

Original Research Article

IMPACT OF BETEL LEAF FARMING ON LIVELIHOOD AND INCOME GENERATION IN SOME SELECTED AREAS OF THE RAJSHAHI DISTRICT OF BANGLADESH

ABSTRACT

Betel leaf is popularly known as “paan” in Bangladesh. As income and livelihood are greatly impacted by the different production practices, the goal of this study was to determine betel leaf farming's impact on livelihood and income generation in some areas of the Rajshahi district of Bangladesh. A total of 108 farmers were randomly selected from three Upazilas (Bagmara, Durgapur, and MohanpurUpazila) of the Rajshahi district using a multistage sampling technique. Primary data were collected through a face-to-face survey during the month of December 2021. The CARE livelihood approach was carried out to determine the impact of betel leaf farming on livelihood. To better understand the livelihood and income status of the respondent, Focus Group Discussion and different observation techniques were employed. The results of the study showed that betel leaf cultivation produced income throughout the year for most of the farmers, and a large group of people directly earned their livelihood through it. In addition, it was revealed that about 77% of the farmers thought that they had a better living standard due to the betel leaf production though 17% were of the opinion that there were no changes in their living standard. Inadequate capital, market risks, production risks, institutional risks, human risks, and financial risks were the main problems and constraints of betel leaf farming in the study area. So, the government should come forward to address these issues for the continuous productivity and welfare of betel leaf farmers. Finally based on the results, significant policy recommendations could be made regarding betel leaf farming in Bangladesh.

Keywords: Betel leaf, Cash Crop, Livelihood, Risk Factors, Rajshahi district

1. INTRODUCTION

Betel leaf (*Piper betel*) locally known as ‘Paan’ belongs to the *Piperaceae* family and includes pepper and kava (Megagroup bd, 2018; Karim, 2015). This leaf is consumed mostly as betel quid which contains betel leaf, areca nut, and slaked lime (WHO, 1998). In Bangladesh, about 30% and in the world context approximately 10-20% of adults chew betel quid (Gupta and Warnakulasuriya 2002, Flora et al. 2012). Betel leaf has the properties of an antacid, carminative, and tranquilizer which helps in digestion, improves taste and appetite, and strengthens the teeth (Islam et al. 2015). Being one of the vital cash crops of this country, it has been under cultivation in Bangladesh for centuries and it is produced almost in all parts of the country but districts like Cox’s Bazar, Chittagong, Greater Khulna, Greater Barisal, Greater Faridpur, and Greater Rajshahi are remarkable for their production. Some parts of Rajshahi especially Bagmara, Durgapur, and MohanpurUpazila are famous for their production (Mahfuza et al. 2020). In the year 2017-18, the total betel leaf cultivation area in Bangladesh was 22257.71 ha, producing 2,14,000 MT of betel leaf. whereas in the Rajshahi district, the total cultivation area was 4780 acres and yields were 28197 MT (BBS, 2018). At present betel leaf occupies a broad market and Bangladesh is exporting it to many countries like India, Saudia Arabia, Pakistan, United Arab Emirates, England, Germany, and Italy (Banglapedia, 2015).

Betel leaf has a great impact on the economy and livelihood of many people in Bangladesh including the people of the selected research area. Its cultivation is increasing day by day in the Rajshahi district as it requires less cultivation and irrigation costs compared to many other crops (BSS, 2019). Furthermore, it can fetch cash income to its growers throughout the year. For these reasons, more than 25000 farmers are directly involved in its farming and they are producing betel leaf valued at around Taka 90 crore annually (BSS, 2019). Despite being a commercially viable crop and

substantially high market potentialities in both domestic and foreign markets, there are few works so far that have been done on betel leaf. To date, maximum of the research has been done on Though Among these Islam & Matin, 2017; Islam et al, 2015 have studied the benefits and cost of betel leaf, Jahan & Murshed, 2005 tried to identify the influence of production inputs on the return of betel leaf. Mayoory et al., 2018; Rahman et al., 2016 studied different socioeconomic characteristics of betel leaf farmers. However, there is limited research that has paid attention to livelihood strategy, the economic condition of the betel leaf farmer, and also different risks involved with its farming. Considering the above-mentioned research gap the purpose of this study is to investigate the impact of betel leaf farming on farmers' income generation from the perspective of livelihood along with the socio-economic condition. Secondly, this study also tried to find out the types of risks experienced by the producers in the study area.

