

## **The 2010-11 Employment and Unemployment Survey Preliminary Findings**

The 2010-11 Employment and Unemployment Survey (EUS) was a sample survey conducted by the Fiji Bureau of Statistics between April 2010 and March 2011. The EUS is an in-depth household survey which gathers detailed labour force information such as, employment, unemployment, underemployment, work skills, the employment initiatives of the unemployed etc. It also gathered information on unpaid household work, and leisure activities such as sports, religion and other social activities. The availability of such information allows for the formulation of plans and programs aimed to better develop and utilize the country's human resources.

This is the second such survey, conducted since the 2004-05 EUS. While it will be possible to make many comparisons with the earlier survey, the 2010-11 Survey has a number of extra questions on non-employment activities, with some variations from the 2004-05 Questionnaire.

### **Total population as per survey**

While the 2007 Census had indicated a total population of 837,271 persons, the 2010-11 EUS indicated a total population of 819,416. The latter figure is lower largely because the EUS covers the conventional households, excluding the "institutional" population at the time of the EUS, such as those in the services, prisons, school residences etc. Some differences are also to be expected because the 2010-11 EUS data is from a small sample of 2.2% of households and the estimates would be subjected to sampling errors, although there is reasonable accuracy on key statistics. Readers are advised to be cautious when comparing the EUS aggregates for populations with the 2007 census results and projections.

### **1. Population by age, sex, rural/urban**

Table 1a indicates the gender composition of the age groups, with higher proportions of females at the highest age groups, due to the higher average life expectancy of females.

<b>Table 1a Population (by age groups and sex (2010-11 EUS</b>				
<b>Age</b>	<b>Female</b>	<b>Male</b>	<b>All</b>	<b>% Fem</b>
A 0-4	36273	40917	77190	47
B 5-9	38040	39769	77809	49
C 10-14	35653	41200	76853	46
D 15-19	35468	38316	73784	48
E 20-24	33044	37368	70412	47
F 25-29	37145	36636	73780	50
G 30-34	28998	31316	60313	48
H 35-39	26952	29930	56882	47
I 40-44	27196	26933	54129	50
J 45-49	26448	26608	53056	50
K 50-54	22379	24298	46677	48
L 55-59	16515	18655	35170	47
M 60-64	12457	11169	23625	53
N 65-69	8699	8916	17615	49
O 70-74	5746	5385	11131	52
P > 75	5808	5181	10989	53
<b>All</b>	<b>396821</b>	<b>422595</b>	<b>819416</b>	<b>48</b>

Table 1b gives the rural/urban break-down of the population by age groups.

<b>Table 1b Population by Age Groups and Rural/Urban (2010-11 EUS)</b>				
<b>Age</b>	<b>Rural</b>	<b>Urban</b>	<b>All</b>	<b>% Rural</b>
A 0-4	40622	36568	77190	53
B 5-9	39833	37976	77809	51
C 10-14	40588	36265	76853	53
D 15-19	34101	39683	73784	46
E 20-24	32066	38346	70412	46
F 25-29	32635	41146	73780	44
G 30-34	26661	33653	60313	44
H 35-39	26622	30260	56882	47
I 40-44	26558	27571	54129	49
J 45-49	26683	26373	53056	50
K 50-54	21724	24953	46677	47
L 55-59	18462	16707	35170	52
M 60-64	11786	11840	23625	50
N 65-69	10425	7190	17615	59
O 70-74	6527	4604	11131	59
P > 75	6579	4410	10989	60
<b>All</b>	<b>401871</b>	<b>417545</b>	<b>819416</b>	<b>49</b>

The percentages in rural areas, while around 49% in aggregate, is somewhat higher in the ages 0 to 14, and also amongst the elderly with the proportion of the over 65 being around 60% in rural areas.

## 2. Dependency Ratios

Table 2a indicates the rural/urban differences in dependency ratios. While the national Total Dependency Ratio is 50%, Child dependency, elderly dependency and Total Dependency are all significantly higher in the rural areas, indicating a greater burden on those of working ages. In particular, the Elderly Dependency Ratio is some 64% higher in the rural areas than in urban areas, indicating the higher urgency to the problems of the elderly in the rural areas.

