good because of low demand. The presence of middlemen at most urban centres presents serious competition and affects both market prices and farmers' returns. These middlemen, because they live in the urban areas, have no reason to be worried by the unreasonable prices they put up. Without the time to spend marketing their produces, many farmers sell to them.

High returns do not necessarily mean that a farmer is successful or prosperous. For the small farmers of Lomaivuna, most of their income goes into farm investments, repayments of debts, domestic and other expenses. A farmer's ability to cultivate a large proportion of his block does not mean that he is doing well. Market demand and the capability to make good sales are just as important. For most leaseholders, the household incomes are made up of farm, off-farm (remittances) and non-farm income (from other sources as trucking, hancicraft and wood carving) as given in Table 5.8.

Table 5.8	Total Average	Income, 1988-89
Major	Number of	(\$000)
Sources	Leaseholders	Amount (%)
Farm	80	\$3.36 (58)
Off-farm	54	1.9 (33)
Non-farm	38	0.51 (9)

(Field Survey, 1989)

5.9.1 Farm Income

As shown in Table 5.7, over 94% of the sampled leaseholders produce the first three crops which bring in about 77% of the average income (cassava 30%, taro 27% and ginger 20%). The other produces are grown to safeguard against unexpected poor seasons. Capital-intensive activities as poultry and pig farming are beyond their individual resources and financial capabilities. Excluding off-farm income, root crops make up about 60% of the total income compared to the other crops' 36%.

5.9.2 Non Farm Income

In rural Fiji, there is a strong relationship between individual small farming and non-farm economic activities. The most common in Lomaivuna are handicraft, wood-carving, trucking and to a limited extent, prawn sales. About 48% of the leaseholders earn some income from these activities at one time or another. However, four of them rely on these activities, especially handicraft and wood-carving as their main sources of income (see Table 5.6). In this way traditional skills are being utilized to boost economic returns. Table 5.9 outlines these non-farm activities and their benefits to the farmers.

Table 5.9 Nor	n Farm So	urces of	E Income,	1988	-89
		\$1000	\$'000	\$'00	0
	Number/	Total	Average	Rang	e
Sources	Farmers	Income	Income	Low	<u>High</u>
Handicraft	26	9.37	0.36	0.2	2.44
Wood Carving	9	6.25	0,69	0.2	2.4
Trucking	1	2.84	-	-	
Prawn Sales	2	0.92	0.46	0.42	0.5

(Field Survey, 1989)

5.9.3 Off Farm Income

Off-farm (and non-farm) incomes have always played an important and growing role in the economy of a significant portion of farming households in Fiji [Anderson, (1968, 15) and Sofer (1983, 13)]. It seems that the growth of the household, pressure on the land or low crop demand and prices, and availability of off-farm employment are the motivational factors. In Lomaivuna, this source, in the form of remittances from household members, plays a more important role than non-farm income. About 33% of the households benefit from it with an average of nearly \$2,000.00 for the surveyed period (see Table 5.8). The remittances range from as low as \$400.00 to about \$6,000.00 (a household with four wage/salary employees). On the whole, farming remains the main source of income for most households. The future importance of non-farm income and off-farm employment depends on the growth and profitability of farming and the efforts put in by individual farmers.

5.10 Farmer Performance

Sofer (1987, 16) states that flexible and secure land tenure, government support and infrastructure have helped farmers to show a greater degree of success in Lomaivuna. Also important to consider are the sacrifice, perseverance and cooperation shown by individual farmers and their households. In this study, farmer performance is assessed by means of farming returns (economic and standing crops), standard of living in terms of home and capital assets, and farming management. In Table 5.10 -5.12, the farmers are assessed according to age, periods of entry and provincial origin. The aim is to find whether there is any similarities or differences in farming productivity. The impact of the number of farmers per group is considered.