2. METHODOLOGY

Study areas and Sampling technique

The primary data used in this study were collected from the Rajshahi district as a large number of people are engaged in betel leaf production in this district. The survey for primary data collection was based on a multistage sampling of betel leaf farmers. The following stages given in Table 1 were considered in the data collection process.

Table 1: Stages of sampling

Stage	Sampling	Referred to us
First	Upazilla	First-stage unit
Second	Union	Second-stage unit
Third	Village	Third-stage unit
Fourth	Betel leaf farmers	Ultimate-stage unit

There are nine subdistricts in Rajshahi and among these three Upazilas (Bagmara, Durgapur, and MohanpurUpazila) were selected randomly. Then, one union of each Upazila was selected in the second stage. Thereafter, two villages from each union were selected in the third stage. A list of betel leaf growers from the selected villages was prepared with the help of SAO personnel. Finally, 18 farmers (an equal number of respondents) from each village were surveyed randomly. So, the sample size was 108 ($n = 3 \times 1 \times 2 \times 18$).

Data collection: The study was conducted using mainly primary data. Data were collected in December 2021 covering 108 betel leave farmers with the help of a face-to-face survey. A pilot survey was conducted to pre-test the questionnaire. Besides qualitative tools such as Focus Group Discussion (FGD) and observation techniques were carried out among farmers, to have a better understanding of their opinion on improving their livelihood situation, existing risk, and potentiality of the betel leaf business.

Data analysis and tools: After completing the field survey, the task of data processing was done. All the completed questionnaires were transformed into the data code sheet. Thereafter, tabulated data were processed and analyzed using MS Excel. Descriptive statistics were used to synthesize and explain the acquired data.

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The socio-economic condition of the people engaged in the betel leaf business in theRajshahi district

For these study areas, betel leaf was one of the main and unbeatable cash crops for the general people. During the time of data collection, it was observed that, if the household head had no money on hand, they quickly harvested some betel leaves and earned some immediate cash simply by selling these leaves to the nearby market. So betel leaf had immense importance in their life. Different socioeconomic characteristics such as literacy status, age, household size, education, etc. influenced different types of crop cultivation decisions. In the Rajshahi district, most of the surveyed farmers (70%) were middle-aged (35-50 years old) followed by old (>50) aged (18.5%) and young (<30) aged (11.5%). It indicates that most middle-aged people were engaged in betel leaf cultivation. The average family size was 4.13. The average age of the family head was 42.50 years. More than half (22.95%) of the farmers had primary-level education, while 36% and 19.67% of farmers had secondary and higher secondary education respectively (Table 2). Some of them also had a university-level education (9.83%). So, it was observed that most of the farmers had formal education except 11.55% were illiterate. This high literacy rate may be due to the financial viability of the region and socio-economic development.

In these areas, betel leaf was the main crop for 86.85% of farmers. The farmers also had access to credit (93%) from different non-governmental organizations and also Bangladesh Krishi Bank. Very few Farmers sometimes got updated information related to insecticides, fertilizers, new varieties, etc. from extension agents like sub-assistant agricultural officers (SAAO). The study found out that only 35% of the farmers had contact with the extension agents during the whole years of betel leaf cultivation. The entire scenario is presented in the following table 2.

Table 2:Basic Household Characteristics

Average Family Size (Numbers)	4.13		
Average Age of Family Head (Years)	42.50		
Average Education of Family Head			
	Illiterate: 11.55 %	Primary: 22.95%	
	Secondary: 36%	Higher secondary:19.67%	
	University level: 9.83%		
Betel leaf as a main crop for farmers	86.85%		
Access to credit	93%		
Changes in living standard	Better: 77%	Worse: 6%	Constant: 17%
Contact with the extension agents	36%		

Years involved in betel leaf production

From the survey, it was found that most of the respondents (67%) were directly or indirectly engaged in betel leaf farming from their childhood. About 23% were engaged in this farming for 15-20 years. Only 2% of respondents were found cultivating betel leaf a few years earlier.