<b>Table 2a Dependency Ratios (%) 2010-11</b>				
<b>Age</b>	<b>Rural</b>	<b>Urban</b>	<b>All</b>	
	<b>Numbers</b>			
(1) 0 to 14	121042	110809	231852	
(2) 15 to 64	257298	290531	547829	
(3) > 64	23531	16204	39735	
<b>All</b>	<b>401871</b>	<b>417545</b>	<b>819416</b>	
	<b>Percentages</b>			<b>%(R-U)/U</b>
Child dependency ratio (1)/((2)	47	38	42	23
Elderly Dependency ratio (3)/(2)	9	6	7	64
Total Dependency ratio (1+3)/(2)	56	44	50	29

Table 2b indicates the quite differential growth rates of the population in the different age groups. While total household population is indicated to have grown by a small 0.2%, the rural sector declined by 0.6% while the urban sector grew by 1%.

<b>Table 2b Dependency Ratios (2004-05 to 2010-11)</b>			
<b>Ages</b>	<b>2004-05</b>	<b>2010-11</b>	<b>% Change</b>
<b>Rural</b>	<b>404384</b>	<b>401871</b>	<b>-0.6</b>
A 0-14	127585	121042	-5.1
B 15-64	257215	257298	0.0
C >64	19584	23531	20.2
<b>Urban</b>	<b>413568</b>	<b>417545</b>	<b>1.0</b>
A 0-14	113485	110809	-2.4
B 15-64	285120	290531	1.9
C >64	14964	16204	8.3
<b>All</b>	<b>817952</b>	<b>819416</b>	<b>0.2</b>

The different age groups show much greater diversity. The 0-14 age group declined in the rural areas, by 5%, and in urban areas by a smaller 2%. However, the over 64 age group increased in rural areas by a large 20%, compared to an also moderate 8% in urban areas.

Child Dependency Ratios i.e. the number of persons aged 0-14 divided by the number of persons aged 15- 64 have declined over the period with a slightly higher rate in the rural areas (-5.2%) than in urban areas (-4.2%).

<b>Table 2c Child Dependency Ratios (2004-05, 2010-11)</b>			
	<b>2004-05</b>	<b>2010-05</b>	<b>% Change</b>
Rural	49.6	47.0	-5.2
Urban	39.8	38.1	-4.2
Total	44.5	42.3	-4.8

Table 2d indicates that the Elderly Dependency Ratios are increasing quite rapidly in rural areas (by 20%), compared to a more moderate 6.3% in urban areas, with a national aggregate increase of 14%. These are large changes over a short six years and point towards a greater need in area of elderly care.

<b>Table 2d Elderly Dependency Ratios (2004-05, 2010-11)</b>			
	<b>2004-05</b>	<b>2010-11</b>	<b>% Change</b>
Rural	7.6	9.1	20.1
Urban	5.2	5.6	6.3
Total	6.4	7.3	13.9

With the numbers in the child dependency age groups being much larger than those in the elderly, Table 2e indicates that the reduction in the Child Dependency Ratio is large enough to overcome the increase in the Elderly Dependency Ratios in both urban and rural areas. The Total Dependency Ratio therefore declined in rural areas by 1.8% and a slightly larger 3% in urban areas. Nationally the total dependency ratio declined by a small -2.5% indicating a slight easing of pressure on working age adults.

<b>Table 2e Total Dependency Ratios (2004-05, 2010-11)</b>			
	<b>2004-05</b>	<b>2010-11</b>	<b>% Change</b>
Rural	57.2	56.2	-1.8
Urban	45.1	43.7	-3.0
Total	50.8	49.6	-2.5

### **3. Economically Active, Money Income and Subsistence**

The Economically Active and the more familiar Labour Force are basically the same. Statisticians are more inclined to use the term Economically Active. There are two "economically active" concepts used in employment statistics: "usually active" and "currently active". The Usual Activity of an individual aged 15 and over is determined by the activity status which occupied a greater time period over the previous 12 months. The usually active are either Employed or Unemployed. Data on this will be given in later reports.

