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As a traditional country of immigration, New Zealand has often looked outside of its borders for its population composition and as a result 19 percent of New Zealand’s current population were born overseas. In recent times, immigration has been used by successive governments as a means of countering severe skills shortages and off-setting a declining birth rate. While attention in the media, public and to some extent in academic circles has been largely focused on the increasing volume of immigrants to New Zealand from Asian countries, migration from Europe has often been overlooked and yet it remains an important component of the New Zealand’s migration flows. This thesis explores this stream of migration – from the member states of the European Union to New Zealand – by examining the specific case study of contemporary European Union migration to the Canterbury region, incorporating migrants who live, work and study in Canterbury. The thesis used surveys and in-depth interviews in addition to secondary data to investigate the composition of the European Union migrant population in Canterbury, as well as exploring the motivations and experiences of these migrants. Conceptualising the motivations of contemporary migrants from the EU to New Zealand is difficult, due to a multiplicity of theories and frameworks surrounding the topic of migration. As such, this thesis suggests a three level framework drawn from in order to better understand the motivations of target population. Although the experiences of the surveyed migrants were largely positive, some difficulties were noted, particularly while seeking work and building friendships with New Zealanders. Finally, this thesis proposes a number of recommendations at a policy and academic level which may assist in furthering understandings of the important but often ignored group of European Union migrants in New Zealand.
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Chapter 1
Introduction

“New Zealand is a country that has been built through immigration, and immigration is vital for New Zealand’s well-being.”

– Hon Paul Swain, Minister of Immigration

“Perhaps there was a time in New Zealand foreign policy when it didn’t seem very fashionable in New Zealand to focus on Europe. Yet Europe has always been of great importance to New Zealand, and always will be.”

– Rt. Hon. Helen Clark, Prime Minister

1.1 Introduction

Migration, in its many incarnations, is a topical and often contentious issue in many regions of the world. Advances in travel, the globalisation of the world economy, problems of ageing populations in many OECD countries, conflict and poverty have all contributed to an increase in and diversification of flows of international migration. The purpose of this thesis is to provide an overview of one contemporary migration flow; that from the European Union to Canterbury, New Zealand. This flow is comprised of residents, temporary workers and students, and while in global terms their volume is very small, it does have importance for New Zealand, both in terms of helping to fill skills shortage in the NZ labour market and in increasing New Zealand’s global connectedness. This thesis is located within three broad contexts, the first of which is the continuing importance of immigration to New Zealand. The second context is the significant but often overlooked relationship between NZ and the European Union, and the third relates to the current direction of migration research in NZ. Following a discussion of these contexts, a more detailed outline of the research problem will be presented.

1.2 The Importance of Immigration to NZ

New Zealand is one of the traditional countries of immigration, along with Australia, Canada and the United States. According to the 2001 New Zealand Census of Population and Dwellings, nineteen percent of the usually resident population were born overseas, and immigration continues to be important to NZ for multiple reasons, three of the most significant of which are highlighted here. Firstly, in terms of population, for almost 25 years New Zealand’s birth rate has been at or below the required level of 2.1 births per woman needed to replace itself\(^3\). That is to say, New Zealand faces not only an aging population as the baby boom generation reach retirement but also a long term decline in its total population and this will have serious social and economic implications, for example, with a smaller tax base the government provision of social services and pensions will become more difficult. Migration is one means of counteracting this low birth rate.

Migration can also assist in another closely related problem that NZ is facing, that of chronic and severe skills shortages across many industries. Shortages of skilled workers in NZ have been evident and increasing since the mid 1990s and combined with the one of the lowest unemployment rates in the OECD in 2004 and 2005 have the potential to restrict economic growth as businesses fail to recruit the staff they require to meet current demand or to expand\(^4\). These shortages have been exacerbated by a continued out-migration of skilled New Zealanders. While migration cannot completely alleviate these shortages, it can play an important role alongside the other initiatives such as directed training schemes, promoting higher female participation in the work force and encouraging older workers to continue to work for longer. However, it is also necessary to recognise that NZ is not alone in these trends. Increasing globalisation has led to and facilitated an increase in global exchanges of skilled labour which have created a highly competitive environment in which to attract migrants, thus making New Zealand’s task of finding skilled workers more difficult and


placing emphasis on the need for these migrants to settle readily into the New Zealand environment\textsuperscript{5}.

Finally, migration plays an important role in connecting NZ with the wider world. Migrants bring knowledge of their home country markets, preferences, culture and language to a country, and they help to form interpersonal and business networks between their home and adopted countries. Although not often directly factored into calculations on the fiscal impacts of migration, these links have been shown to have positive impacts on imports and exports\textsuperscript{6}.

1.3 New Zealand’s Relations with the EU

Despite the realignment of New Zealand’s geopolitical interests towards Asia in the late 1980s and early 1990s, New Zealand’s relationship with Europe, and in particular the European Union, continues to be significant in both political and economic terms. Originally forged through its colonial relationship with the United Kingdom, and the subsequent migration of many British to NZ, NZ shares close cultural ties with Europe, and the current NZ Prime Minister Helen Clark has noted that many New Zealanders, including herself, “...strongly identify with European traditions, tastes and cultures.”\textsuperscript{7}. The EU also shares with NZ a similar world view, emphasising the importance of a fully functioning multilateral world system, and in particular the need for an effective United Nations, along with respect for human rights, democracy and the rule of law\textsuperscript{8}. Furthermore, despite a significant diversification in the nature of New Zealand’s economic partners following the accession of the UK to the then European Economic Community, the EU is currently New Zealand’s second largest trading partner, after Australia\textsuperscript{9}. The EU is also one of the largest development aid donors to the Pacific region, New Zealand’s neighbourhood. In recognition

\textsuperscript{9} The European Commission’s Delegation to NZ, EU/New Zealand Economic Relations, accessed online on 17/02/2005 at \url{http://www.delaus.cec.eu.int/newzealand/EU_NZ_relations/tradeandeconomy.htm}.
of these close ties, the Joint Declaration on Relations Between the European Union and New Zealand was signed in 1999 providing a more formal framework to the relationship. This agreement established common interests in a variety of fields, including international relations, trade, development, environmental protection. Additionally the Declaration called for both sides to “foster mutual knowledge and understanding between their people and their cultures” in part by “facilitating further people-to-people and scientific links, and encourage cooperation and exchange in education.”

In 2004, the shared interests of the 1999 Joint Declaration were reviewed and more explicit proposals for cooperation were outlined in the EU-NZ: Priorities for Future Cooperation agreement. Despite the signing of the Joint Declaration, in the build up to the 2004 EU enlargement at which ten new Central and Eastern European countries joined the existing fifteen member group, concerns were raised regarding a possible loss of profile for NZ in the enlarged union. While the new members would offer opportunities for expansion of the existing European market, “[t]here was a risk that the EU would be heavily preoccupied with internal concerns, and that it would be harder to make New Zealand’s voice heard.” This risk was seen to be further exacerbated by New Zealand’s low level of contact with the new member states. To alleviate possible risks, the government placed an emphasis on strengthening official contact between the EU and NZ at a governmental level, including the first Prime Ministerial visit to Brussels in two decades, visits by the NZ Foreign Minister to most of the new member states, and the opening of an embassy in Poland – the largest enlargement country. However, it was also acknowledged by the then current NZ administration that “[t]here is no substitute for well-developed people-to-people contacts, to underpin political relationships.”

---

In awareness of the importance of these contacts then, in 2004 NZ extended its three month visa-waiver to cover the six new member states of the EU whose citizens had previously been required to have a tourist visa prior to entering NZ, and thus ensured visa free access to NZ for all EU citizens\textsuperscript{15}. Negotiations were also undertaken to extend the reciprocal working holiday schemes NZ has with EU countries. These schemes allow young people from both NZ and the EU to travel and work in each others’ countries, helping to foster "mutual understanding"\textsuperscript{16} between the EU and NZ. The strengthening of educational links and the promotion of student mobility were also recognised as ways of fostering these important people-to-people links\textsuperscript{17}. However, despite the importance placed on the relationship between the EU and NZ, and the role that people-to-people links play in this alliance, little research into the nature of these links has been undertaken.

\subsection*{1.4 Research Context}

Until 1987, migration to New Zealand was dominated by traditional source countries such as the United Kingdom and Australia. However, since a change in immigration legislation in 1986 which abolished the traditional source country preference, and further policy reform in 1991, which introduced a skills based points system, the majority of immigrants to New Zealand have originated from Asia\textsuperscript{18}, with steady but much smaller flows from the UK and remainder of the EU. The significant rise in migration from Asia in the early and mid 1990s generated stereotypical, markedly negative reporting of Asian migrants in the NZ print media

\textsuperscript{15}’EU tourists visa-free’, (2004, September 21). \textit{The Press}. However, at the same time, access for NZ citizens to the EU was put under threat by the Schengen Agreement (signed in 1990 by all member states excluding the UK and Ireland) which altered the reciprocity of the bilateral three months visa waiver agreements from a member state basis to an EU basis. This meant that New Zealanders travelling to the EU could spend only a total of three months in the entire Schengen area rather than three months in each member state. The NZ government lobbied against this change and while an alternative solution is being sought, the pre-Schengen status quo remains.

\textsuperscript{16}MFAT website, Europe Division: Priorities for Cooperation section, People-to-People links, \url{http://www.mft.govt.nz/foreign/regions/europe/eu/nzeu.html}


\textsuperscript{18}Bedford, R., E. Ho and J. Lidgard, (2001). ‘Immigration Policy and New Zealand’s Development into the 21st Century: Review and Speculation’, \textit{Asian and Pacific Migration Journal}, 10(3-4). Further immigration policy changes in 2003 again impacted upon the national distribution of incoming migrants with the proportion of migrants from the UK increasing significantly, and this is further discussed in Chapter 5.
that focussed on problems such as poor driving and pressure on houses prices and schools\textsuperscript{19}. This, together with the intense politicisation of immigration in the 1996 general election when the NZ First Party campaigned on an anti-immigration, and particularly anti-Asian, platform, contributed to the ‘problematisation’ and ‘Asianisation’ of immigration in the media\textsuperscript{20}. This was also reflected in public opinion: “...a survey of letters to the editor makes it clear that for many people, ‘immigrant’ and opposition to current ‘immigrants’ is a code for concern about Asian immigrants.”\textsuperscript{21}. Although, the focus of media reporting altered towards the end of the 1990s and began to examine other issues such as the economic impact and benefits of migration, the societal focus on Asian immigrants remained\textsuperscript{22}. Spoonley and Trlin note that “...the continued immigration of Europeans, especially British immigrants, or those from North America, is not seen as an issue by the media, the politicians or by the public in periodic opinion polls.”\textsuperscript{23}. This fits with a statement by King, who notes that “[m]igrations can be spectacular or mundane, or...regarded as problematic or non-problematic. By and large, the mundane, unproblematic forms of movement are left unrecorded and often unstudied”\textsuperscript{24}.