Graph 5.5 may assist in the understanding of the returns by labour input of the household members. Note that the members' work duration (in weeks) per year is variable. Constraints as bad weather, traditional and other

136.

commitments, holidays and illnesses should be considered.Table 5.10a below is based on calculating a conservative 40-week yearly working duration. It has also considered the common practice of Fiji farmers working an average of 8 - 10 hours per day during a 5-day week (marketing and preparation for Sabbath on Saturday). Average household earnings of \$4,854 (gross) and \$2,033 (net) per annum can be found in Table 5.13.

Sources	% Labour Input]nput Val Gross	ue Per Net	Week	(\$)
Sons	24	29	12		
Farmers' Wive	s 18	22	9		
Daughters	13	16	7		
Relatives (ma	les) 16	19	8		

Table 5.10a : Returns By Labour Input

NOTE: Average Weekly Earnings - Gross \$121, Net \$51 Source : Field Survey, 1989.

The balance of each column is the conservative assessment of the individual leaseholder's contribution. Of significance is the high input of the female members exceeding that of the immediate male members (sons) by about 7%. The major determining factors in the above analysis are household membership composition and farm work duration (hours per week) by each membership group.

136a

The table shows that there is not much difference in the net input values. Daughters' and relatives' input values are both below the mean of 22 (gross) and 9 (net). Table 5.5 provides the types of farming activities done on the farm.

Age	No.	of	Farm,	/	Averaged	Income	(\$'000)	
<u>Grps.</u>	Farr	ners	<u>Size</u>	Farm	Non-Farm	<u>Off-Far</u>	m <u>Total</u>	<u>Net</u>
			(ha)					
60+	11	L	4.23	\$3.14	\$0.27	\$2.08	\$5.49	\$2.37
				(57%)	(5%)	(38%)		(43%)
50+	33	3	4.13	2.98	0.43	1.37	4.77	2.07
				(62%)	(9%)	(29%)		(43%)
40+	28	3	4.83	3.55	0.2	1.18	4.94	2.01
				(72%)	(4%)	(24%)		(41%)
30+	(5	4.25	5.33	0.33	0.24	5.6	2.65
				(95)	(0.6)	(4.4)		(47)
30-	2	2	4.05	1.65	0.1	-	1.75	0.21
				(94)	(6)			(12)

Table 5.10 Returns by Age Groups, 1988-89

(Field Survey, 1989)

5.10.2 By Periods of Entry

Not all leaseholders above fifty years of age entered the scheme in the 1960s. About 16% of them came to Lomaivuna after 1967. On the other hand, those who came to Lomaivuna in the 1980s are not necessarily young farmers. The following table (5.11) relates farmer performance by age groups in terms of economic returns.

	No. of	Farm,	/	Average	ed Income	(\$000)	
Periods	Farmers	Size	Farm	Non-Farm	Off-Farm	<u>Total</u>	Net
		(ha)					
E/1960s	45	4.16	\$2.93	\$0.3	\$1.71	\$4.99	\$2.1
			(60%)	(6%)	(34%)		(41%)
L/1960s	12	4.12	2.99	0.23	0.55	3.77	1.27
			(79)	(6)	(15)		(34)
1970s	17	4.83	4.85	0.11	0.62	5.58	2.86
			(87)	(2)	(11)		(51)
1980s	6	4.79	2.7	0.05	1.48	4.24	0.95
			(64)	(1)	(35)		(22)

Table 5.11 Returns by Periods of Entry, 1988-89

NB: 1. Farm size in hectares

2. Percentages in brackets

3. E Early; L Late

(Field Survey, 1989)

There is not much difference in the returns for the farming season judging from the presentation in Table 5.11 and the previous table. The best-performers seem to be those who entered the scheme in the 1970s during the DAF management (the greatest percentage of income from farming and the best net returns). Farm size has nothing to do with this. It would be unjust to say that there was a closer association between these leaseholders and the DAF extension officers. The proportion of 'off-farm' income in the 1980s group's total income is fairly high (people who have just entered the scheme). This is explained by the presence of recently retired wage/salary earners. Non-farm income is the least important to the leaseholders.