The Currently Active population are those aged 15 and over, who are Employed and Unemployed over the Last 7 Days, and corresponds to the "Labour Force" concept, which includes those employed, about to be employed, and unemployed.

In the 2010-11 EUS, a number of persons who recorded themselves as employed under the usual categories (A,B,C,D,E,F,G), also recorded that they were "Looking for Paid Employment".<sup>1</sup> This category (L) was interpreted to be part of the effectively "unemployed" group, in addition to those who explicitly said they were Unemployed (K).

Table 3.1 indicates that the Labour Force (those aged 15 and over) increased by 41,928 persons, or 13% between the two EUS.

---

<sup>1</sup>This question was unfortunately part of a section which excluded the respondents from the "formal unemployment" category, as well as the further questions on unemployment responses.

Wage employment decreased by 8306 persons (-6%), Salaried employment increased by 5,118 persons (12%) as did the Self-Employed (by 8,604 persons).

The most significant change however, was in those categorized as working for Family/No Pay which increased by an extremely large 112% or 38,442 persons. This is a category dominated by very low-paid persons who are significantly underemployed in terms of hours and days worked.

It should also be noted that the additional details captured in the EUS means a higher Labour Force number compared to the Population Census.

<b>Table 3a Labour Force (15 and over) (Over Last 7 Days)</b>				
<b>Row Labels</b>	<b>2004-05</b>	<b>2010-11</b>	<b>Absolute Change</b>	<b>Perc. Change</b>
A Wages	137782	129477	-8306	-6
B Salary	43221	48339	5118	12
C Employer	3319	4106	787	24
D Self-employed	74652	83292	8640	12
E Family/pay	2982	3155	172	6
F Family/no pay	34212	72654	38442	112
G Community worker	3479	2473	-1006	-29
H Job but not at work	8448	6415	-2033	-24
H Should be working soon	4189	1235	-2954	-71
K Unemployed	15608	17577	1970	13
L Looking for paid employment	7418	8514	1097	15
<b>Total Labour Force</b>	<b>335309</b>	<b>377237</b>	<b>41928</b>	<b>13</b>
Unemployed (K+L)	23025	26092	3066	13
Perc. Unemployed	6.9	6.9		1

The number unemployed, both explicitly unemployed and those stating they were "Looking for Paid Employment" increased by 13% and 15% respectively, to total 26,092 persons by 2010-11. This number is fairly close to those recorded as unemployed in the 2007 Census (28,220).

Another perspective on those working is obtained from Table 3b which indicates that while the total employed in Fiji increased by 15%, those working for Money increased by only 3%, while those dependent on Only Subsistence increased by an extremely large 93%. In other words the bulk of the 46,037 increase in employment went into Subsistence production, emphasizing the critical importance of this sector in coping with the increase in the Labour Force.

<b>Table 3b Working for Money and Subsistence (Last 7 Days)</b>				
	<b>2004-05</b>	<b>2010-11</b>	<b>Absolute Change</b>	<b>Perc. Change</b>
<b>1. Working for Money (A1+A2)</b>	<b>262331</b>	<b>270515</b>	<b>8185</b>	<b>3</b>
A1 Money/no subsistence	202422	180254	-22167	-11
A2 Money/with subsistence	59909	90261	30352	51
<b>2. Only subsistence</b>	<b>40640</b>	<b>78492</b>	<b>37852</b>	<b>93</b>
<b>3. Total Employed (1+2)</b>	<b>302970</b>	<b>349007</b>	<b>46037</b>	<b>15</b>

It is important to note that those working for "Money/No subsistence" i.e. only working for money decreased by 22,167 persons, or an extremely large 11%.

Table 3c gives the patterns of employment over the Last 7 Days and changes between the two EUS. The overall increase of 46,717 was largely due to the 57,449 increase in Skilled Agriculture and Fishery workers, and in smaller absolute increases in categories 1, 2 and 5.