As with the media portrayal, recent academic research has also had a focus on migration from Asia\textsuperscript{25}. While this is reasonable given the distinct change in New Zealand’s migration patterns and the associated difficulties with unemployment, under-employment and settlement among some migrants from Asia, it means other flows of migrants such as those from the EU have been overlooked. Additionally, recent research regarding European migrants has tended to focus on historical flows or examine a single national group, and this

\textsuperscript{20} Ibid., pp. 22. Spoonley and Trlin, however, do note that this is by no means the first time that immigration has been highly politicised, for example the anti-Asian institutional discrimination in the 1890s through to the dawn raids on Pacific Island migrants in the 1970s.
\textsuperscript{21} Ibid., pp. 25.
\textsuperscript{22} Ibid., pp. 61.
\textsuperscript{23} Ibid., pp. 25.
\textsuperscript{25} However, the New Settlers Programme, an extensive study undertaken by Massey University researchers covers Chinese, Indian and South Africans migrants, and other research undertaken on behalf of the NZIS and the DOL focuses on specific migrant categories, such as business migrants, skilled migrants or work permit holders.
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has resulted in a gap in the research centred around contemporary migrant flows from the EU.

1.5 Research Problem

Prime Minister Helen Clark noted in the 2002 Annual Europa Lecture that, "[p]eople to people contact is one of the cornerstones of the EU/New Zealand relationship"\textsuperscript{26}. The human dynamic of the relationship between NZ and the EU encompasses migration of New Zealand citizens to EU member states, migration of EU citizens to New Zealand, bilateral student migration, tourist flows, as well as contact between government officials. In the light of the three contexts discussed above: the importance of immigration to NZ; the significance of the EU-NZ relationship; and the minimal recent research on migration between the EU and NZ; this thesis examines one thread of these important people to people contacts, that of contemporary migration from the EU to Canterbury, New Zealand. In this thesis, migration is recognised as the movement of people to live, work or study in Canterbury. The analysis excludes the equally important tourist flows from the EU, however due to the necessarily limited nature of Masters’ thesis research, all aspects of people-to-people contact could not be satisfactorily addressed. The reasons for the exclusion of tourist flows are further discussed in Chapter 2. Additionally, this thesis is focused on contemporary migration flows from the EU, rather than historical flows, as considerable research on historical flows has previously been undertaken. Because of the limited nature of recent research on EU migrants in NZ, the aim of this thesis is to provide an overview of the migration flows and to create a picture of the migration experience currently facing EU migrants in Canterbury. As such, an examination of the recent trends in residence, work permit and student approvals is carried out before investigating the motivations for moving to NZ, the settlement experiences of EU migrants to Canterbury. The nature of the networks that these migrants create between the EU and NZ will also begin to be explored. The specific research questions and methodology guiding this research are given in Chapter 2.

\textsuperscript{26} Clark, (2002). \textit{Op. Cit.}
1.5.1 Chapter outline

Chapter Two outlines the methodological approaches, research questions and limitations of this research. While the research is empirically driven, a range of methods were employed to ensure the greatest validity of findings, and thus secondary data, such as statistics, were utilised in addition to primary data. The primary data was derived from two surveys and additional follow up interviews, investigating the motivations for migration and experiences in NZ of EU migrant groups. One survey covered recent migrants living and working in the Canterbury region, the other targeted EU students studying in two Canterbury universities.

Literature regarding recent European migration to NZ is reviewed in Chapter Three before an examination of current theories regarding the causes of international migration is undertaken. Much of the theoretical literature in this area aims to account for the major flows of international migration, specifically from countries that are labour rich but capital poor, however, migration from the EU to Canterbury, NZ does not fall into this category, and thus alternative concepts must also examined to help to characterise these flows. An alternate framework of understanding migration from the EU to NZ is suggested.

Chapter Four situates the current examination of flows from the EU in the context of historical flows of migration to NZ. This discussion pays particular attention to flows from Europe in the initial settlement period of NZ and then those post World War II. This chapter also highlights the major changes in immigration entry policies which have impacted on the distribution and forms of migration to NZ before providing an overview of the current entry policy framing contemporary migration flows. The volume and characteristics of contemporary EU migrants in Canterbury and NZ are subsequently examined in Chapter Five using statistics from the NZ Immigration Service and the 2001 Census.

Chapters Six and Seven present the results of the survey undertaken of contemporary EU migrants living and working in the Canterbury region. The motivations for these migrants to undertake migration are examined along with their settlement experiences and future intentions. While the desire for a better lifestyle motivated a sizable proportion of this migration, other less anticipated motivations were noted such as migration for a challenge.
and migration for ‘love’\textsuperscript{27}. Settlement outcomes were identified as primarily positive. However, for a small group of migrants, non-inclusion in the work force was a major problem and for a large number of migrants, the distance from friends and family in their home country was found to be difficult.

The results of the survey of EU students at two Canterbury universities are discussed in Chapter Eight, following a review of the major initiatives to encourage EU-NZ student exchange. International students are a less studied but integral component of international migration flows, particularly for countries such as NZ where foreign exchange earnings from international students provide a significant income. A desire for overseas experience and language acquisition were two of major motivations identified for EU students to study in NZ.

Chapter Nine draws the findings of the empirical research together to make concluding remarks, and recommendations for action. Additionally, the problematic nature of theorising migration from the EU to NZ will be revisited and an assessment of the theoretical framework that guided this research will be made.

\textsuperscript{27} The research of King, (2002). \textit{Op. Cit.}, pp. 99, has identified that with an increase in mobility, the likelihood of people establishing intimate relationships with foreign nations also increases, resulting in possible migration. He has termed such movement, “love migration”.
Chapter 2
Research Questions and Methodology

2.1 Introduction
This section details the research questions under examination and then outlines the approaches used to address them. The methodological difficulties encountered during the research are outlined along with a discussion of the limitations of some of the secondary data being used. First, definitions of key terms and other more ambiguous terms are given.

2.2 Terminology and Definitions
Owing to the complex nature of the migration phenomenon, it is necessary to delimit the meaning of words that are used in a way that is more circumscribed or specific than in general public discourse. In addition to being a highly complex phenomenon, migration is also a topic that is often loaded with emotion. While terms such as immigrant and emigrant are regularly used, these are laced with meaning beyond that of a dictionary definition. While a person moving to a new country would most likely refer to themselves as an emigrant, for the inhabitants of the country they move to, they will be regarded as an immigrant. Unfortunately, in many circumstances, the term immigrant carries a negative connotation, for example, immigrants are often accused of taking up jobs that nationals believe they are entitled to, or driving up house prices. To avoid these problems, the term migrant will be used throughout this study as it is accepted to be a more neutral term. However, this raises the second, more difficult question of just who constitutes a migrant?

Varying definitions of migration can be found in literature, though most contain the idea of a spatial movement across some sort of boundary, whether administrative, social or political, as well as some notion of permanence. For example, the International Organisation for

Migration (IOM) states that “[m]igration is the movement of a person or group of persons from one geographical unit to another across an administrative or political border, wishing to settle definitely or temporarily in a place other than their place of origin.”\textsuperscript{2} Similarly, Faist defines migration as “…a permanent or semi-permanent change of residence, usually across some type of administrative boundary.”\textsuperscript{3} While not explicitly stated in either of these definitions, there is often an assumption that the movement across the boundary must be ‘significant’ or involve some sort of minimum distance\textsuperscript{4}. What actually constitutes significance however, is hard to define. Often a differentiation is made between intra-national and international migration, with the assumption that international migration involves higher barriers and intervening obstacles and has bigger implications in terms of cultural and labour market adaptation than does internal migration. This assumption has led to a differentiation in literature and theory regarding these two areas, but such a separation can be misleading as some international moves, for example between neighbouring European countries, can involve much shorter distances, and perhaps less cultural and financial impact, than some intra-national moves, for example from the East coast to West coast of the United States.\textsuperscript{5} Fortunately, in the case of movement from the EU to NZ, this issue of definitions is relatively unproblematic, as the distance involved is certainly significant, crossing both national and cultural borders as well as several oceans.

The second element of what constitutes migration in the above definitions relates to the temporal aspect of the movement. While neither of them gives a definite time frame, both refer to settlement which is permanent or semi-permanent in nature. But what constitutes permanence or even semi-permanence? Most often, the notion of permanence is linked to a specified length of time and when a time frame is established, as is the case when migrants are defined for statistical purposes, the period of 12 months is usually used. This is the formula by which Statistics NZ calculates the net permanent and long term migration flows for this country, but this is an arbitrary time limit and other researchers can and do define

\textsuperscript{2} Ibid., pp. 8.
\textsuperscript{5} Ibid., pp 4.
their parameters differently\textsuperscript{6}. Certainly for some international highly skilled workers, such as academic research postings, the time involved in migration could be under this 12 month limitation, but this does not stop them from being considered migrants. Such migration as this is generally considered temporary, and there is a wealth of literature exploring this aspect of migration.

For NZ, there are four main flows of people to the country: new residents; temporary work permit holders; international students; and tourists. The first of these, new residents who come to live permanently in NZ, appear to fit easily into the migrant category, largely because they reflect the idea of what is normally associated with migration, that is settler migration. Temporary workers also seem able to be incorporated into this category with little difficulty as they form part of the highly skilled migrant group which is now widely acknowledged in migration research. Furthermore, such workers are likely to stay in one location if they have committed to a employment contract, which may be a condition of their permit. International students, despite not appearing in international migration literature as often as the former two categories, also stay for substantial lengths of time. For tertiary students this could be several years in their country of study. Research has also shown that study abroad, irrespective of length, can influence an individual’s future migration plans as it “…build[s] up the social and information links with the country…”\textsuperscript{7} and can shape “…orientations in relation to national origin and the outside world…”\textsuperscript{8} and therefore it seems important to include this group as migrants. Finally, the last category of international movers is tourists. Here, definition could be problematic as some tourist experiences can last for an extended duration. However, the major difference between a tourist and a migrant is the element of settlement or change of residence. Even a tourist on a long holiday would still generally consider their home country as their residence. Additionally, they are likely to move from one place to another during their experience, especially if it is over a long period, however this issue is not always unequivocal. For example, working holiday schemes are an

\textsuperscript{6} For the purposes of his study on international migration and transnational social spaces, Faist, (2000). \textit{Op. Cit.} considers all people who move for three months or more to be migrants.


\textsuperscript{8} Ibid., pp 52.
important part of the NZ immigration programme and participants help to fill specific gaps in the workforce, primarily in low skilled occupations. While traditionally the primary reason for the working holiday was intended to be for holiday and tourism with work being incidental – a condition written into the terms of the visa – this has recently been changed, allowing for work to become a larger component of the trip. Programmes of this nature further blur the boundaries of tourism and migration.\(^9\)

With the previous discussion and the difficulties of definition in mind, and following the goal of this study to provide an overview of the entirety of the current migration stream from the EU to Canterbury, it was decided to encompass into the research, the first three categories of people – new residents, workers and students – who fall into the definition of migrants as discussed above. As working holiday makers form part of the work permit programme they were not excluded from this analysis despite the traditional tourism focus of the programme. However, due in part to the nature of that programme (discussed subsequently Section 4.4.2), only two working holiday permit holders were included in the survey. Although non-working tourists from the EU are exceptionally important for NZ, they were not included in this analysis as their motivations for coming to NZ and their experiences of the country are from a different perspective than migrants.

