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Abstract

Internal migration in developing countries is becoming a major urban crisis. The inability of the urban infrastructure to handle the rural population is causing a number of problems ranging from environmental and social to economic. Waste disposal, water provision, crime and violence and unemployment are rising in the urban areas and the city planners are struggling to solve the problem. At a broader level, many governments want to dampen or stop the rural-urban migration. However, to develop an effective policy, the root cause of such phenomenon must be identified. This study is the first ever scientific research conducted via a structured questionnaire survey in Fiji to ascertain the reasons for such a high rate of rural-urban migration. Results from the study indicate that those who have migrated are highly unlikely to return to rural areas. However, there is a high likelihood of stopping the urban drift by the immediate resolution of the impasse on expiring agricultural leases which is a major push factor. Furthermore, all measures to build confidence in the rural dwellers with regards to a secure future in their current location of residence must also be undertaken.
A. Introduction

The study of migration has been undertaken not only by economists, but also by demographers, sociologist and geographers. Work in this area gained momentum in the 1960s when cross border migration began to show signs of a steady rise. The two main areas of research were the examination of the determinants of migration and the consequences of migration on the sending country, in particular, the brain drain effect. Most of the studies on the impact of brain drain on domestic economy conclude that brain drain has a detrimental effect on the economy of the sending country (see Bhagwati and Hamada, 1974; Piketty, 1997; Miyagiwa, 1991; Haque and Kim, 1995 and Galor and Tsiddon, 1997). The migration issues particularly, the outflow of human capital and loss of skilled people is one of the major concerns in developing countries. Many small island countries in Pacific region such as e. g., Tonga, Samoa have financially benefited to a certain extent from the outflow of their human capital resources. The outflow has helped in economic growth and prosperity to these ‘MIRAB economies’ (Bertram and Watters, 1985) as remittances from relatives abroad have been the largest foreign exchange earner. Fiji has also received a significant sum of foreign capital in the form of remittances over the last five years. These include money sent by Fiji citizens residing abroad, rugby players and soldiers serving in international and regional peace keeping forces.

However, not until recently did research on internal migration receive the attention that it truly deserved. The call for more research in this area comes from planners and policy makers confronting the problem of a rise in urban population and its associated problems of waste management, housing, water provision, unemployment and crime and violence. The rise in population density at the core has become so serious that some countries have redesigned their cross border migration policy where people intending to migrate to the periphery are awarded more points.

The urban population crisis is common not only in poor countries but in rich countries as well. The Pacific is no exception to this. The urban population in the Pacific ranges from 12 to 93% with majority of the countries having more than 40% of the total population concentrated in their urban centres (Table 1).

Storey (2006) argues that for most of the countries, a significant and increasing proportion of the urban population are poor or marginalized. This is certainly true in the case of Fiji. The sudden influx of rural population has led to the rise in a number of squatter settlements. There a number of associated problems with this population rise including an rise in unemployment, rise in sex workers and beggars on city streets, rise in crime and violence, problems of waste disposal and inability to provide water and housing.

Given the gravity and the wide range of problems that the urban planners have to grapple with, it is imperative to examine the causes of such a rapid rural to urban migration. The de-population of the rural areas is also affecting the growth of the agriculture sector. Agricultural output and productivity have been declining (Reddy, 2006), prices of
agricultural products increasing and import bills rising. Therefore any policy designed to
dampen or discourage rural-urban migration will need information on the exact causes of
such exodus. While there are a number of hypothesis being proposed such as lack of land
in rural areas, inadequate educational opportunities for children and low levels of wages
and employment opportunities which push people out, for these factors to form the basis
of policies requires it to be based on scientific research. Therefore, the purpose of this
research is to examine in detail the factors that contribute to rural-urban migration and the
ways in which such movement can be discouraged.

The paper is outlined as follows. The second section provides an overview of the broad
strands of migration theories, The following section describes the methodology adopted
and used in this study. The fourth section provides and discusses the results while the last
section summarizes and concludes the findings.