<b>Row Labels</b>	<b>2004-05</b>	<b>2010-11</b>	<b>Abs. Ch.</b>	<b>Perc. Ch.</b>
1 Legislators, Senior Officials & Managers	15873	19009	3136	20
2 Professionals	19549	24321	4772	24
3 Technicians & Associated Professionals	18705	15536	-3169	-17
4 Clerks	20184	18204	-1980	-10
5 Service Workers and Shop and Market Sales	33242	37593	4351	13
6 Skilled Agriculture & Fishery Workers	79716	137165	57449	72
7 Craft & Related Workers	38809	33292	-5516	-14
8 Plant & Machine Operators and Assemblers	24807	24148	-660	-3
9 Elementary Occupations	55455	43790	-11665	-21
<b>FIJI</b>	<b>306339</b>	<b>353056</b>	<b>46717</b>	<b>15</b>

Significantly, there were reductions in categories 3 (Technicians and Associated Professionals), 4 (Clerks), categories 7 (Craft and Related Workers), 8 (Plant and Machine Operators) and 9 (Elementary Occupations). The categories in which these major reductions have taken place are extremely critical to economic productivity and growth.

#### **4. Not Economically Active**

Table 4.a gives those aged 15 and over who were classified as Economically Not Active (although it must be emphasized that those doing unpaid Full-time Household work do work on average some 40 hours per week).

As the categories for Not Active were expanded for the 2010-11 EUS, categories M, N, O and P have been aggregated into the upper half of the table.

<b>Category</b>	<b>2004-05</b>	<b>2010-11</b>	<b>Absolute Change</b>	<b>Perc. Change</b>
J Household work	128410	103676	-24733	-19
K Retired/Pensioner	14106	10383	-3723	-26
L Disabled	3644	5115	1471	40
Others (M,N,O,P)	17071	17356	285	2
X FT student	77978	72477	-5501	-7
Y NAS Sch.Age	449	40	-409	-91
<b>FIJI</b>	<b>241657</b>	<b>209047</b>	<b>-32611</b>	<b>-13</b>
<b>Breakdown of Others for 2010-11</b>				
M Old Age		10708		
N Sickly		4373		
O No intention to work		538		
P Other	17071	1737		

Overall, the aggregate Not Active decreased by 32,611 persons, of which the Household Workers contributed the largest reduction of 24,733 (or a very significant 19%). Much of this reduction may be seen as part of household strategy to cope with household needs during this period.

Significantly, those reporting themselves as Retired/Pensioners also reduced by 3723 persons or 26%, possibly for the same reason.

There was a 40% increase in those categorized as Disabled, probably a reflection of greater social willingness to accept this association.

<b>Table 4b Percentages of Age Groups Attending School</b>						
<b>School Age Groups</b>	<b>Percentage at School</b>			<b>Percentage Not at School</b>		
	<b>2004-05</b>	<b>2010-11</b>	<b>% Change</b>	<b>2004-05</b>	<b>2010-11</b>	<b>% Change</b>
A 0-4	6	1	-79	94	99	5
B 5 (ECE)	35	47	36	65	53	-19
C 6-13 (Primary)	96	99	4	4	1	-79
D 14-18 (Secondary)	82	88	7	18	12	-32
E 19-21 (Tertiary)	37	40	7	63	60	-4
F 22-29	7	8	17	93	92	-1
G 30-34	1	2	103	99	98	-1
H > 34	0	1	317	100	99	-1
<b>FIJI</b>	29	28	-4	71	72	2

Table 4b presents some interesting statistics on percentages of age groups attending and not attending school, according to the two EUS, with some generally good news.

At the primary school ages (6 to 13) there has been an increase from 96% to 99% or almost universal primary education.

At the secondary school ages (14 to 18 or five years of secondary) there has been a significant increase from 82% to 88% by 2010-11, an increase of 7%, no doubt a reflection of the taxpayers' subsidization of school bus fares and fees, and the Ministry of Education's pressure on schools not to ban students who are unable to pay fees. As of 2010-11, there still were some 12% of secondary school age children Not Attending School, a remaining challenge.

At the tertiary age group of 19 to 21, there has been a similar increase of 7% in school attendance, rising from 37% to 40%. There percentages are nevertheless still on the low side, indicating that 60% of all persons in the tertiary age groups are still not attending school.