Figure 1: Years involved in betel leaf production in the survey area

Impact of betel leaf cultivation on the livelihood of the farmers

In general, by livelihood, we understand securing the basic necessities of life such as food, water, shelter, clothing, and medicine. The activities are usually carried out repeatedly and in a manner that is sustainable and provides dignity. In this specific study area, it was found that the construction of roads and the supply of electricity facilities have enormously changed the livelihood of many farmers. Betel leaf farming was the main occupation for most of the farmers there.

Moreover, some farmers also grow rice and potatoes along with the betel leaf. In this research, it was revealed that about 77% of the farmers thought that they had a better living standard due to the betel leaf production though 17% were of the opinion that there were no changes in their living standard through this farming (Table 2).

Livelihood Status of Farmers in the Study Area

Several indicators are used to monitor complex changes in livelihoods and to understand the processes that have produced such change. CARE (2004) identified 26 livelihood indicators to measure around 9 livelihood outcomes. Examples of the broad livelihood outcomes can be seen through aspects, like shelter, economic security, nutritional security, health security, water and sanitation security, education security, community participation, and access to institutions and services (Sheheli 2012). In this study, seven livelihood indicators, namely food availability, housing conditions, water facilities, health situation, sanitation, and participation in social activities, were investigated to understand the practical situation of farmers. They were asked to give their opinion to understand whether there was any noticeable change aspect of their lives since performing this farming. Their opinion is summarized in Table 3.

Household income: In the case of household income, the majority of the farmers (64.81%) agreed that their overall household income improved while 29.63% said that it remained the same as before.

Food Availability: Most of the farmers (79.63%) agreed that the food availability was increased, whereas 18.52% thought that was the constant. But shockingly 1.85% of farmers thought the situation even got worse.

Housing Condition: The housing conditions of the study area indicated that the majority of the farmers (55.56%) experienced better housing conditions. A large percentage of farmers possessed dwellings with a corrugated tin roof (64%), 3% percent had dwellings in a mud house and 33% had a straw roof.

Health Condition: About 53.70% agreed they experienced better health conditions while 5.56% thought this situation got worse.

Sanitation: A high majority of the farmers (80.56%) agreed they experienced better sanitation facilities while 19.44% thought this situation remained constant.

Water Facilities: In this study area 60.19% of farmers were of the opinion that they had improved water facilities whereas 39.81% of farmers experienced this facility as like as before. It may be noted that in MohonpurUpazilla, almost 95% of farmers use their own motor for water availability and the remaining number largely depends on government motor.

Participation in Social Activities: Most of the farmers (75%) agreed that their overall participation in social activities was increased, the participation of farmers in social activities lay particularly among low to medium, while a majority had low participation (67%). One-third (28%) had medium participation and only a few (only 5%) had high participation in the study area.

Table 3:Opinion of farmers regarding the impact of betel leaf farming on their livelihood

Statement	Better	Constant	Worse
Household income	70 (64.81%)	32 (29.63%)	6 (5.56%)
Food availability	86 (79.63%)	20 (18.52%)	2 (1.85%)
Housing condition	60 (55.56%)	43 (39.81%)	5 (4.63%)
Health Condition	58 (53.70%)	44 (40.74%)	6 (5.56%)
Sanitation	87 (80.56%)	21 (19.44%)	0 (0%)
Water facilities	65 (60.19%)	43 (39.81%)	0 (0%)
Participation in social activities	81 (75%)	27 (25%)	0 (0%)
Overall livelihoods	83 (76.85%)	18 (16.67%)	7 (6.48%)

The majority of the farmers (76.85%) indicated that their livelihoods improved through participation in betel leaf farming. Participation in social activities, water facilities, and sanitation also increased remarkably. Many of them (16.67%) reported that involvement with betel leaf farming does not change their livelihood status and 6.48% mentioned that their livelihood status decreased. As betel leaf farming is a risky project, cutting down the whole boro due to the spreading of diseases, loss of production, unstable market prices, defaulting, and the burden of loans were major reasons for the negative effects reported by them.

Annual Income from betel leaf farming occupation

All the farmers do not have the same access to land, labor, capital, and other opportunities. So, income is not the same for all. According to this study, the economic status of the farmer was affected by betel leaf production. This study reveals that per household income from betel leaf production ranged from tk.60000 to tk. 540000 annually. The majority of the households earned tk. 150,000 to 250,000 annually. The yearly average income of the farmers from betel leaf was tk. 174666.67 while their average income from all types of occupation (farming other crops i.e., rice, potato, or working outside) was tk. 275666.67 annually. Only 6% earn less than tk.100000 annually.