### 2.2.1 Operational definitions

**EU Migrant**

For the purposes of this study, an EU migrant is someone who was born in the EU and is now living in NZ on a residence, work or study permit, or who was born in the EU and has now been granted NZ citizenship.

**Recent EU Migrant**

A recent EU migrant is classified as someone who was born in the EU and has lived in NZ for five years or less, or for up to but not including six years. This classification is based on the definition used by the NZIS in their analysis of census data and is acknowledged to be an arbitrary one.

---

\(^9\) For an extensive discussion of the tourism migration nexus see Hall and Williams (2002), *Op. Cit.*
Established EU Migrant
An established EU migrant is defined as one who was born in the EU and has been in NZ for six or more years.

EU25
The European Union of 25 members (as from 1 May 2004): Austria, Belgium, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Ireland, Italy, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Netherlands, Poland, Portugal, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, United Kingdom.

EU24
The European Union of 25 excluding the United Kingdom.

2.3 Research Questions
A number of research objectives and associated questions have been formulated in order to examine recent migration from the EU to NZ.

Objective 1. **To provide an overview of the trends and characteristics of recent European Union migration to NZ.**

i. What have been the main changes in the distribution of EU migrants between member states?

ii. What is the distribution of recent EU migration across migration streams?

iii. What have been the changes over time in the volume and the distribution of EU students in NZ?

iv. What are the demographic characteristics of recent EU migrants?

v. Are the characteristics of migrants in the Canterbury region in line with the national trends?
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Objective 2. To examine the reasons for moving to Canterbury, NZ and the experiences of recent European Union migrants with life in Canterbury.

i. What are the motivations for EU citizens to emigrate to Canterbury, NZ?
ii. Is migration intended to be temporary or permanent?
iii. What are the economic experiences of life in Canterbury for recent EU migrants?
iv. What are the social experiences of life in Canterbury for recent EU migrants?
v. What links do recent EU migrants retain with the EU?

Objective 3. To present an analysis of EU student migration to Canterbury, NZ.

i. What are the motivations for EU student migrants to choose Canterbury for study?
ii. What experiences do EU students have in Canterbury?
iii. What impact does EU student migration have on future migration to NZ?

2.4 EU migrants to Canterbury

New migrants to a country traditionally settle in large cities where the chances of finding work are higher, and where there are already established communities of migrants that can ease settlement. NZ is no exception to this phenomenon and approximately 57 percent of recent migrants were located in Auckland in 2001, up from 53 percent in 1996, while only 9 percent settle in Wellington and 8 percent settle in Christchurch. Though this Auckland-centric pattern is more pronounced for some migrant groups that others, for example 68 percent of recent North Asian migrants and 74 percent of recent Pacific migrants reside in Auckland compared with only 32 percent of Australian migrants and 44 percent of ESANA migrants, it is still reasonable to ask if it is appropriate to study recent EU migrants in Canterbury when a much greater proportion live in Auckland. There are several reasons why Canterbury is a good choice of location for studying EU migrants. Firstly, due to the concentration of migrants in Auckland many previous NZ migrant studies, particularly those regarding migrants from Asia, have been based on samples from Auckland. Therefore,

---

11ESANA is a Statistics NZ term which refers to Europe (including Russia), South Africa and North America (please see Section 2.5.3 later in this chapter for a comment on the difficulties of this grouping).
Canterbury provides an area that has not been substantially examined in the past. Secondly, while the census figures show only 8 percent of recent ESANA migrants live in Christchurch, when the rest of Canterbury is encompassed, this figure rises to 12 percent\textsuperscript{13}. This reflects the more widely disseminated nature of recent EU migrants to NZ who have a relatively higher proportion (33 percent) who live in ‘Other areas’\textsuperscript{14} compared with other migrant groups\textsuperscript{15}. Furthermore, the national distribution of recent EU migrants in Canterbury is quite similar to the overall national distribution of recent EU migrants in NZ (see Table 2.1\textsuperscript{16}), though the Czech Republic, Poland and France are slightly under represented in Canterbury and the Netherlands and Ireland are marginally over represented.

### Table 2.1: Percentage of recent migrants in Canterbury from total NZ

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Canterbury n</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Total NZ n</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>% recent migrants in Canterbury</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cyprus</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Czech Republic</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>297</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estonia</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
<td>708</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>306</td>
<td>29.8%</td>
<td>2418</td>
<td>29.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hungary</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>13.7%</td>
<td>960</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>306</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latvia</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lithuania</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luxembourg</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malta</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{13} This 12% figure is based on slightly different calculations than the figure given for the ESANA migrants which is drawn from NZIS, (2003a). It is for migrants who had been in NZ for only 4 years and was calculated from tables regarding European migrants only, rather than the whole ESANA grouping.
\textsuperscript{14} Other areas are defined as all areas excluding these main centres: Auckland (including North Shore, Waitakere, Auckland City and Manukau), Hamilton, Wellington (including Porirua, Upper Hutt, Wellington City and Lower Hutt), Christchurch and Dunedin.
\textsuperscript{15} Australian migrants are the only group with a higher proportion living in other areas (44%), while the average for other groups is between 10% for North Asian migrants to 15% for South East Asian migrants.
\textsuperscript{16} The UK is excluded from this table as its inclusion renders the percentages for the remaining EU24 countries too small to compare. The figures for the UK are: recent UK migrants in Canterbury n=3606 (77.8\% of EU25 total) and recent UK migrants in NZ n=28176 (77.2\% of EU25 total), % of recent UK migrants in Canterbury = 12.8\%.
\textsuperscript{17} Percentage of recent national migrant group in Canterbury from total recent EU migrants in Canterbury.
\textsuperscript{18} Percentage of recent national migrant group in NZ from total recent EU migrants in NZ.
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The methodology used in this research combines both qualitative and quantitative techniques and draws on secondary and primary data to address the research questions.

2.5.1 Secondary Data Collection

To address the first research objective regarding the demographic characteristics and recent trends of EU migration NZ, secondary statistical data is drawn from two main sources; NZIS online records of visa and permit approvals and the 2001 Census of population and dwellings. Reports published by the NZIS are also used, where possible, to provide comparisons between recent EU migrants and the total recent migrant population in NZ. Furthermore, a large range of secondary sources, such as books, journal and newspaper articles, and statistics have been used to provide context for the analysis of the primary data relating to the second and third research objectives.

2.5.2 Difficulties with secondary data

Obtaining data on international migration is problematic due to the differences in definitions and in methods of data collection. While this project does not seek to compare data from different countries, and therefore avoids some of the problems encountered by those undertaking research into multiple international migrant flows, there are nevertheless methodological traps that need to be considered. The main limitations of these statistical data sources are discussed below.

Although statistical data regarding the issue of permits and visas are available on the NZIS website, this only dates back to 1997/98. Data prior to this time are held by NZIS but were

|        | Permits |     | Visas |     |  
|--------|---------|-----|-------|-----|---
| Total  | 237     | 23.1%| 1389  | 16.7%| 17.1% |
| Poland | 30      | 2.9% | 369   | 4.4% | 8.1%  |
| Portugal| 6     | 0.6% | 48    | 0.6% | 12.5% |
| Slovakia| 3     | 0.3% | 81    | 1.0% | 3.7%  |
| Slovenia| 0     | 0.0% | 69    | 0.8% | 0.0%  |
| Spain  | 15      | 1.5% | 123   | 1.5% | 12.2% |
| Sweden | 51      | 5.0% | 390   | 4.7% | 13.1% |
| Total  | 1026    | 100.3%| 8340  | 100.0%| 12.3% |
not accessible for this project and as a consequence, it is only possible to present recent
trends in approvals for residence, work and student permits of people from the EU.
Furthermore, these data refer only to the number of visas issued to people, not to the actual
number who take up residence in NZ. It is possible, for various reasons, that people may be
granted a visa and subsequently choose not to travel to NZ. Alternatively, people could come
to NZ and then decide to return home shortly thereafter. As a result, these permit numbers
could be slightly overstated. Thirdly, the data represent the total number of applicants per
application approved, as more than one individual can be represented on each application.
This is helpful as it gives a more accurate count as to the total number of people intending to
come to NZ. However, if an individual/family applies for more than one permit or visa
during any one year, they will be recorded on each occasion which could result in them being
counted twice and this may result in an elevation in the number of permits but not in the
actual number of migrants. This problem is of relatively minor concern when examining the
number of residence permits as applicants are unlikely to be approved for residence more
than once a year, however for both student and work permits, it is distinctly possible that
more than one permit can be granted to an individual in a year. One estimate of approvals
per person for skilled work permits is approximately 1.3 permits per year per individual\(^\text{19}\).
Thus, a difference between the number of permits approved and the number of individuals
they pertain to for work and student permits is probable. Fourthly, these data do not reflect
the number of people who applied for but were declined approval or who withdrew their
application. Therefore, the data cannot be used to provide an indication of the numbers of
people interested in migrating to NZ. Finally, information regarding the personal
characteristics of the applicants involved is not provided by the data\(^\text{20}\), nor can they give an
indication of how many migrants chose to settle in the Canterbury region. Census data has
been used, therefore, to outline these additional features of EU migration to NZ.

The census data used in this project are drawn from the 2001 Census of Population and
Dwellings. Most of the data are readily accessible from the Statistics NZ website, however,
the data set regarding recent EU migrants in the Canterbury region was created by Statistics

\(^{19}\) NZIS, (2004b). *New Zealand Work Policy: Meeting talent, skill and labour needs*, Wellington: Department of
Labour, pp 11.

\(^{20}\) Although, again, this data is held by NZIS but was not available for this project.
NZ specifically for this project. Some qualifications must also be outlined regarding these data. Firstly, census data only provide a snapshot of the personal characteristics of recent migrants from the EU and do not show trends in these characteristics over time\textsuperscript{21}. Secondly, census data is published with a base three random rounding system in order to ensure confidentiality of individual information\textsuperscript{22}. Although the figures for the UK are sufficiently substantial to make the effect of this rounding negligible, for some of the other EU countries the number involved is quite small. This effect is heightened when different variables are cross referenced. Thus, the rounding system may have a more significant impact than would be desirable and in these cases, figures for the EU countries as a whole have been used to mitigate this.

At this point, the possibility of sampling errors must also be acknowledged. While the Census is based on a sample of the entire nation, it possible that misunderstanding of questions, incorrectly completed forms and other procedural errors may occur and this is an additional justification for using the largest aggregate results for the group where possible. Finally, it is not possible to differentiate permanent residents, workers and students in census data. Every person normally resident in NZ and physically in NZ on Census night, fills in a census form and therefore makes up the sample group. However, this excludes overseas visitors who self-identify as being usually resident overseas and therefore, it may be possible that some people on a medium term stay, for example a student, may identify themselves as being usually resident overseas and therefore be missed. Additionally, those persons who are out of the country may be excluded from the count. Finally, in its analysis of people born overseas in the 2001 Census data, NZIS uses the grouping ESANA, or Europe (including Russia), South Africa and North America, which is based on a high level grouping introduced for the Longitudinal Immigration Survey: New Zealand (LisNZ)\textsuperscript{23}. This grouping was created because these migrants were deemed to have ‘similar’ characteristics, though this similarity was not further defined. This means however, that figures for the EU specifically are largely obscured and while it was possible to purchase some Census data from the most

\textsuperscript{21} While it would have been useful to compare the 2001 census data for recent migrants with that from previous years censuses this was not possible due to the cost involved in obtaining the specialised data sets that would have been required to make this comparison.
\textsuperscript{22} From the Stats NZ website, http://www.stats.govt.nz/census/2001-maori/standards.htm, on 23/06/2005
\textsuperscript{23} See Section 3.2.2 for further information regarding the LisNZ study.
recent Census to overcome this problem, the cost was prohibitive and as a result comparisons between Censuses was not able to be performed.