Table 1: Pacific Urban and National Population Figures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fiji</td>
<td>1996</td>
<td>775,077</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Caledonia</td>
<td>1996</td>
<td>196,836</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Papua New Guinea</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>5,190,786</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solomon</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td>409,042</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vanuatu</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td>186,678</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FSM</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>107,008</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>-2.4</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guam</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>154,805</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>n.a</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kiribati</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>84,494</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marshall Islands</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td>50,840</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Islands</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>69,221</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palau</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>19,129</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French Polynesia</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>244,830</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samoa</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>176,710</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tonga</td>
<td>1996</td>
<td>97,784</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Project, Targeted Research Papers for AUSAID, pp. 38.
B. Migration Theory: An Overview

Migration can be broadly defined as a “permanent or semi-permanent change of residence” (Lee, 1966:49). The causes and determinants of migration can be classified under two broad theories:

a) The Sociological Theory of Migration: The Push and Pull Factors

These two strands of theories are explained in detail below.

a) The Sociological Theory of Migration: The Push and Pull Factors

The sociological theory of migration takes into account the push-pull factors. That is, the interaction of factors that attract migrants to their destination with factors that repeal them from their origin (Ravenstein, 1885). The factors influencing the decision to migrate can be summarized into the following four categories as stated by Lee (1966):

i) Factors associated with the area of origin;
ii) Factors associated with the area of destination;
iii) Intervening obstacles;
iv) Personal factors

Although Lee (1966) categorized these factors to explain cross-boarder migration, this framework can extended to explain internal migration as well.

i) Factors associated with the area of origin

The origin will have issues that will push people out or hold people back. For example, persons living in the area of origin have immediate and often long term acquaintance with the area and are usually able to make considered and unhurried judgment regarding them. Furthermore, for many migrants, the area of origin is that in which the formative years have been spent and for which the general good health of youth and the absence of annoying responsibilities create in retrospect an over evaluation of the positive elements in the environment and an under evaluation of the negative elements (Lee, 1966). However, factors like livelihood options, security, land tenure system are all that could push or retain people.

ii) Factors associated with the area of destination

As argued by Lee (1966), knowledge of the area of destination is seldom exact. He argues that the advantages and disadvantages of the area can only be experienced by living there. He further argues that difficulties associated with assimilation in a new environment may create in the newly arrived a contrary or erroneous evaluation of the positive and negative facts at destination. The destination area also provides an indication
of the expected wages. In fact, strong argument put forward by the economic theories is that higher expected income in the destination will be a defining reason for migrants to leave their area of origin.

**iii) Intervening obstacles**

Often during cross border migration, distance, transportation and visa problems are the key obstacle. However, internal migration does not have visa problems. In contrast, distance, transportation do become an obstacle for poverty stricken households. Furthermore, the greatest obstacle is accessibility to housing at the destination. For this reason, squatter settlements and slums are widespread in developing countries where formal housing is either not available or unaffordable.

**iv) Personal factors**

There are many personal factors as well that promote or impede migration. One of these could, for instance, be the unwillingness of elderly parents, living with the migrant, to migrate. Therefore, the potential migrant is not able to migrate. Similarly, some may migrate because their children are staying and working in the urban area. Furthermore, some will have to migrate because of marriage to someone who stays and works in the urban area. Lee (1966) also attributes injustice and insecurity as a factor that could push people out of a particular area. Rhoda (1983) suggests that in societies with strong cultural ties, the family head makes migration decision on behalf of the children. There are ethnic, religious and racial factors that also affect migration and which are not picked up by the economic theory of migration. Certain areas may be dominated by a particular ethnic, religious or racial group that may be intolerant and hostile towards minority communal groups which would cause the latter to migrate.