Figure 2: Household total annual income, annual income from betel leaf, and annual expenditure

Utilization of income made from Betel leaf cultivation

From the research, it was found that betel leaf cultivation has contributed to an increase in the income of farming households. Therefore, these farming households are able to allocate their income to different sectors. Because of the great scope of earning a handsome amount of profit, not only the poor households but also the affluent households are participating in this farming business. As a consequence, farming is no longer considered a low-level occupation in our society. In the study area, for most of the farmers, the common sectors of expenses were food, clothes, children's education, paying loans, and purchasing livestock. When their earnings increased, they also allotted their income to other properties like purchasing cultivated land, improving the housing conditions, building toilets, and other luxurious goods. It was revealed that most of the households (35.84%) used their income for food expenditure. Right after that, it was in education where they spent almost 25.02% of their income on children's education. Human empowerment is an important aspect of livelihood and education plays a vital role here. It is a good sign that all farmers paid quite much attention to their children's education. Next, they use their 12.28% of income to pay loans. They also (10.5%) spent their income on non-food expenditures i.e., Fuel & Lighting, Cosmetics, Clothing, Washing & Cleaning, and Travel expenses. Because of the increasing income rate of the farmers, they are now able to save 6.07% of their income for the future, and 4.63% was allocated for rearing livestock. Few households spent their income (4.03%) on improving their houses. Only 1.26% expend their income on health and sanitation purposes. It is noteworthy to mention that, by health and sanitation this research meant going to hospitals, treatment during the time of illness, buying medicine, building and improving toilets, etc. On the other hand, 0.96 percent utilized their income in different kinds of social activities such as donations to

mosque construction, rural road construction, helping the extremely poor, etc. As the majority of the farmers are now able to afford to spend their money in different sectors along with the food expenditure, these are positive signs of improvement in the livelihood of farmers in the study area.




Figure3:Utilization of income from betel leaf farming

Risk Involved in Betel Leaf Farming:

Farmers constantly face different types of agricultural risks. Risk by its nature involves adverse outcomes like lower yields, lower income, financial bankruptcy, food insecurity, and health problems. Its outcomes can have chain effects where one type of risk contributes to another type. For example, excessive rainfall during harvest is an event that can engender another set of risks such as financial risks associated with being unable to repay loans (Pelka, 2015). However, the most important risks that farmers face can be categorized as production risks, market risks, institutional risks, human risks, and financial risks (Hardaker et al., 1997). In this study, this classification was the basis for analyzing the types of risks faced by betel leaf producers in the study area. Therefore, taking into consideration both the chances of occurrence and the severity of consequences, market risk ranks first followed by production risk, financial risk, human risk, and institutional risk respectively.

Market risk: Uncertainty with betel leaf prices and market access was the major risk faced by the farmers. Moreover, weather shocks and their effects on yields, and access to market information were additional sources of market risk. Farmers' decision-making evolves in a context in which multiple risks occur simultaneously, such as weather variability and price spikes or reduced market access (Holden and Shiferaw, 2004; Harvey et al., 2014; Lazzaroni and Wagner, 2016). Sometimes intense winter caused their produce to rot at an alarming rate, forcing most of the farmers to throw away their produce. This is why there is a huge chance that many farmers opted out of growing betel leaves permanently. On the other hand, the spike in betel leaf prices also poses a problem for the producer, as nobody will buy the produce at an increasing rate. According to a farmer in this region, even a 1-taka increase affects their selling significantly. So, farmers are forced to sell a betel leaf comparatively at a lower price. According to the majority of the farmers (75%), the low price of betel leaf during the rainy season (June to August) was a great problem. On the contrary, the storage system is not well organized in the study area. So many times, the farmers have to bear the loss as they have to sell the products at a throwaway price.

Production risk: Typical sources of these risks are related to weather and climate, and pests and diseases (Komarek et al. 2020). Since it is vulnerable to weather, the betel vines of this district may have been hit hard by storms, excessive temperatures, and rain. Since thousands of people in many Upazilas of the district are heavily dependent on betel plantations, this may result in a great loss of their livelihood. In the study areas, quite frequently farmers faced setbacks because of fungus attacks. About 70% of farmers reported that leaf rot disease was common for betel leaf cultivation.