One final difficulty with the Census data stems from the disparity in migrant numbers from the various countries of the EU. UK nationals comprise approximately 80-85 percent of migrants from the EU in NZ. Consequently, their numbers easily and regularly dominate any figures or percentages given for the EU25. In the figures presented below then, reference will sometimes be made to the EU24 and the UK separately in cases where the EU24 are different from the UK.

While these difficulties may seem sizeable, it is not impossible to use these data, provided these caveats are kept in mind and conclusions drawn from the data are not overstated.

2.5.3 Primary Data Collection
As discussed in Chapter 1, there are no studies relating to recent EU migrants currently available, and as such, the second and third research objectives could not easily be addressed using secondary data. To detect peoples’ motivations and experiences of migration therefore, it was necessary to access them directly, either through survey or interviews. Different methods were employed for the recent EU migrants living and working in Canterbury\textsuperscript{24} and the EU student migrants. The reason for this duality of methods was two-fold. First, it was possible to access EU students in a different manner to other EU migrants and secondly, the questions for EU student migrants were different to target and reflect the different purpose of their residence in NZ.

It is notable that some researchers have suggested that interviewing migrants in the place of destination about their migration motivations can result in responses that are skewed by post-migration rationalisation or are “...the post hoc reflections of migrants about their prior

\textsuperscript{24} As noted in the Section 2.2.1, a recent EU migrant is one who has lived in NZ for not more than 5 years. In order to correspond with this, survey respondents also had to be living in NZ for not more than 5 years. However, to ensure a minimal level of experience of NZ society, a 6 month lower time limit was also imposed. In short, to be eligible to participate in the survey, EU migrants had to be living in NZ for between 6 months and five years.
behaviour.” That is to say, once a move has been completed the need to justify or rationalise the behaviour can affect the responses that are given. Additionally, problems associated with memory can result in respondents only recalling the main influences on their decision to migrate and not reporting additional or secondary factors. However, in this study, all of the migrants questioned had arrived within a five year time frame, mitigating against the problems of recall, and the use of in-depth qualitative interviews in addition to the open-ended questions in the questionnaire allowed the issue of motivation to be probed more fully.

This investigation is situated primarily at the micro level of decision making; it directly examines an individual’s or family’s decision making process. However, it is acknowledged that other factors do influence decision making at the meso and macro levels. Such factors as these will be discussed further in the theory overview and will be considered in the analysis of the generated primary data.

2.5.4. Primary data collection on recent EU migrants to Canterbury

The design for the primary data collection for the recent EU migration to Canterbury was challenged by the lack of a straightforward means of contacting the targeted migrants as they constitute an essentially ‘hidden population’ within NZ society. Because migrants are not required to register with a local or national body and there is no centralised list providing contact details for them, and because many EU migrants have similar visual characteristics to the general NZ European population, they are not easily distinguished and are consequently more difficult to locate and contact. Additionally, some portions of the EU migrant community in Canterbury, Dutch and British migrants in particular, have been shown to distribute themselves geographically along similar lines to the general population, so there is no particular suburb to target for investigations of this nature. Other studies, for example

Buller and Hoggart\textsuperscript{28}, have made use of linguistic difference in names to sample migrants from a telephone directory, however, with NZ’s long history of migration and the similarity of names of particularly British migrants to NZ Europeans, as well as the significant contribution of migration after marriage to a NZ partner, this technique was not practical for this case study. While a direct approach to the NZIS requesting contact information for recent EU migrants in Canterbury may have been possible, due to the restrictions of Privacy Act, it is unlikely that the Service would have been able to release their details. Finally, any existing records may not have been current for migrants up to six years after arrival, and if the study had association with the NZIS, it may have made potential participants feel uncomfortable about participating or to feel pressured to provide certain responses.

This lack of an existing sampling frame made any kind of probability sampling impossible. Consequently, a snowball method was used to gain access to participants. This chain referral technique, whereby initial contacts are made with possible informants or members of the target population who are subsequently asked to recommend further potential participants, is relatively common in migration studies, particularly in those with a more qualitative orientated approach, for example Boyer, Burgelt, and Mitchell, Bunting and Piccioni\textsuperscript{29}, and other studies where the target population is hidden and it is “...difficult to contact people in any other way.”\textsuperscript{30}. 

Several chains of contact were initiated in the search for participants. Enquiries were made to the available Honorary Consuls based in Christchurch representing EU countries and to national societies such as the \textit{Alliance Français} and the Polish Association. Two people who work with and support migrants were used as primary contacts; the Canterbury Employer’s Chamber of Commerce Migrant Co-ordinator, and a contact at a migration agency. Additionally, a newspaper advertisement was placed in the Diary section of The Christchurch Press and an interview was given on the local Dutch Radio to try and enlarge the sample. Finally, the personal networks of the researcher were utilised for making initial contacts.


\textsuperscript{29} For full bibliographic references for these authors, see References section.

Some of the initiated chains were more successful than others in locating migrants willing to participate.

Of the ten EU honorary consuls\(^{31}\) in Christchurch, only four responded to the initial enquiry. Out of these, only one, the German Honorary Consul, was able to provide any information on possible participants. The remaining three were unaware of any potential candidates for the research although two did suggest contacting their respective national clubs in Christchurch. It seems likely that the consuls who did not respond also did not feel that they could assist with the research as they did not have any information about recent migrants, so this chain resulted in three contacts.

Of the thirteen national clubs contacted, eight replied and either provided contact details for possible participants or forwarded and/or advertised details of the research to their members. This chain resulted in eleven contacts overall. The national societies, however, were not themselves straightforward to contact as the details provided on the Christchurch City Council directory were not all up to date, and in some cases it took several referrals and other enquiries to find the current club president or secretary. Additionally, from discussions with several of the club presidents, it did seem that some clubs primarily had older memberships drawn from the established migrant population, or, as in the case of the \textit{Alliance Française}, a high proportion of NZ Francophiles. A further seven participants were gained from the advertisement chain. The major chain resulted from the direct personal contacts of the researcher which after several levels of referral resulted in thirty participants.

In total fifty-six questionnaires were returned, with four being discarded for various reasons of ineligibility\(^ {32}\), leaving a total of fifty-two participants.

During the snow-balling, contact was made with prospective participants either by asking the initial contact to provide details for them and then contacting that person directly or by asking the initial contact to pass on the researcher’s details to the prospective participant so

\(^{31}\) Belgium, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Italy, the Netherlands, Spain, Sweden, UK.

\(^{32}\) One respondent had been in NZ for over 6 years, one was on a visitor’s visa, one on a student visa and one not from the EU.
they could contact the researcher. It was considered important to provide this option to protect the privacy of people who did not wish to participate, however the system worked more effectively when the researcher was given the contact details to follow up on personally. One extreme example of this is the chain that started with the migration consultant who reportedly contacted thirty-five potential participants. Due to privacy restrictions the firm was unable to give the researcher contact information for the clients and instead emailed out information regarding the study directly to the clients. Unfortunately, out of this chain only one migrant responded and the chain subsequently ended. One possible explanation for this is that once a personal connection was established with the researcher, participants felt more inclined to take the study seriously. However, it may have also related to the length of the survey, a feature that will be discussed later in this section.

There are, of course, limitations to using this type of snowballing technique. The most important of these is the resulting lack of representativeness of the sample as the participants are not randomly chosen but are instead “…dependent on the subjective choices of the respondents first accessed…”33. This lack of representativeness can be further compounded by the chain referral technique at the basis of snowballing which can emphasise homogeneity in the sample. This is because people tend to group together with others who have similar characteristics, such as age or occupation. This can be somewhat offset by “…initiating several discrete chains with fewer links…”34, and wherever possible this technique has been used in this research as outlined. Due to the lack of representativeness however, no claims of generality are being made from these results. They are instead intended as an explorative foray into a target population which has not been recently examined. The results therefore will be largely descriptive and can be used as a basis for future research into the area.

The actual instrument by which to collect the primary data for this study was also a complex choice and ultimately two methods were used. First, a postal survey was sent to the participants as they were located by the snowball technique. Secondly, semi-structured interviews with a selected sub-set of the sample were conducted. It was initially decided that

34 Ibid., pp 4.
a structured questionnaire would provide a good range of information. The choice to use a postal delivery method was made as it seemed the best method for accessing migrants throughout the Canterbury region. Owing to the large geographic area of this region, the potential travel distance required for undertaking a large number of face-to-face interviews was considered disadvantageous. The questionnaire, which included both open-ended and closed questions covering the motivations for leaving the home country and the decision to choose NZ, and the experiences of the immigration process and subsequent settlement outcomes in NZ, was developed and pilot tested. Despite this pilot testing phase and subsequent revision of the questionnaire, it is likely that it was overly long for the postal format and this may have negatively impacted the response rate\textsuperscript{35}. In hindsight, face-to-face administration of the questionnaire, a method which allows longer interviews\textsuperscript{36} may have been a better choice to increase the number of respondents and may have heightened the success of the snowball technique which, as discussed above, was more effective with personal contact. This notion is further strengthened by the composition of the final group of respondents, most of whom live in or near Christchurch and would have been easily accessible for face-to-face interviews. Such factors were not obvious at the beginning of data collection but may be taken into consideration for future research.

Qualitative semi-structured interviews were undertaken to supplement the information gained from the questionnaire. In total twelve interviews were conducted lasting from 20 minutes to an hour and a half in length, and were tape-recorded and subsequently transcribed\textsuperscript{37}. Ten interviewees were selected from the questionnaire respondents to represent the various groups and outcomes that were discovered in the questionnaire findings. These included three respondents with NZ partners, one single person and six couples, covering Dutch, English, French, German and Hungarian nationalities. The interviews were carried out at the

\textsuperscript{35}Based on 2001 census data, the estimated number of recent EU migrants in Canterbury was placed at approximately 4,500 and it was hoped that a total number of 75-100 questionnaires may have been returned. Unfortunately, this number was not reached and ultimately n = 52.


\textsuperscript{37}One spontaneous interview was not able to be tape-recorded and instead notes were taken during the interview.
interviewee’s place of choice and four of the interviews took place with both partners in the couple. A mix of stated motivations was sought, from migration for work purposes as well as lifestyles reasons, and a balance between permanent and temporary migrants. Outcomes in the labour market were spread between those who had a job prior to arrival, those who found work after arrival and those who could not find work. The two additional interviews were carried out with migrants introduced to the researcher following the conclusion of the postal survey and therefore do not form part of the questionnaire findings. However, these subjects were felt to demonstrate two very interesting cases, particularly in the area of economic experiences, and thus were included in the final interview findings.