**b) The Economic Theory of Migration: The Human Capital and Income Models.**

In the human capital approach, the potential migrant will select a location from which he or she is able to obtain the maximum expected net benefit. The income that an individual expects to earn at each alternative destination will be considered seriously and thoroughly. The individual will consider the discounted present value of the future stream of income with discounted value of future stream of costs. The straight forward NPV of the benefit-cost ratio in the human capital literature was first introduced by Schultz (1961) and Becker (1962). Following these two developments, Sjaastad (1962) applied the notion of human capital to an individual’s decision to migrate. Consequently, the Harris-Todaro model was introduced which argues that the incentive to migrate comes from a quest to maximize the positive difference in the expected level of wages. Todaro (1969) and Harris and Todaro (1970) first used rural to urban migration to suggest this theory. In this paper, we adapt the Harris-Todaro framework proposed by Morrison (1993) and make some changes to theorize the rural to urban migration in Fiji. This is based on the fact that migrants not only respond to economic incentives to ensure that are equal to the urban born, but are also sensitive to social factors such as security and social networks.
Following Morrison (1993), we define an individual maximizing his utility over the consumption of two goods (C and S) subject to a budget constraint:

\[
\text{Max } U(C,S) \text{ subject to } Y \geq C + P_F F
\]  

(1)

Where S = represents safety from political instability, lawlessness, violence and intimidation;
C = represents all other goods and services that an individual purchases;
Y = is the individual’s income;
P_F = price of inputs required to produce safety good (price of C is taken to be a numeraire);
F = quantity of inputs required to produce safety good.

There are a number of ways individuals produce safety goods. These include hiring bodyguards, paying village youths to stand guard at night, bribing policemen at police stations to make regular patrols, making their homes more secure, making a presentation of gifts to village chief to receive protection from the violent activities of hoodlums or migrating from rural to urban or from one country to another. However, individuals paying similar amounts for security may not get equal outputs because of various reasons including different personal characteristics, proximity from the village where the violent youths are based, skills, qualification, status in the society, etc. Therefore, the production of safety for individual \( r \) is formalized as:

\[
S_r = \beta(F,V), \quad \beta_F > 0, \quad \beta_V < 0,
\]  

(2)

Where V is the level of violence occurring in the region where \( r \) lives. Therefore, the safety and security of an individual depends on the inputs he purchases to produce safety, the level and nature of violence and his personal characteristics. Increasing violence will reduce the individuals’ utility.

The above section has utilised the Morrison (1993) variation of the Harris-Todaro model to explain how safety from violence, as captured in the variable “S” and other factors such as wage differential as captured by the variable “C” affect individual utility. In the quest to maximize this utility, the composition of the “S” variable along with the “C” variable will determine whether a person would migrate from rural to urban areas or from one country to another.

**C. Methodology**

Data for this study was collected from two major areas of Fiji, Suva and Nasinu, the main destination of 70% of the migrants and Labasa, the origin of approximately 70% of the migrants. In Suva/Nasinu, the low-cost squatter settlements of Sekoca, Jittu Estate, Narere and Vatuwaqa were subject to the study. In Labasa, the Seaqaqa, Dreketi and Wainikoro area was surveyed. In these places, every third household was surveyed.
Those households refusing to participate were left out and the next house was chosen as a substitute.

The survey was administered over a 3 month period in March-May, 2006. A total of 600 households were targeted. Approximately 450 migrant households in urban were targeted while 150 rural households were targeted (those still staying in rural areas). The urban households are the ones which have migrated from the rural areas over the last ten years while the rural households are ones engaged in agricultural activity in the rural areas. These households were interviewed using structured questionnaires. While no theoretical basis was used for taking a particular sample size, the idea was to keep it sufficiently large to ensure that sample mean responses converge on the population mean with a socially accepted level of confidence. Of the targeted sample, 420 urban household questionnaires were returned of which 399 were found to be complete for analysis. Of the targeted rural households, 117 were returned of which 94 had sufficient information to be included in the analysis. The survey was carried out with the support of University undergraduate students.