5.10.3 By Provincial Origin

All groups earn not less than an average of \$2,000.00 from farming with the highest for Tailevu and Lau farmers (see Table 5.12). Non-farm sources remain the least important (similar to the two previous assessments). Rewa farmers seem to rely the most on off-farm incomes followed by leaseholders from other Viti Levu provinces (including Tailevu and Lau). This could be due to either the presence of wage or salary-earners in the households or proximity to their home provinces (villages and relatives) and nearby urban certres. It should be noted that one and five individuals from Tailevu and Lau (respectively) were the best performers. Farming remains the major source (over 59% of the total returns) with non-farm income the least important.

Tabl	<u>e 5.12</u> 1	Returi	ns by 1	Provincia	l Origin,	1988-	89
	No of	Farm,	/	Averaged	d Income	(\$000)	
Origin	Farmers	<u>Size</u>	Farm	Non-Farm	<u>Off-Farm</u>	n <u>Total</u>	Net
			(ha)				
Lau	49	4.31	\$3.34	\$0.26	\$1.32	\$4.93	\$2.14
			(68%)	(5%)	(27%)		(44%)
Other							
Island							
Provinces	13	4.35	2.88	0.06	0.72	3.67	1.58
			(79)	(2)	(19)		(43)
Rewa	6	4.05	2.89	0.15	1.85	4.89	1.77
			(59)	(3)	(38)		(36)
Tailevu	6	4.38	4.15	0.52	1.4	6.07	2.01
			(68)	(9)	(23)		(33)
Other							
Viti Levu	L						
Provinces	6	4.12	2.90	-	1.52	4.42	1.33
			(66)	-	(34)		(30)

(Field Survey, 1989)

Overall, younger farmers seem to rely more on farming (market gardening) while others also exploit available sources of income depending on the household's economic position, arising opportunities, resources or the presence of wage/salary-earners. Off and non-farm income are support sources of older leaseholders. Lau farmers, with their traditional craftsmanship, are the most involved in handicraft and wood-carving. The three tables show that the farmers' spending is greatly dependent on available financial returns. In such a position of limited resources, it is hard to fully carry out what one wishes to do to improve on the farm (or business) enterprise.

5.11 Budgeting and Standard of Living

Budgeting, basic financial management and accounting skills, for Lomaivina farmers or most rural small farmers in Fiji remain problem areas. Anderson (1968, 17) states that few rural small farmers and households maintair written records of incomes and expenses to enable them basic tudgeting, farm/household planning and management. Another is the farmer's refusal or reluctance to reveal their bank assets (savings, loans, etc.). The general offer was that they only had a few dollars in savings, that business was bad (especially market saturation) or they had many commitments (including traditional obligations) to meet. These had been frustrating their progress. It would be unreasonable to deny them this right if they felt that such revelation would be embarassing (despite promises about anonymity or confidentiality).

5.11.1 Investment and Expenses

Incomes from different sources are provided in Tables 5.7 - 5.9 with an overall presentation (with expenses and returns) in Table 5.13. Graph 5.8 analyses the major expense components. Farm investment (or expenses) is limited to basic requirements for most farmers. The most common are fertilizers, insecticides,

weedicides, seeds, fuel, tools and for some, labour costs. For most farmers, investment in the true sense of the word, is limited to the education of their children.



Graph 5.7 Average Expense Analysis (%), 1988-89

```
Major Expenses Major Other Farm

(Expenses)

<u>Key:</u> A. Domestic B. Transport C. Education

D. Traditional Obligations E. Farm

E.(i) Fertilizers (ii) Labour

(iii) Land Rents (iv) Weedicide

(v) Bank Payment (vi) Insecticide

(vii) Seeds (viii) Fuel

(ix) Tools (Field Survey, 1989)
```

The average total income and expenses range between \$1,700.00 - \$6,000.00 and \$1,500.00 - \$4,000.00 respectively with an average net returns of \$200.00 - \$2,000.00. The survey revealed that five farmers (four from Lau and one from Tailevu) earned and spent more than the others (refer to 5.10.3). The latter earned a gross income of \$17,900.00, over 70% from pig farming with the balance from the trucking business and sale of crops. His average net return was about \$6,000.00. It means that this single individual dominates the analysis for Tailevu farmers in Table 5.12.