It would finally be worthwhile to note several changes that may have improved the number of responses gained and the delivery of the survey. A large number of internet sites established for people thinking of migrating to NZ and for those who are already in NZ currently exist. While these sites were not utilised in this study, these could prove helpful in future research efforts. These sites cover a range of issues on migration but also provide a forum where both migrants and prospective migrants discuss migration and offer advice and recommendations on best practise. Such websites are primarily targeted at British migrants, although they are also used to a lesser degree by migrants of other nationalities and would provide another source for gaining contacts for migrants. Furthermore, an on-line delivery of the survey may have made it more accessible to migrants and eased the collation of results. However, online surveys in which participants are gained from snow-balling still encounter the same problems of non-representativeness as other forms of questionnaires using this technique. Additionally, online surveys are at risk of ‘spoofing’ where people “...purposefully [fill] in questionnaires falsely whilst pretending to be someone else.”

Other possible contacts for potential participants may be through businesses associated with migration, for example, international removal firms, although privacy issues may be problematic.

2.5.5 Primary data collection on EU student migrants to Canterbury

In order to assess the motivations and experiences of EU students studying in Canterbury an email survey was sent out. While the student population in Canterbury is made up of English language students, students studying at sub-tertiary levels and tertiary students, this survey was only conducted of tertiary students, specifically those at Canterbury’s two universities, Lincoln University and the University of Canterbury. These parameters were set for several reasons. Primary students were excluded from the study as it is most likely that they have come to NZ because of the decision of their parents\(^ {39} \) and thus asking for their motivations would be of little help in assessing the motivations of EU migrants in coming to Canterbury. Additionally, although the experiences of children of the migration process are a valid avenue for research, they do not fit directly into the current project and therefore were excluded from the sample. Secondly, over thirty registered English language schools are based in Canterbury, around 35 high schools, numerous private tertiary institutions and five state tertiary institutions\(^ {40} \). To cover all of these groups comprehensively was not feasible for the scope of this project. Additionally, as noted above, obtaining an accurate gauge of the numbers and types of international students in the Canterbury region was very difficult, and it was therefore it was not possible to know what proportion of EU student are enrolled at the various institutions. Compounding these difficulties was the fact that many English-language courses were of short duration, making it more difficult to access the students, and it was therefore decided to concentrate on state tertiary institutions and specifically universities. University courses are generally at least a semester in length, thus providing a larger window in which to access students and are also in line with the experience limit used for the migrant survey.

Students were accessed by email via the university’s international offices’ electronic mailing lists. This allowed students who did not wish to participate to remain anonymous. Unfortunately due to delays in receiving Ethics Committee approvals, the survey was not

\(^{39}\) This is not to assume that a child has not input into the migration decision of their parents, as the child may in fact be one of the motivating factors for the parent, but it is assumed that the final decision is that of the parent and not of the child.

ready until after Lincoln University had broken for its end of year exam period in 2004. Consequently, the survey was initially sent only to the University of Canterbury EU students in late October 2004. Only 25 completed surveys were returned at this stage and owing to this low number the survey was dispatched a second time both to Lincoln and Canterbury Universities in May 2005. During this second phase, 38 responses were received from Canterbury and 14 responses were received from Lincoln, giving a total of 77 responses.  

2.5.6 Ethical Issues
This study was approved by the University of Canterbury Ethics Committee and has been carried out according to the agreed process. No participating person is identified by name and care has been taken to present information so individuals are not identifiable. Participation in the study was on a strictly voluntary basis. All participants involved in the postal survey and interviews gave their written consent. In the case of the student email survey, consent was tacit through the return of the questionnaire (participants were informed of this assumption). However, all participants were fully able to withdraw from the project, including the withdrawal of any information previously provided, at any stage. In the cases of recorded and transcribed interviews, the transcription was carried out by the researcher so confidentiality was maintained.

---

41 Response rates from the second distribution of EU student surveys were approximately 20 percent.
Chapter 3

Literature and Theory Review

3.1 Introduction

Much scholarly attention has been paid to the area of migration in the past and currently, and as a consequence, literature on international migration is vast and wide ranging. As the focus of this research, however, is migration to NZ it is pertinent to primarily examine the related literature and as such, the initial part of this literature review addresses the relevant literature on migration to NZ. The second part of the literature review relates to theories exploring the causes of migration and it is here that the wealth of global literature is drawn upon.

A survey of NZ migration literature produced between 1995-1998 noted that much of the recent literature regarding European migration tended to be historical in nature, arguably due to “…the emergence of a ‘new’ historiography of the nineteenth century simulated by the writings of scholars such as James Belich…”1. While this literature is extremely interesting, it does not form part of the current review as this research deals specifically with contemporary immigration flows. An overview of the historical flows of European migrants to NZ is undertaken in Chapter 4.

3.2 Literature Review

3.2.1 Research Objective I

Trends and Characteristics of Recent EU Migrants to NZ

Trends in migration to NZ are extensively monitored by the Department of Labour and the New Zealand Immigration Service (NZIS). Since 2000, the NZIS has published an annual Trends in Residence Approvals report. These quantitative studies are based upon data

---

collected by the NZIS and they describe who is coming to NZ in terms of age, nationality and other factors under the different migration categories. The reports also look at temporary permit holders and the transition between residence and temporary permits. These reports provide an extremely useful overview in which to examine the statistics on migration from the EU. However, although Great Britain often appears individually in the presented statistics, the remaining EU member states are only rarely mentioned due to the often small size of their migration flows and therefore it is necessary to explore other options in identifying the current EU migration trends.

Analyses of people born overseas from census data have been carried out by NZIS in 1996 and 2001. Again migrants are described in terms of nationality, age, employment status and occupation and, additionally, differences between established migrants and recent migrants are discussed. However, in these analyses, EU migrants are again not differentiated. Instead, the grouping of ESANA (Europe, including Russia, South Africa and North America) is used. Other reviews of migration trends have been written by academics. In their digest and bibliography series, Trlin and Spoonley\(^2\) presented migration trends from different regions, including Europe, and provide useful contextual information for discussions on migration. In addition to these general trend studies, the New Zealand Department of Labour (DOL) monitors the fiscal impact of migrants on NZ. However, only two recent articles exist which deal with migration trends of European migrants as a group to NZ\(^3\). This is likely due to the relatively small recent flows of continental European migrants to NZ, and to the concentration of scholars on other areas, particularly Asia.

Trapeznik used NZ Immigration Service data to analyse the trends in European migration to New Zealand from 1982-1991 and again from 1991-1994, though he excluded both the UK and the Netherlands from his analysis as the larger numbers from these countries can cause


“...ambiguity and distortion...”\textsuperscript{4}. Trapeznik noted that during the two time periods in his study, migration from Eastern Europe more than doubled from 1 percent of the total residence stream to 2.9 percent, and the author attributed this to the political changes associated with the break up of the Soviet Union in Eastern Europe. During the same monitored time period, he noted that the levels of Western European migration remained largely stable. Although Trapeznik’s study covered only residence permits, it is particularly helpful as it encompassed the period just prior to that addressed in this thesis and so contributes to establishing trends. The second relevant article authored by Winkelmann\textsuperscript{5}, is also quantitative in nature but rather than addressing the arrival numbers of migrants, the research is focused on the economic performance of European migrants in NZ.

Winkelmann went beyond simply examining the number of migrants from Europe and assessed the labour market performance of recent European migrants in the 1980s and 1990s as compared to the New Zealand-born work force and non-European migrants. Using census data from 1986 and 1996, Winkelmann’s research analysed the personal characteristics, including language proficiency and qualifications, and the subsequent labour market performance, as shown by rate of employment and annual income, for male migrants. The choice to study only male migrants was based upon the desire for compatibility with other international studies. Like Trapeznik, Winkelmann separated migrants from the UK and the Netherlands – more traditional sources of migrants for NZ – from those from ‘other Europe’ and compared between these groups. He found that in 1986 all European migrant groups were employed at a similar or higher rate than the NZ born population, and that this was especially the case for all recent European migrants, although UK migrants had the highest levels in both groups. However, in 1996 this trend had changed and of established European migrants, only those from the UK were comparable with NZ born men, with both Dutch and ‘other Europe’ migrants falling behind. For the recent migrants in 1996, however, it was only those from ‘other Europe’ who continued to be employed at a lower rate than NZ born men, though this was significant at over 20 percentage points less than NZ born men. It should be noted though, in all of these situations, non-European migrants were employed at

\textsuperscript{5}Winkelmann (2000), \textit{Op. Cit.}
far lower rates than NZ born and European migrants, though this may be partially explained by the high rates of participation in post-secondary education of recent non-European migrants. After using regression analysis to control for different personal characteristics, Winkelmann concluded that despite all groups having generally higher qualifications than NZ-born men, only UK migrants ‘integrated well’, or achieved similar income and employment rates as comparable to NZ men. Dutch migrants showed a slight disadvantage compared with NZ born men although the income differential was small. ‘Other Europe’ had a further disadvantage again, and this was particularly the case for those arriving between 1991 and 1996. Finally, however, non-European migrants had the greatest relative disadvantage. Winkelmann’s research is useful as it provides a background of the economic situation of recent European migrants in the period prior to this research. While it shows that on the whole UK migrants found employment, it serves to demonstrate that not all European migrants necessarily integrate into the economy immediately and easily.

3.2.2 Research Objective II

Motivations and Experiences of Recent EU Migrants to NZ

Literature on the motivations for moving to NZ and the experiences of various migrant groups is substantial. Recent literature in this field though is again focused generally on migrants from Asia. A variety of authors cover different aspects of Asian migration, with studies on Chinese, Taiwanese and Korean migrants as well as more regionally based studies\(^6\). A substantial proportion of these publications stem from the New Settlers Programme run by Massey University. This extensive longitudinal study examines the settlement outcomes of Chinese, Indian and South African migrants who have arrived in NZ under the general skills category since 1997. In addition to reports on the employment and health impacts of migration, other supplementary papers of more general aspects of migration have been published within the framework of this programme. Researchers at the Migration Research Group based at Waikato University also contribute significantly to the literature on the many aspects of recent migration. Finally, the NZIS produces reports on the experiences of different migrant groups such as skilled migrants and business migrants. While all of

\(^6\) For studies on migration from Asia see bibliographies provided in Trlin and Spoonley (1987-2005). Also see websites for the New Settlers Programme and the Migration Research Group.
These publications add to the knowledge surrounding recent migration to NZ, the specific experiences of European migrants is missing.

In 2004, the NZIS launched the pilot report for its Longitudinal Immigration Survey: New Zealand (LisNZ). This project is designed to “…provide a profile of new migrants to New Zealand, linking migrant characteristics with subsequent settlement experiences and outcomes.” The study is intended to be based upon migrant interviews that take place over three years, with the aim of having 5000 participants in the final stage of interviewing. It will cover such areas as motivations, experiences, living arrangements, labour force participation and social integration and settlement. The pilot survey covered approximately 550 new residents living in NZ main centres and found that the main motivation for migrants from the skilled business stream to choose NZ was lifestyle, followed by climate or physical environment, though employment opportunities were third. Unsurprising, for those in the family/international stream, the main motivation was a family relationship.