At the pre-school age of 5, there is evidence of excellent progress in the increase in percentage attending school, rising from 35% in 2004-05 to 47% in 2010-11.

Given the generally good news above, it might be thought anomalous that at the Age group 0 to 4 (roughly representing earlier than pre-school ages) there has been a reduction of Percentages Attending School, from 6% down to 1%. It must also be noted that 60% of those aged 5 are still not attending school.

## 5. Unpaid Household Work

Table 5a gives the Total Household Work done (hours per week) at various age groups according to the 2010-11 EUS. It may be seen that right from the earliest years, Females do more household work per week than males: 1 hour more at the primary school ages, 5 hours more at the secondary age, 15 hours more at the tertiary ages, and 27 hours more at the ages 22 to 29.

Age Grps.	Female	Male	All	(F-M)
C 6-13	4	3	3	1.1
D 14-18	11	5	8	5.2
E 19-21	22	7	14	15.2
F 22-29	37	10	24	26.7
G 30-34	42	13	27	29.7
H > 34	32	11	21	20.8
FIJI	23	8	15	15.5

As table 5a also includes Full-Time Household workers at the upper ages, Table 5b gives the values by Employment Status over the Last 7 Days. This indicates again, that Female Wage and Salary Earners still do some 15 hours more on average per week than do Male Wage and Salary Earners. These differences have not changed from the previous EUS in 2004-05.

Employment Status	Female	Male	All	(F-M)
A Wages	24	9	13	15
B Salary	24	9	14	15
A and B	24	9	13	15

## 6. Leisure Time Use

For the first time, the 2010-11 EUS asked questions on Leisure Time use, such as sports, kava drinking, religious gatherings and television/DVD watching.

Table 6a gives the average hours per week spent on sports, which are extremely low numbers all round, rising to only 5 hours per week at the age group 19 to 21 for males only, while for females the peak is for the age groups 6 to 13, at 2.7 hours per week.

The table indicates the expected Female and Male differences but there are interesting patterns with increasing age. The average hours per week spent by females are generally low but quickly fall off from age 19 onwards. The percentage difference by which Females lag behind males at every age groups therefore keeps rising from -25% at ages 6 to 13, to -50% at 14 to 18, and over -70 thereafter.



Table 6a Average Hours of Sports per week (by age groups) (2010-11)				
Age Grps.	Female	Male	All	%(F-M)/M
A 0-4	0.7	0.6	0.6	21
B 5	1.5	1.5	1.5	-1
C 6-13	2.7	3.6	3.1	-25
D 14-18	2.3	4.6	3.5	-50
E 19-21	1.3	5.1	3.4	-74
F 22-29	0.6	3.8	2.2	-83
G 30-34	0.6	2.9	1.8	-80
H > 34	0.3	1.0	0.7	-65
<b>FIJI</b>	<b>1.0</b>	<b>2.4</b>	<b>1.7</b>	<b>-58</b>

Table 6.b gives the quite interesting result that there is virtually no difference in the average hours per week spent attending religious gatherings, with the averages being between 5 and 6 years for both females and males, with the only group indicating a higher female attendance being those aged 30 to 34, where the difference was 7% in favour of females.

Table 6b Average Hours of Religious Gatherings per week (2010-11)				
Age Grps.	Female	Male	All	%(F-M)/M
A 0-4	3.6	3.6	3.6	-2
B 5	4.7	4.9	4.8	-6
C 6-13	5.7	5.8	5.8	-2
D 14-18	5.7	5.6	5.7	2
E 19-21	5.5	5.5	5.5	0
F 22-29	5.4	5.3	5.3	0
G 30-34	5.8	5.5	5.6	7
H > 34	5.8	5.9	5.9	-1
<b>FIJI</b>	<b>5.5</b>	<b>5.5</b>	<b>5.5</b>	<b>0</b>

Table 6c gives the expected higher attendance at kava gatherings by males, and gradually rising with age, while the female attendance is fairly low. What is of concern however is that already by the ages 14 to 18, males are attending 0.6 hours on average, rising to 2.6 hours per week by the ages 19 to 21. Between the ages of 22 to 34, the male average rises above 5 hours per week, and clearly is much higher than the hours spent on sports.