Domestic needs (mostly store foodstuffs, clothing, home appliances and furnishings) are the largest expense items. Farm investment and expenses make up about 35% of the total. The other major components are transport costs, education and traditional obligations. The latter should make up a greater share of the total expenses if the value of crops (or animals) and other exchange items (clothing, store foodstuffs, kerosene or traditional exchange goods) is considered.

The following table indicates a fairly satisfactory performance in terms of net returns to leaseholders. This has increased more than four times the projected net returns from banana production in the 1960s (see 3.3.8) but cost of living has also risen.

	Income	Expenses	
Farm	\$3,328	Fertilizers	\$201
Non Farm	242	Labour Costs	177
Off Farm	1,284	Weedicide	149
		Seeds	82
		Land Rents	129
		Other Items	269
		Home Welfare	1,062
		Transport	351
		Education	217
		T/Obligations	184
TOTAL	4,854		2,821

Table 5.13 Income, Expenses & Net Returns, 1988-9

NB: Net Return of \$2,033 (Field Survey, 1989)

This has been achieved through minimizing their expenses. However, some improvement could still be achieved if unproductive expenses (as traditional obligations) are further reduced in order to boost farm investment. This may help to raise productivity and returns to the farmers. Nevertheless it should be noted that the data provided in this table, based on averaging the figures for all in the survey can be misleading because of its distributory influence. As Tables 5.10 - 5.12 show, a few farmers earned less than the averaged net return in Table 5.13. The same also applies to gross returns and expenses.

The average gross earnings of urban employees in labour jobs (both public and private) vary between \$4000 - \$5000 per annum (Fiji Facts And Figures, Economic Statistics, BSF, Suva). Village cash-crop earnings depend on the types of crops (see Section 5.7). Of importance are sugarcane (Western Viti Levu and northern Vanua Levu, broom-corn and melon (Sigatoka Valley), tobacco (Nadi) and rice (Rewa, Navua and Dreket: Valley). With reliable markets and reasonable constant prices, these farmers are assured of more regular but lower income flow. The tobacco farmers have a net annual income of about \$2,021 (Eaton 1988, 27). For over 2,200 sugarcane farmers (overall), an average of about 227 tonnes per farmer (57 tonnes/ha and \$39/tonne) bring an average gross earnings of nearly \$9,000 for 1989 (BSF, 1989-90).

However, the earnings seem to be somewhat compatible except for sugarcane. The major equalizing factor between the urban and rural employees is the high cost in the urban areas (electricity, gas, water, foodstuffs, etc). To these other farmers, fertilizers, weedicides, other chemicals and machinery are essential. This means more expenses and greater loan commitments. Lease rents are higher; \$200/ha (tobacco) and \$35/ha for sugarcane (Eaton, ibid).

144a

5.11.2 Material Assets

The previous discussion on incomes, expenses and net returns may look good when in fact, the farmers are trying hard to cope with rising cost of living, farm inputs, transport and the handicap of saturated markets. Farmers are finding it difficult to sell at their preferred prices because the public are hard pressed financially to make ends meet. As a result, many farmers could not afford to improve the material aspects of their lives in terms of furnishings or improvement of their homes and other domestic needs. Some farmers' houses badly need repair as these are more or less still in the state when the LDA built them.

Practically the state of households is more satisfying than most in the village and they are better off in terms of their own leasehold block and some degree of freedom with the opportunity to earn more regularly from farming. It is assumed that most leaseholders have achieved what they want and the life they live today is quite fulfilling to them. Farming expansion, greater productivity for economic gains and subsequently social improvement would only be pursued if the opportunity arises in terms of the introduction of a profitable crop, available markets, market demand and better prices. Graph 5.8 below may help illustrate the material assets of farmers in Lomaivuna to give some idea of their standard of living.