Many farmers complain that due to the diseases, 80% of the leaves have already been damaged. Again, root rotten problems and fungus attacks cause the whole boroj to cut off which is a tremendous financial loss for the farmers. In fact, after the fungus attack, it is difficult to replant the boroj, and its growth is also hampered (Mahfuza et al., 2020). Moreover, the boroj is susceptible to damage in nor'wester or similar types of storms, and almost every year the farmers complain of huge losses as cultivation of boroj is quite an expensive investment. As a consequence, many of the farmers are forcefully switching their jobs from betel leaf farming to different crop farming.

Human risk: Causal labor is one of the important inputs to betel leaf cultivation. It is very labor-oriented considering that leaves must be plucked from the plant continuously otherwise there is a chance to lean off the whole plant. At present rural laborers are interested in engaging in non-farm activities rather than farming. Simultaneously labor wage rate is increasing over time. The unavailability of skilled labor at a reasonable wage rate is a big threat in this aspect. Consequently, the rise in the wage rate of laborers lowers the total revenue as well as the profit.

Financial Risk: Sometimes changes in interest rates or credit availability from banks or NGOs, or changes in credit conditions got farmers into trouble. It is noteworthy to mention that, betel leaf production requires high initial investments. On average, for betel leaf cultivation total of 918108 BDT/hectare was required for the initial setup of the Boroj in 2015 in the Rajshahi district. About 68% of farmers reported that lack of capital was a major financial risk during setting up the new boroj.

Institutional risks: Around 15% of farmers faced institutional (formal and informal)risks like unpredictable changes in regulations, informal trading partners, rural farmer organizations, or changes in social norms that all affect farming.




Figure 4: Different risks faced by farmers associated with betel leaf

4. CONCLUSION

The study examined the impact of betel leaf farming on livelihood and income generation in some parts of Rajshahi district in Bangladesh using different methods. The aim of the study was to assess changes in the livelihood and income of the farmers after taking betel leaf as a farming practice. The results of the study showed that betel leaf was the main source of income for most people, and a large group of people directly earned their livelihood through it. Despite the many positive impacts, this enterprise becomes risky for investment due to some factors. As betel leaf production is capital intensive and involves high initial costs, the capital shortage was one of the several problems faced by betel leaf growers. Moreover, it is also found from the present study that the betel leaf farmers face multiple problems such as price risk, pest, and fungulattacks, skilled labor shortage, etc. Without institutional credit support, it is difficult for the farmers to devote a large area to betel leaf production. It is, therefore, necessary that credit on easy terms and conditions may be provided to the farmers by different government agencies and NGOs for betel leaf production. The government should

take the necessary steps for the establishment of a research center to improve techniques and methods of betel leaf cultivation. In addition, a Proper price system should be developed so that farmers can get fair prices for their produce to continue this operation.

Based on the results of the study, policymakers should take into account the diverse positive changes in livelihood and income when establishing policies to promote betel leaf farming in Bangladesh. Finally, different infrastructural facilities like the construction of roads and bridges, transportation, and communication facilities should be developed to easily facilitates the marketing of betel leaf. Since betel leaf is one of the vital cash crops in Bangladesh, more attention should be given to ensure the continuous productivity and welfare of the farmers associated with it.