Unfortunately the pilot study results are not broken down by nationality, only by immigration stream, so it is not possible to see if these motivations are equal between migrant groups. The pilot report also covered a range of settlement experiences, in both the social and employment spheres. While exploring these results, differences between national groupings were examined but European migrants were again put into the ESANA grouping which merges them with Russians, South Africans and North Americans. The advent of such a longitudinal study may seem to mitigate the usefulness of this thesis. However, the final results of the LisNZ project will not be available until 2007 and if the NZIS continues with its current trend of merging European migrants into a bigger ESANA grouping, then it is possible that even in the project’s final stages, a specific picture of European migration will not be clear. Still, the LisNZ pilot survey is helpful as a guide to highlight differences or similarities with the findings of the current research and to see areas where future research may be needed.

Some studies of the motivations and experiences of recent European migrant groups are available but there is no study of the EU or even European migrants as a collective. Additionally, the studies that are available tend to be either old or quite specialised.

Zodgekar\textsuperscript{8} studied 332 British migrants to NZ. The study was based upon questionnaires completed by heads of households who had been granted an emigration permit in 1983. So as to eliminate the possibility of post-migration rationalisation, the questionnaires were completed by participants prior to actually emigrating. The questionnaires covered issues such as the migration history of family members, the influence of family and friends on migration, as well as the expectations of the household heads on the economic and housing situation in NZ and the push and pull factors that were involved in the decision making process. Zodgekar found that the migrants’ perceptions of NZ were extremely positive and that this contributed to the desire to migrate. However, the author felt that this perception, perhaps built on stereotyped and selective advertising, may have led to post-migration frustrations. Another interesting feature of Zodgekar’s findings was the prevalence of employment as a pull factor, with over 60 percent of his sample under 60 years spontaneously mentioning it, thus making it the highest of pull factors mentioned. However, Zodgekar also noted that “...contacts with family, friends and life experienced in New Zealand also seem to have influenced their decision to emigrate there.”\textsuperscript{9}

In another survey based study, Kruiter\textsuperscript{10} presented data regarding the characteristics and motives of prospective Dutch emigrants to Canada, Australia and NZ. Unfortunately the actual methodology of this survey is unclear as only a four page summary of the research is available in English. Like Zodgekar, Kruiter’s study also found that was a substantial push factor but his study found that for migrants to NZ, the pull factors such as peace, scenery and space were more important than economic considerations. Both Zodgekar’s and Kruiter’s studies are useful to the present research as they presented information on the motives of


European migrants in a earlier period and thus can be used to inform the current research and potentially assist in showing any continuation or change in motivations over time. However, neither study relates the migration motivations with the subsequent experiences of the migrants in NZ.

Another study on Dutch migration by van Dongen\textsuperscript{11} in 1992 largely covered the arrival and outcomes of Dutch migrants from the 1950s to 1970s. This article, published on the 350\textsuperscript{th} anniversary of Dutch explorer Abel Tasman’s first sighting of NZ, is principally descriptive, and outlined 1950s migrants’ first impressions of NZ, their struggle to retain Dutch culture and the impact of Dutch migrants on the agricultural industry and NZ society in general. However, it noted the changing motivations for migrants in the 1950s, who were “...escaping the problems of poverty...”\textsuperscript{12}, compared with those of more recent migrants for whom migration was a more positive choice.

Several more recent studies have also been undertaken examining German migrants to NZ. Bönisch-Brednich\textsuperscript{13} undertook 102 life history interviews in 1996-97 with German migrants who had arrived in NZ over a 60 year timeframe. Along with these interviews, Bönisch-Brednich used a wide range of secondary sources and statistics to build a picture of migration from Germany which is analysed in two ways; first, by chronological groups of migrants, and then by central themes. This analysis is interesting because it interwove the social and economic conditions of NZ and Germany with migrants’ own stories to present an integrated picture of the migration process. Particularly relevant for this research is the chapter regarding ‘The 1990s: Emigration and Lifestyle’, which discussed some of the paradoxes of modern first-first world migration that this study is also concerned with. One of the differences noted by Bönisch-Brednich, that is echoed by some participants in this research, was that the decision to move to New Zealand was not necessarily always considered a permanent move, and that some migrants were and are prepared for future ‘shifts’ or lead a circular lifestyle split between Germany and NZ. Furthermore, Bönisch-Brednich also found

\textsuperscript{12} \textit{Ibid.}, pp. 90.  
that migration was not always predicated on the idea that there was something wrong in Germany, but instead that New Zealand was considered better for the migrant at that particular time\textsuperscript{14}. Bönisch-Brednich identified two types of German migrants who came to NZ in the 1990s: financially secure early retirees who desired a safe Western but slightly alternative place to live with a natural setting, especially in the aftermath of German reunification; and young urban migrants, generally with transportable careers, for whom emigration was not a life long undertaking but was instead akin to ‘shifting house’. In a qualitative psychologically orientated study, Bürgelt\textsuperscript{15} looked at the migration process for German couples. She examined the reasons for and impacts on those migrants who return to Germany and how their experience differed from the ‘stayers’. Additionally, the role gender plays in the migration process was observed. Because the Bürgelt study was based upon a small sample of only eight couples however, and because the focus of the study is much narrower than this research, it has only minimal applications for this research.

\textbf{3.2.3 Research Objective III}

\textit{EU Student migration to NZ}

As with literature regarding migrants to NZ, literature on international students in NZ is considerable and diverse. A recent review of the NZ literature on export education, or New Zealand’s international education services, yielded around 350 articles falling into six broad themes: practical teaching advice; sociology/societal attitudes/relationships; economics; policy/regulation; marketing; and miscellaneous\textsuperscript{16}. This review noted that due to the dynamic nature of the sector, research prior to the late 1990s was often out of date and that much of the earlier research was institution-specific or focussed on particular aspects of the industry. More recent research however, was noted to have taken a broader approach\textsuperscript{17}.

A 2003 report for the Canterbury Development Corporation examined the trends in growth of foreign fee-paying (FFP) students enrolled at primary and secondary schools, public and

\textsuperscript{14} Ibid., pp. 147.
\textsuperscript{15} Burgelt, P. (2003). \textit{Is New Zealand the Right Choice? The Psychological and Social Factors Influencing the Decision for German Immigrants to New Zealand to Stay in New Zealand or to Return to Germany}, Masters Thesis, Psychology Department, Massey University.
\textsuperscript{17} Ibid., pp. 12.
private tertiary institutions, and English language schools in the Christchurch/Canterbury region. They found a steady increase in FFP student numbers from 1994 to 2002, with only a temporary dip in 1998 following with the Asian economic crisis of 1997. These strong figures were seen to be due to NZ’s safe and friendly environment, cheaper cost and proactive marketing. Unsurprisingly, the national distribution was dominated by Asian students, and in 2002 students from Europe made up 1.6% and 6.6% of the foreign fee-paying students in Canterbury schools and public tertiary institutions respectively. Lee and Gan surveyed 56 education providers for their opinions on future growth trends in the industry. Most predicted reasonable growth over the following five years. Although most provider types indicated that they would continue to focus on China, they also intended to explore new markets, including Europe. In particular, the English language schools indicated Eastern Europe as a potential source of new students.

Unfortunately, there are no studies available that deal with primarily with EU or European student migrants in New Zealand. One recent wide-ranging study, the report on the national survey of international students in NZ, does make some reference to ESANA student migrants. This study is particularly useful as it gives a contemporary perspective on both the motivations and experiences of international students studying in NZ. The survey, carried out on behalf of the Ministry of Education, sampled 2736 students from secondary, tertiary and private language schools and reported on a wide range of issues, including why students chose NZ, educational experiences, living arrangements, social outcomes and future intentions. The students sampled were mainly from China, in line with national trends, and only five percent were from ESANA. In the area of motivations for studying in NZ, the survey found that the most important features were “the English-speaking environment, safety, the international recognition of New Zealand qualifications, the quality of education...”

---

19 Ibid., pp. 8.
20 Ibid., pp. 23.
22 In this case, the ESANA grouping also included students from Australia.
However, it was noted that the quality and international recognition of NZ education were of less concern to students from ESANA compared to those from Asia, and that the more important factors for students from ESANA were those associated the ‘Kiwi experience’ such as scenery, culture and lifestyle, as well as the travel and adventure aspects of studying abroad. This survey found that respondents were mostly satisfied with their experiences in NZ over all sectors examined, though Chinese students were slightly less satisfied than other groups. One area in which most respondents noted a less satisfying experience was with their limited interaction with New Zealanders students and the majority of respondents wanted to have more NZ friends. This issue was noted particularly by students located in Christchurch and Auckland, and although this finding was treated with caution, it was suggested that the relative concentration of international students in these centres, and the consequent presence of international networks, may “reduce incentives to establish relationships with New Zealanders”. Indeed, students in this research who had more interaction with New Zealanders were noted to report better levels of academic progress and satisfaction with life in NZ.

3.3 Theory Review

This review of theoretical frameworks or conceptual models of migration is introduced to contextualise the results of the questionnaires and interviews presented in the forthcoming chapters. As already demonstrated in Chapter 2 migration is a highly complex phenomenon that is difficult to define. Due to this complexity, there is no overarching theory that can explain the causes of migration and, moreover, there is some debate among scholars as to whether such a theory would be desirable owing to the level of abstraction such a goal would require. Instead, the multifaceted and inherently interdisciplinary nature of migration research has led to a multiplicity of theories relating to the causes and consequences of
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24 Ibid., pp. 29.
25 Ibid., pp. 70.
26 Ibid., pp. 71.
27 Ibid., pp. 72.
migration arising between and within disciplines. In addition to these varied approaches, the level at which theories are based is not straightforward. Some operate at the micro level where individuals are the key players in the decision making process, while others are articulated at the macro level and posit structural factors like the global economy or colonial linkages as the major drivers of migration. Further, some frameworks take into account contributing factors in both of these levels, often linked by a third meso-level which is conceptualised in varying ways. These theories are not mutually exclusive however, and there has been an increasing call for if not a single meta theory, then at least a more complementary, multidisciplinary approach to migration studies. An additional complication is encountered in trying to find theoretical perspectives that offer insight into contemporary migration from the EU to NZ. Most migration theory attempts to explain the general phenomenon, or main migratory patterns. As Massey et al. state “most immigrants today come from countries characterized by a limited supply of capital, low rates of job creation, and abundant reserves of labour.” While this is undoubtedly true globally, it does not accurately describe the flow of EU migrants to NZ. Such migrants are from developed economies, some of which have themselves become countries of immigration in the latter half of the twentieth century. So, being situated outside of the norm then, how do we understand this migratory behaviour? Is it possible to use the main theories of migration or is it necessary to look at more specialised theoretical frameworks?

This section will give an overview of some of the main theoretical perspectives or conceptual frameworks that currently underlie migration studies and give explanations for the causes of migration. It will first address the economics based theories and will then examine the more specialised literature on highly skilled migration. Following this, a brief exploration of migration systems theory will be undertaken. Finally, a theoretical framework drawn from internal migration literature, counter-urbanisation, will be examined as an alternative to the more production led models. Owing to the breadth of literature on migration, while comprehensive, this review is not a complete examination of all the existing theory. The

focus of this research has guided the theory overview, but there are many good reviews of multiple theories in other works, for example in De Jong and Gardner, Massey et al, Portes, Faist and Castles and Miller\textsuperscript{31}.