A summary profile of the respondents is provided in Table 2 below. The mean age of the respondent in the urban area was 44 years while that of the rural household respondent was 48 years. The respondents were the head of the households. Indo-Fijian societies generally tend to have males as heads of the households unless the husband has passed away. Therefore, the gender profile reveals that almost all of the respondents were male (90.5% in urban and 91.5% in rural area). The mean education level of the respondents was just below the full primary school education. This indicates that their ability to work in the formal sector is quite limited. The household size is typical of households in developing societies, with the urban household having 5 members while the rural household having six. The gross monthly income of the rural and urban household is markedly different. The rural household has a monthly income of $185 while the urban household earns $238 in the same period. The main reason for this difference is that in the urban areas, both the partners are able to engage in wage employment while in the rural areas, only the husband is engaged in paid employment.
Table 2: Basic Profile of the Urban and Rural Sample Households.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>Sample Area</th>
<th>Index</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sample size (No)</td>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>399</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age (Years)</td>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender (%)</td>
<td>Urban: Male/Female (%)</td>
<td>90.5/9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rural: Male/Female (%)</td>
<td>91.5/8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education level (years)</td>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Household size (No)</td>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gross Income (F$/month)</td>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>185</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Data obtained from primary survey.

D. Results and Discussion

Reasons for Migrating to Urban Area

The results from the survey are presented in Tables 3, 4, and 5 below. When the question of what prompted their migration to the urban area was posed, 66.4% of the respondents replied that expiry of land leases and the unavailability of affordable residential space had forced them to seek refuge in urban areas. A small proportion, a mere 13.3% expressed that the scarcity of employment opportunities in the rural area was the main cause for them moving into urban centres. It was seen that for most people this reason was not the prime one for migrating to urban areas as 32.6% (the largest proportion) stated this as the second reason they had migrated. However, this reason was stated as the second reason by the largest number of people, 32.6%. The third largest group, 5.2% of the respondents responded that their main reason to move from a rural to an urban area was because the latter provided better prospects for their children. Interestingly, lower wage rates in the rural area relative to urban area was the major reason for only a small percent (1.6%) of the migrants. As the third reason, the land problem and children’s future received the highest responses. As the fourth reason, the state of rural infrastructure had the highest responses while the second highest was lack of or the poor state of public utility provision. As the fifth reason, the state of rural infrastructure received the most responses.
Table 3: Causes of Rural to Urban Migration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reasons for Migration</th>
<th>1&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt; Reason</th>
<th>2&lt;sup&gt;nd&lt;/sup&gt; Reason</th>
<th>3&lt;sup&gt;rd&lt;/sup&gt; Reason</th>
<th>4&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; Reason</th>
<th>5&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; Reason</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Land Problems</td>
<td></td>
<td>66.4</td>
<td>29.8</td>
<td>18.1</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Expiry of land lease</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Lack of land</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Employment problem</td>
<td></td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>32.6</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Lack employment opportunities/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Lack of job security</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Underemployment/ Seasonal employment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Future of children</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>18.1</td>
<td>13.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Poor facilities for children’s education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. State of rural infrastructure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>11.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Poor state of rural infrastructure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Under provision of rural infrastructure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Public Utilities</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>17.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Under provision of public utilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Lack of public utilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Inefficient performance of public utilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Government facilities</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>14.9</td>
<td>9.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Inaccessibility of government facilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Security problem</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Inadequate provision of law and order</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Under provision of law and order</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Wages rate</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Low wage rate in rural areas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Low income from rural enterprise/agriculture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Finance problem</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Lack of finance opportunities for agricultural activity finance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reasons for Not Migrating to Urban Area