Table 6c Average Hours of Kava Gatherings per week (2010-11)				
Age Grps.	Female	Male	All	%(F-M)/M
D 14-18	0.1	0.6	0.3	-86
E 19-21	0.5	2.6	1.7	-79
F 22-29	1.0	5.0	3.0	-80
G 30-34	1.1	5.9	3.6	-82
H > 34	0.9	6.1	3.5	-85
<b>FIJI</b>	<b>0.6</b>	<b>3.6</b>	<b>2.2</b>	<b>-83</b>

Table 6d indicates that watching television and DVDs occupies the largest time per week for both males and females, and at every age group. At virtually all age groups females watch more television and DVDs than males, with the averages peaking for both males and females at the age group 19 to 21.

<b>Table 6d Average Hours of TV/Videos per week (2010-11)</b>				
<b>Age Grps.</b>	<b>Female</b>	<b>Male</b>	<b>All</b>	<b>%(F-M)/M</b>
A 0-4	3.1	3.0	3.0	4
B 5	6.5	5.1	5.8	27
C 6-13	6.4	6.3	6.3	0
D 14-18	7.3	7.9	7.6	-7
E 19-21	8.7	8.1	8.4	7
F 22-29	8.5	7.7	8.1	12
G 30-34	8.0	7.4	7.7	8
H > 34	6.7	6.5	6.6	3
<b>FIJI</b>	<b>6.8</b>	<b>6.5</b>	<b>6.7</b>	<b>5</b>

Of concern is that young people (both males and females) are watching far more television and DVDs than they are spending on physical activities such as sports.

The statistics in these tables indicates evidence of sedentary life-styles for young people, which are likely to lead to serious NCD's later in life.

## **7.0 Small Scale Business Activities**

As part of efforts to know more about the informal sector, information was gathered on small scale money earning activities which were adjudged to be informal in nature. The survey did capture information on a wide range of economic activities which should be useful to the development of small and micro-enterprises.

An estimated 75,742 households were engaged in some sort of small scale business activity. While the aggregate estimate for total sales and expenses from such activities need to be verified with other sources, useful information worth reporting at this stage are the problems faced by those engaged in such economic activities.

The most common activities with their most common problems are as follows;

1. Dalo Farming - Unstable Market, unfavourable weather condition, no farm road or bad road conditions, high cost of transportation, high cost of inputs.
2. Yaqona Farming- Unfavourable weather, unstable markets, high cost of transportation and freight.
3. Sugarcane Farming- High cost of fertilizers/chemicals, high cost of transportation, low income generated, unfavourable weather, arson.
4. Fisherman - Unfavourable weather conditions, high cost of fuel.
5. Copra Producer- Unstable Markets.
6. Taxi Owner- High fuel price.
7. Root Crop Farming - High cost of Transport and unfavourable weather.

8. Vegetable Farming - High cost of manure and chemicals, unstable markets, unfavourable weather, inconsistent or no water supply.
9. Cassava Farming - Unfavourable weather.
10. Yaqona Seller - Late Payments of Credit and competitive market
11. Coconut Seller- High Transportation costs.
12. Mixed Crop Farming- Bad Road Conditions.
13. Canteen Operation- Competition and Inconsistent demand.
14. Tobacco Farming- Unfavourable weather.
15. Carpenter – Competition and Inconsistent demand.

### **8.0 School Aged Persons Not At School**

An estimated 3500 persons aged 6 to 17 were reported to have left school. The majority (49.7%) were in the age group 10-14 when they left school. The main reasons for leaving school were as follows;

- 1) Not Interested – 36.2%
- 2) Cannot Afford – 31.9%
- 3) Disability/Illness – 8.3%
- 4) Family did not allow – 5.0%
- 5) To help at home – 2.5%
- 6) To work as unpaid family worker – 1.5%
- 7) Other Reasons - 15.5%.

The Bureau will be releasing further results from the 2010-11 EUS in the New Year, including a detailed gender analysis of the data.



Epeli Waqavonovono  
**Government Statistician**