\subsection*{3.3.1 Economic Theories of Migration}

The predominant approaches to identifying the causes of migration in the past have been from an economic standpoint. One of the seminal works in the study of migration is that of E.G. Ravenstein. In his 1886 and 1889 papers Ravenstein set out his famous ‘Laws of Migration’ based on his studies of census data from Britain initially and then using data from over twenty countries. These rules, the exact number of which differs depending on the interpretation of the original articles, included observations on the nature of the movement, for example that most migrants only move a short distance and that most movement occurs in stages towards towns; and the characteristics of migrants, for example that females are more migratory than males. In regards to motivations for migration Ravenstein noted that:

\begin{quote}
\begin{itemize}
  \item \textit{[b]ad or oppressive laws, heavy taxation, an unattractive climate, uncongenial social surrounding, and even compulsion (slave trade, transportation), all have produced and are still producing currents of migration, but none of these current can compare in volume with that which arises from the desire inherent in most men to ‘better’ themselves in material respects”}\textsuperscript{32}.
\end{itemize}
\end{quote}

One of his laws is therefore known as the \textit{primacy of the economic motive}. The remainder of this section will briefly discuss the various theories arising from the economic migration literature.

The basic premise of the most eminent economic model of migration dating from the 1960s, neo-classical economics, is that “\textit{international migration…is caused by geographic differences in the supply of and demand for labor.”}\textsuperscript{33}. Neo-classical economics can be articulated at both a macro and micro level. At the macro-level, wage differentials between states caused by an under or over supply of labour results in certain countries being more

\textsuperscript{31} For full bibliographic details of these reviews please refer to References section.
attractive in employment and wages terms which consequently prompts migration as individuals move to maximise their earnings. Under this supposition, migration will continue to exist while wage differentials remain but the act of migration in itself will help to equalise the supply and demand for labour across countries. When this occurs, the wage differentials will disappear and migration will cease\textsuperscript{34}. At its micro level, neo-classical economics asserts that individuals make a rational choice to migrate if the higher wages they earn in the destination country adequately offset the costs of migration. Factors influencing the decision making process in neo-classical economics are often described as push and pull factors; for example the higher wages in the destination country are pull factors while the poor economic conditions or abundant labour supply in the sending country act as a push. However, this theory places very little weight upon non-economic factors, positing that even though a psychologically attractive country may make up for a negative migration cost, migration should still cease in the face of negative wage differentials\textsuperscript{35}. This makes it particularly difficult to fit to the EU-NZ migration flow as NZ wage rates are considerably lower than those in most of the pre-2005 enlargement EU member states, particularly in Britain where most of NZ’s EU migrants come from or through. Additionally, for the member states which joined the EU in 2005 whose wages may be lower than those in NZ, the cost of migrating to NZ would be very high, especially compared with moving within the EU.

Further developments in economic theories of migration have occurred since neo-classical economics, however, they tend to suffer similar drawbacks when attempting to describe developed-developed world migration. Dual labour market theory, described first by Piore in the 1970s, is based upon the structure of post-modern society and its associated demand for labour, and the causes of migration are seen to stem from the destination country. Under this theory, limited labour supply in a society means that low skilled jobs are not able to be filled by native workers due to their low status and wages. Increasing wages for these jobs would fuel inflation and thus is not possible; instead these jobs are filled by migrant labour for

\textsuperscript{34} Ibid., pp. 19.  
\textsuperscript{35} Ibid., pp. 21.
whom the wages are still higher than in their country of origin and who can derive high status in their country of origin by sending remittances.\textsuperscript{36}

In the 1990s the new economics of migration was developed by Stark, and was not based solely upon wage disparities but rather on viewing migration as a strategy used by a household, rather than an individual, to minimise the risk of income loss. The cause of migration is seen to lie in imperfect markets in the country of origin; not just labour markets, but also credit or capital markets, crop markets and the lack of government support in terms of social welfare or the accessibility of private insurance. By sending family members who can then send remittances, overseas to loosely associated economies, families minimise the risk of failure in their home markets.\textsuperscript{37} Unfortunately, neither of these theories assists in the case of EU-NZ migration. The EU does not suffer from the kinds of imperfect markets that prompt migration under ‘new economics’ and while NZ does have a low unemployment rate and requires workers, these are predominantly skilled workers who are not those simply filling manual labour positions.\textsuperscript{38}

**3.3.2 Highly Skilled Migration**

As will be shown in Chapter 5, the majority of EU migrants are entering NZ under the skilled migrant category. Findlay offers a description of highly skilled migration that seems to parallel the migration of EU migrants into NZ, “in most advanced economies there is a significant level of international migration which goes unnoticed. It is not noticed because it poses no threat in terms of perceived social and economic burdens for the sender and host societies, as well as often being invisible in terms of ethnicity.”\textsuperscript{39} With such obvious links to the EU-NZ case then, it may be appropriate to look further at theories relating to highly skilled migration.


\textsuperscript{38} Although recent shortages in seasonal fruit and vegetable picking have prompted the introduction of new measures to allow workers from the Pacific Islands to come to NZ temporarily to assist in these industries.

Unfortunately, there is not one accepted definition of what constitutes highly skilled migration. Migrants are normally considered to be highly skilled if they have a university degree or possess extensive experience in a particular field\textsuperscript{40}, however not all graduates work in skilled jobs, and some jobs that require extensive expertise do not require a degree. Koser and Salt note that highly skilled migrants are defined differently by sending countries (who see skilled migrants in opposition to unskilled migrants, identifying concepts such as brain drain, for example); by receiving countries (who identify skilled shortages in their own labour market and skilled migrants by extension); and by employers (who define skills or expertise as required by their organisations)\textsuperscript{41}. Additionally, the necessary time period for migration is debated and these factors have led to several different typologies of highly skilled migration based upon direction of movement or the types of professions involved, such as technicians, professionals, clergy, entertainers, academics (including students) and business people. Koser and Salt note that for a typology such as the latter the assumption is made “…that migration is related primarily to position in the labour market.”\textsuperscript{42}.

Related to the difficulties in defining highly skilled migration, there is also no single theory or explanatory model of what causes it. As with the economic theories, different explanations of highly skilled migration are modelled at macro, meso and micro levels, or a combination of these.

Macro level explanations tend to be situated within economic globalisation theories and particularly regard the new international spatial division of labour\textsuperscript{43}, related largely to the “…global expansion of world trade and international expansion of transnational companies.”\textsuperscript{44}. The growing influence of global cities as centres of capital providing large numbers of professional jobs is also important at the macro level. Koser and Salt\textsuperscript{45} also note

\textsuperscript{42} Ibid., pp. 288.
\textsuperscript{43} Ibid., pp. 289.
that the deregulation of financial markets in the early 1980s contributed to highly skilled migration as experts were required to follow the freer movement of capital and they suggest that the increasing deregulation of services will have consequences for highly skilled migration.

Meso level explanations are based primarily around the role of both states and trans-national corporations in promoting migration. States desire to both control migration and enter the competition for highly skilled migrants to fill labour market shortages and promote growth and excellence. Iredale notes, however, that state policies can actually be viewed as being used “...to speed up desired industry-motivated movements”\textsuperscript{46}. Trans-national corporations (TNCs) are seen to facilitate highly skilled migration through their internal labour markets. Although much of the focus of research has been on trans-national corporations, there is increasing recognition of the role of inter-company networks as well as international recruitment agencies in migrant recruitment\textsuperscript{47}.

Explanations at the micro or individual level tend to be quite fragmented. Iredale\textsuperscript{48} notes that under human capital theory, highly skilled migrants are seen to migrate in order to gain the best possible return on their investment in education/training by moving to the most well paid or interesting job available or to better use their capabilities and to have “...superior conditions of work and existence.”\textsuperscript{49}. Mahroum however, notes that different kinds of professional groups move for different reasons. For examples, doctors may be attracted to centres of excellence with quality research facilities and specialist training, while bankers may choose global cities where there are concentrations of financial employment opportunities along with other “...important ‘soft factors’ such as the cultural or convivial affinities of these cities.”\textsuperscript{50}. Mahroum\textsuperscript{51} also notes that even within professional groupings individual motivations could differ; for example, a scientist may move to satisfy scientific curiosity whereas for an engineer the motivations may simply be related to salary or labour

\footnotesize
\textsuperscript{51} \textit{Ibid.}, pp. 29.
market conditions. More generally, Todisco\textsuperscript{52} differentiates motivating factors between highly skilled migrants and unqualified migrants. He sees unskilled labour migration as being predominantly influenced by push factors or the need to leave, with the choice of country being tightly constrained by personal networks of family and friends and only a superficial knowledge of the economic conditions in destination countries. Conversely, pull factors are the most important for highly skilled migrants, who also make a more deliberate choice of destination based upon objective appraisal of international vacancies and the use of professional networks, rather than family. While these discussed micro level models vary, they are broadly orientated towards migration decisions dependent largely on employment or career related issues.

Several authors have proposed that a theoretical framework requires elements from all of these levels. For example Salt and Findlay state four required elements are \textit{“...the new international spatial division of labour, the nature of careers, the role of internal labour markets (within companies) and the lubrication provided by recruitment and relocation agencies.”}\textsuperscript{53}. However, Iredale\textsuperscript{54} suggests two further elements be added; that of the role of government policies, both national and bilateral or multilateral agreements, and the level of internationalisation, in terms of a profession’s transferable qualifications for example. Beaverstock\textsuperscript{55} also proposes a multi-level model which \textit{“...combines the evolution of international labour markets, movements within internal labour markets, and individual career-path decisions influenced by personal aspirations and potential financial gains”}.

### 3.3.3 Migration Systems Theory
Unlike the previous economic theories, migration systems theory is a multilevel theory simultaneously encompassing macro, meso and micro levels. It is also interdisciplinary in that it places migration flows within the context of \textit{“...other flows and exchanges taking}

\textsuperscript{54} \textit{Ibid.}, pp. 122.
incorporating the influence of historical, cultural or economic
countries.” A schematic representation of a migration system is presented
below (Figure 3.1), reproduced from Kritz and Zlotnik. A migration system consists of a
group of countries (a minimum of two), which are linked by large reciprocal migrant flows.
The countries linked in a migration system are often identified within one region, however
inter-regional flows are also important for some systems. Migration systems are often
organised around colonial relationships and subsequent post-colonial ties. The flows
between countries in a system represent all kinds of migrants; settlers, workers, refugees,
students, highly skilled migrants and tourists. Although tourists are not often directly
included in discussions of migration, migration systems theory sees them as another
important connection between countries especially as migrant movement often follows
tourists flows.