The rural households were also asked to state the five major reasons (in the order of importance) they would choose not to migrate to an urban area. A bulk of respondents gave unavailability or un-affordability of housing in the destination area as the major reason they would choose not to migrate. A total of 83.2% of the respondents stated that they do not have a place to stay and buying houses in urban areas is beyond them. This corresponds well with the fact that most of the rural dwellers who are not very educated end up in squatter settlements. The second reasons given for not moving to urban area was a social one of parents living with them who do not wish to reside in an urban area. The Indo-Fijian culture strongly insists the responsibility of the son to look after his elderly parents. Most elderly parents, consequently, stay with their children and with the social and sentimental links they have with the rural setting they live in, they are very reluctant to migrate. Their insistence not to leave the origin destination forces the children to continue residing in the rural area. Another factor that received a large
number of responses was the high cost of living in the urban area. This is true since most rural dwellers produce a lot of food items for consumption by themselves which may not be feasible in a urban setting where land for agricultural activities is normally not available. Moreover, the “needs” of families in the urban areas would be higher considering the living styles that are prevalent in the two settings. There is also the increased burden of paying electricity and water bills, rent and transportation costs which are not existent in the rural locations. The other prominent reasons given which made urban centres unattractive to several respondents was the worsening law and order problem in the urban areas and the disruption of rural lifestyle. Some respondents also raised some concern about the unavailability of finance to start up an own business in the urban area and environmental problems which are persistent in urban areas.

Table 4: Reasons for not Migrating to Urban Area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reasons</th>
<th>1st Reason %</th>
<th>2nd Reason %</th>
<th>3rd Reason %</th>
<th>4th Reason %</th>
<th>5th Reason %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Land property property in Urban areas</td>
<td>83.2</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>15.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- No land in urban area</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Property price too high to purchase</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Bad urban environment</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Lack of employment opportunity</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Lack of finance to undertake any business</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Lack of social network</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>23.8</td>
<td>21.2</td>
<td>41.9</td>
<td>37.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. High urban cost of living</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Poor government support</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Law and order problem</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>37.7</td>
<td>37.9</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>7.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Parents in rural area</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>19.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Rural lifestyle better</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Government is trying to discourage the rural-urban migration and therefore, a related question was asked to both of the residents on there future moves. To the urban migrants it was asked if resolution of the problems which forced them to move to an urban area would make them move back to the rural area. Only 11.1% stated that they would move back to their original place of residence (Table 5). On the other hand rural households were asked if the resolution of the problems they were encountering would prevent them from moving into urban areas. To this, a good 30.8% responded that they would migrate despite this.

These responses make evident two things. Firstly, the government has a very slim chance of inducing a mass movement of migrants back to their origin areas and secondly, if it is able to resolve the problems in the rural areas that have a “push” effect, there is a fair chance that the majority of the rural population can be retained.
Table 5: Rural/Urban Migration Response.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rural-Urban Movement</th>
<th>% Yes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>If problems in rural area are resolved, would you back?</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If problems in urban area are resolved, would you migrate there?</td>
<td>30.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

E. Summary and Conclusion

This study examined the key factors that are causing the migration of people from rural to urban areas. Furthermore, this study also explored the feasibility of the governments’ strategy to decelerate this drift so that agricultural output could be boosted.

The result from the study indicates that the key reason for migrating to urban areas is not a purely economic reason but rather to the cause of a social problem. The expiring land leases have pushed people out. Given that a land leasing legislation has still not agreed upon, the children of those holding on to the leases have begun to migrate as well. To retain the rural population, the government must immediately resolve the expiring lease problem, provide tenure security to the tenant farmers, and develop basic rural infrastructure and public utilities such as roads, public transport, health facilities, electricity, water and education. These developments will build confidence amongst the rural dwellers that their children can get the same quality of access to health and education in rural areas as that of urban inhabitants and their quality of life will not be significantly different from the urban dwellers.

The Government has given up hope on those who have left but needs to react immediately to ensure that those who remain in rural areas continue to do so by resolving the problems they are facing. In doing so, the rapid rise in prices of agricultural goods will be slowed; food imports reduced and current account balance improved thus supporting a healthy foreign reserve balance. Retaining the rural population will ensure that Fiji continues to source a significant proportion of its growth from the agricultural sector.
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**Appendices 1: ALTA Lease Status, 1997-2002.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Renewed to Sitting Tenants</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>1541</td>
<td>1940</td>
<td>442</td>
<td>609</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cane</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>345</td>
<td>317</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Renewed</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>1110</td>
<td>1593</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>568</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leases to New Tenants</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Landowner or 3rd Party)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cane</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>542</td>
<td>792</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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