Graph 5.8 Household Assets, 1988-89



Household Asset Groups

0. Basic Assets

1. Basic Assets - some furnishings, kerosene stove and light, benzine light and iron, and radio.

2. Basic Assets and some luxuries - kerosene fridge sewing machine and some furnishings.

3. Assets in 2. plus farming tools as sprayer, plough and better furnishings

4. All assets in the first three plus chain-saw and better furnishings

5. Assets in 2. - 4 plus own generated electricity

6. Assets in 2 - 5 plus motor vehicle.

(Field Survey, 1989)

The above graph tries to show household status by material assets. The nil frequency for Asset Group 0 shows that these leaseholders are better than most village farmers. Many of the leaseholders are in the middle groups. A very minor proportion have managed to do better and are in the upper groups (5 and 6). Although all leaseholders can be said to strive for their households' economic security and satisfaction, it is hard to say this that has brought then a better quality of life. Some have acquired enough (materially or otherwise) to illustrate their achievements in Lomaivuna. This does not necessarily mean that they are not concerned with what they have managed so far. With the level of fluctuating returns these farmers are getting, most are just satisfied that the present state of affairs of the household is maintained, let alone obtaining material gains. There is no real drive and determination to do better in business and material possessions without the much-needed support mentioned in previous chapters.

The farmers' experiences in Lomaivuna did not meet their initial expectations. They had hoped to achieve more than was practically possible. Nevertheless such desires drove many to work their land purposefully for the households' welfare (refer Section 5.5). The table below shows the average percentages of sampled leaseholders' perceptions or choices of scheme benefits.

Table 5.14 : Farmer Perceptions Of Scheme Benefits	(옹)			
Individual landholding and lease tenancy				
Economic/Financial benefits				
Educational opportunities for children	17			
Social/Domestic gains	15			
Knowledge/Experience of better farming methods	9			
Business experience/maturity				
Greater access to Government/other services				
Access to other economic/employment opportunities	6			
Freedom from village obligations	2			

Source : Field Survey, 1989

Through farming their own leaseholds, many expected to earn enough to set them up in life, in a manner preferable to the village (refer Section 6.3 - 6.5). They hoped there would be enough earnings to provide for consumer items and to send the children to good schools. This would open the way to better jobs and a better future for their children. The benefits are probably determined by proximity to the urban areas, their facilities, services and amenities. These are the advantages of relocation to the main island and living closer to the capital, Suva (refer Graph 5.4, Section 5.5 and 6.2).

Without available personal resources and assets (as village peasant cultivators), most leaseholders had looked forward to the assistance and cooperation of the Government and support agencies (see Subsection 6.3.1). Initially this was provided via the LDA (loans, farm assistance and marketing) and the FDB (loans). Today the DAF provides the only active assistance (refer Chapter 3), ever since the demise of the LDA (1969). The farmers' views of the support agencies are provided in Table 5.15.

Table 5.15 : Generalized Farmer Perceptions Of Assistance

Highly Satisfactory	Satisfactory	Unsatisfactory
DAF Extension Service	FDB	FAB
DAF, Nausori/Suva	NLTB	Banks
NMA	Landowners	District
	Balthan	Administration
	TFP	

Source : Field Survey, 1989.

147b.

Based in Lomaivuna, the Agricultural Extension Service, (supported by the DAF) have continued to assist and advise the leaseholders (refer Chapter 3 and 5). The NMA had also continued to provide marketing as arranged through the Extension Officers (for the farmers) until the late 1970s. The NLTB and FDB, on the other hand, were not held in high esteem. This is probably due to conflicting issues of lease rent and arrears payment or loan difficulties respectively. Balthan International and TFP had been quite cooperative in the marketing of ginger.

Other listed agencies were not important but the landowners, as a traditional norm, had to show support out of respect. The impact of mcnetization (relative to problems associated with lease rent payments) has eroded and strained this relationships (see Subsection 3.4.3 and 3.5.2). Most leaseholders have nothing to do with the commercial banks because of their high loan interest policies.

147c