REFERENCES

1. Banglapedia. Pan: Available at: <http://en.banglapedia.org/index.php?title=Pan1>. 2015. Accessed: 18/10/18.
2. BBS. Statistical Year Book of Bangladesh, Bangladesh Bureau of Statistics, Ministry of Planning, Government of the Peoples' Republic of Bangladesh, Dhaka, Bangladesh. 2019.
3. BBS. Statistical Year Book of Bangladesh, Bangladesh Bureau of Statistics, Ministry of Planning, Government of the Peoples' Republic of Bangladesh, Dhaka, Bangladesh. 2019.
4. BSS (Bangladesh Sangbad Sangstha). Booming betel leaf farming at Rajshahi villages, 2019. Accessed 1 May 2020.
5. CARE. Measuring Livelihood Impacts: A Review of Livelihoods Indicators. Livelihood Monitoring Unit (LMU), Rural Livelihoods Program. CARE Bangladesh.2004;17-22.
6. de Mey Y, Wauters E, Schmid, Lips M, Vancauteran M, Van Passel S. Farm household risk balancing: empirical evidence from Switzerland. *Eur. Rev. Agric. Econ.* 2016; 43:637–662.
7. Flora MS, Mascie-Taylor CGN, Rahman M. Betel quid chewing and its risk factors in Bangladesh adults. *WHO South-East Asia J Public Health*, 2012; 1(2):169–181.
8. Gabriel SC, Baker CB. Concepts of business and financial risk. *Am. J. Agric. Econ.* 1980; 62: 560–564.
9. Gupta PC, Warnakulasuriya S. Global epidemiology of areca nut usage. *Indian J Hist Sci*, 2002; 34(1):19–32.
10. Hardaker J, Huirne R, Anderson J. *Coping with Risk in Agriculture* CAB International. Wallingford, UK. 1997.
11. Harvey CA, Rakotobe ZL, Rao NS, Dave R, Razafimahatratra H, Rabarijohn RH, Rajaofara H, MacKinnon JL. Extreme vulnerability of smallholder farmers to agricultural risks and climate change in Madagascar. *Philos. Trans. R. Soc. Lond., B, Biol. Sci.* 2014: 369.
12. Holden S, Shiferaw B. Land degradation, drought and food security in a less favoured area in the Ethiopian highlands: a bio-economic model with market imperfections. *Agric. Econ.* 2004; 30: 31–49.
13. Islam QMS, and Matin MA. Profitability level of betel leaf (piper betel l.) cultivation in some selected sites of Bangladesh, *Bangladesh J. Agril. Res.* 2017; 42(2): 343-351.
14. Islam QMS, Matin MA, Rashid MA, Hoq MS, Moniruzzaman. Profitability of betel leaf (Piper betle L.) cultivation in some selected sites of Bangladesh, *Bangladesh J. Agril. Res.* 2015, 40(3): 409-420.
15. Karim AE. Pan1. Retrieved from Banglapedia. 2015. org. Available at: <http://en.banglapedia.org/index.php?title=Pan1>
16. Komarek AM, Pinto AD, Smith VH. A review of types of risks in agriculture: What we know and what we need to know. *Agricultural Systems*, 2020;178: 1-7. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.agsy.2019.102738>
17. Lazzaroni S, Wagner N. Misfortunes never come singly: structural change, multiple shocks and child malnutrition in rural Senegal. *Econ. Hum. Biol.* 2016; 23:246–262.
18. Mahfuza EJ, Sayem SM, Hassan, MF. Trend of Betel Leaf Production in Bangladesh: Prospects and Challenges. *Research in Agriculture Livestock and Fisheries*, 2020; 7(2):209–223. <https://doi.org/10.3329/ralf.v7i2.48861>

19. Mayoory J, Karunaratna B, Liyinthan V. Assessing the socio economic status of betel (piper betel l.) cultivation in Batticaloa district of Sri Lanka: case study from Kaluthawalaivillage, Research in: Agricultural & Veterinary Sciences, 2018, 2(3):132-138.
20. Megagroup bd. Our export product: betel leaf. Retrieved from Mega Group BD.com. 2018. Available at: <http://www.megagroupbd.com/betelLeaf.html>
21. MridhaMRH,JahanH, Murshed MM. Relative profitability of different aged betel leaf production at farm level in some selected areas of Bangladesh. Journal of Bangladesh Agricultural University, 2005; 3(1): 181-188.
22. Pelka N. Does weather matter? How rainfall affects credit risk in agricultural microfinance. Agric. Financ. Rev. 2015; 75: 194–212.
23. Rahman MA, Tani M, Tsuruta H. Socioeconomic Characteristics of the Betel Leaf Farmers in the Teknaf Peninsula, Bangladesh. Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics & Sociology, 2016; 11(3): 1-8.
24. Rayaguru K, Routray W, Mohanty SN. Mathematical modeling and quality parameters of air-dried betel leaf (Piper Betle L.). Journal of Food Processing and Preservation, 2010; 35(4).
25. Sheheli S. Improving Livelihood of Rural Women through Income Generating Activities in Bangladesh. Dissertation, Berlin, 2012.
26. WHO. Betel leaf and its qualitative composition. Report No. 9. Ontario: University of Gulcph. 1998, 36.