Press, pp. 1.
57 Ibid., pp. 3.
58 Ibid., pp. 3.
Kritz and Zlotnik note that a key aspect of a systems approach to migration is the emphasis given to the role of institutional factors (for example government policies) and migrant networks in promoting migration\(^59\). At the macro level, government policies regarding migrant entry, and in some cases exit, play an integral role in controlling and encouraging migrant flows within a system. However, these policies are themselves formed under domestic political pressures which are sometimes in conflict; for example the need to maintain some level of social cohesion or identity while at the same time meeting labour market needs. These pressures can contribute to uneven implementation of these policies which is significant as this can result in migrant flows that are not expected under the letter of

the policy. In addition to internal influences on policy formation, interstate relations can also play a role, whether they are amicable or conflictual relations. In the former, interregional cooperation could lead to free movement between countries, while in the latter conflict may instead stimulate refugee flows. These concerns highlight the importance of examining the different aspects of international relationships when trying to account for migratory movements.

At the micro and meso levels, migrant networks are also a central concern of migration systems. At an individual level networks between migrants can contribute to or discourage migration through the level of support they provide in economic and social terms both at the point of exit and at the destination. These networks consist of personal relationships between family and friends and within a community, and were often referred to as chain migration in earlier research. At the meso level, networks between institutions such as multinational corporations, recruitment or travel agencies, and migration agencies, also facilitate migrant movement, operating between the individual and state levels. Irregular networks, such as people-traffickers, can also facilitate the illegal entry of migrants into destination countries. However, these networks are not necessarily seen as the initiators of migration. Rather they aid the continuation of migration sparked from a previous event; historical labour recruitment programmes, sponsorship of international students for example, or even the migration of a single individual.

Essentially migration systems theory insists upon a holistic approach to examining migration flows, by looking at both the sending and receiving countries, historical and contemporary connections between countries and the interplay of different connections at multiple levels on the development of various migrant flows within an increasingly interdependent modern world. However, migrations systems theory, while allowing for social networks that may encourage individuals to migrate, does not give a clear indication of why some individuals are motivated to move, especially in the absence of disparity in income between origin and destination countries.

3.3.4 Counterurbanization

Counterurbanization theory deviates from the idea of production led migration, characteristic of economic based theories, and instead focuses on moves which tend towards more consumption orientated goals. While tourism is probably the most recognised form of consumption-led movement, there are some streams of migration that are also based on the desire for certain amenities rather than a desire to improve economic outcomes, and one such theory is counterurbanization.

Counterurbanization is not usually consulted to assist in conceptualising international migration, but is instead predominantly used to examine internal movement. Despite this traditional usage however, it may have some relevance for EU-NZ migration. Initially articulated by Berry in the 1970s to deal with the renaissance of rural population growth in the US and other developed countries, counterurbanization refers in general to movement down the population hierarchy, or “...movement from a state of more concentration to a state of less concentration”.

However, some authors have noted that the conceptualisation of counterurbanization is somewhat chaotic. In an article reviewing counterurbanization literature, Mitchell\(^63\) noted that it is normally seen in one of two ways. Firstly it can be viewed as a distinct migratory movement or the relocation of urban residents to a less concentrated area. This movement can be framed in different ways which are more or less specified in terms of destination area; for example movement to any unspecified but less populated area, to areas adjacent to urban cores, to even more remote locations, or as a movement down the settlement hierarchy. Additionally, some of these definitions also include a motivational component\(^64\). Alternatively, others conceptualise counterurbanization as “...a process of settlement system change, resulting in the creation of a deconcentrated settlement pattern”\(^65\), or a time when growth in smaller, non-metropolitan areas is at a higher rate than in metropolitan areas – the opposite of urbanisation. The cause of this growth can

---


either be seen to be due to an inverse relationship between settlement size and net migration or population growth. This latter conceptualisation does not involve the possible motivations for the process, instead being a descriptor of a state population change. Mitchell combines both of these ideas of counterurbanization in an overall framework of population redistribution where the idea of counterurbanization as a process of settlement system change is renamed ‘counterurbanizing’ which can lead to a ‘counterurban’ pattern of population distribution and the term ‘counterurbanization’ is reserved for a migratory movement as first discussed\(^{66}\). A study of internal movement in the mid 1990s in Europe identified a counterurbanizing trend in the UK, Belgium and Denmark, as well as it being a significant process for France, Italy and Germany. Specific regions of Spain and Portugal were also seen to be moving towards a counterurbanizing process\(^ {67}\).

Having outlined the differing uses of the term counterurbanization and accepted Mitchell’s use of the term as a migratory movement, the motivations for migration associated with this concept are now examined. As stated above, when used to define a migration movement, counterurbanization often incorporates motivations as part of its definition. These motivations include, but are not exclusive to, non-economic considerations. Studies have shown that quality of life considerations are present in counterurban moves that may not be considered rational in an economic sense, for example where “… occupation and income considerations are regarded as secondary or incidental to quality-of-life…”\(^ {68}\). Quality of life is a broad term that can encompass various ideas, having better access to leisure activities for example, living in a natural environment, safety, or proximity to friends or family. In their examination of Canadian artists, Mitchell, Bunting, and Piccioni note that “…rural amenities - both tangible (attractive, natural and built landscapes) and intangible (peaceful, quiet, safe or friendly places)…”\(^ {69}\) are motivations for moving to a rural area. However, economic considerations can play a role, either in a positive way through employment

\(^{66}\) Ibid., pp. 21.
facilitating migration to a specific area, or in a more negative way whereby the cost of living in an urban area becomes prohibitive and necessitates a move to a less expensive location. Mitchell uses these varying motivations demonstrated in previous studies of urban-rural migration to classify three different types of counterurbanization\(^\text{70}\). First, \textit{ex-urbanization}, in which the migrants desire to live in a country atmosphere but also to retain their employment links to the city as a daily commuter. Second, \textit{displaced-urbanization}, in which migration to a rural area is undertaken to seek new employment or to live in a more affordable location. In this case, the migration could have been towards an urban environment if the employment or cost-of-living needs could have been met there. Third, \textit{anti-urbanization}, where migrants seek to escape the negative aspects of an urban lifestyle such as crime, noise, pollution and congestion, and have a true desire to live in a rural environment. This latter consideration has been interpreted by some authors as a search for a rural idyll, or Arcadia; “[r]urality itself has become a commodity which is actively sought by middle class migrants who are attracted by an “idyllic rural vision of a healthy, peaceful and natural way of life”\(^\text{71}\).

While the preceding discussion is interesting in its contrast to the economic motivations for migration, it has until this point referred solely to studies which relate counterurbanization solely to internal migration. However, one study has applied the concept of counterurbanization to an international migratory movement; that of British migrants to France. Buller and Hoggart argue that the differentiation between theorising intra and international migration is unhelpful, particularly for moves in a developed-developed world context.

\textit{...explanations that hitherto have been presented to account for intra-national migration can be usefully applied to international population movement (and possibly might apply more generally for certain flows between advanced economies). Our argument therefore is that consumption led migration across international boundaries might be better explained as a geographical extension of domestic migration processes; with that extension being prompted by the

difficulty of attaining a specific consumption goal from an intra-national move, so a potential intra-national move is replaced with an international one.\textsuperscript{72}

Buller and Hoggart note that motivations for British migration to rural France – a process dominated by relatively wealthy middle class Britons – relates to such consumption orientated factors as climate, the French way of life and cost of living, particularly in respect to relatively cheaper property prices\textsuperscript{73}. To further justify the move from Britain to France as predominantly for consumption, Buller and Hoggart note that employment is often not undertaken at all in France or work is only sought when income from other sources runs low. The subsequent work is often in the service industry, providing accommodation or language tuition\textsuperscript{74}. As with the last categorisation of counterurbanization above, \textit{anti-urbanization}, Buller and Hoggart’s study also found that one of the main underlying motivations for the permanent movement of British migrants to France is a desire prevalent among the British middle class for a “... ‘truly rural’ environment that [i]s either unattainable or too expensive \textit{in Britain}”\textsuperscript{75}. The authors argued that this perceived rural idyll in France has developed due to abundant familiar and desirable ‘bocage’ landscapes which are not pressured by urban development or agricultural modernisation as they are in Britain. Added to this is a perception of a rural lifestyle reminiscent of the past and which is characterised by traditional values, welcoming communities, a slower pace of life and a superior quality of life\textsuperscript{76}. Buller and Hoggart noted that this idealisation of the French countryside has continued due to the large majority of British migrants finding the reality of living in France meets their expectations and that this has contributed to a further continuation of migration as positive feedback circulates back to Britain\textsuperscript{77}.

3.3.5 Student Migration Theory

Despite a progressively upward trend in international student migration, student migrants are often overlooked in general international migration research. King and Ruiz-Gelices note

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{73} Ibid., pp. 125.
\item \textsuperscript{74} Ibid., pp. 125.
\item \textsuperscript{75} Ibid., pp. 37.
\item \textsuperscript{76} Ibid., pp. 128.
\item \textsuperscript{77} Ibid., pp. 12.
\end{itemize}
that even recent key works on international migration either do not mention student migration at all or cover it only briefly\(^78\). When international student migration is conceptualised it has been framed in various ways. At a macro level, it is often situated within the processes of globalisation, linked in general to the increased flows of goods, capital and people, and more specifically to the globalisation of trade in higher education services and institutionalisation of student exchange programmes\(^79\). As previously noted, highly skilled migration is also linked to globalisation at a macro level and international student migration has been identified as a subset of this, alongside other specialised flows such as academics and sports people\(^80\). Another approach has been suggested by King who suggests international student migration be placed in a broader framework of youth migration. He posits that youth mobility is motivated more by a "mixture of broader educational goals and experience/travel/pleasure-seeking ..."\(^81\), than by more traditional economic goals.

At a micro-level, the decision to study abroad is based on multiple factors, both educational and experiential. However, there have been found to be some differences between Western and Asian student migration\(^82\). In a study of Hong Kong student migrants in the UK, Li et al note that the motivations of the respondents lay primarily in educational considerations, for example, the good quality of education, the compatibility and length of courses and, to a lesser extent, the unavailability of education opportunities in the home country\(^83\). However, studies of European migrants have shown experiential goals, such as to gain ‘cultural experience’ and ‘general personal development’ to be the primary motivations for studying abroad, along with the key desire to improve foreign language skills\(^84\).


3.4 Conclusion

The above theories offer different perspectives on the causation of international migration both at a global level and from the perspective of individual motivations. However, there are problems in applying them to the EU-NZ situation. The difficulties with the traditional economic theories have already been outlined above. In short they are too narrowly focused on the role of economic disparity between sending and receiving countries to help to assess EU-NZ migration. Highly skilled migration does offer insight into the role globalisation has played in the changing nature of careers and division of labour that can prompt migration. Despite a large proportion of migrants to NZ entering under the skilled migrant category, however, the theory does not assist in migration which is not based primarily on employment, and other studies have indicated that while employment facilitates migration to NZ, it is not necessarily always the primary reason for it. Conversely, while counterurbanization places non-economic factors, for example natural environments and associated ideals of rural community life, as a primary reason for migration, a large number of EU migrants to NZ in fact reside within cities, not in rural environments. Migration systems theory is very useful as it introduces important aspects of the migration process, for example national immigration policies and networks both at the intermediary and individual levels, that influence individual migration decisions, however, it does not necessarily indicate why individual migrants choose to migrate from the EU to NZ at this time. Finally, while student migration may appear to have a reasonably limited application for a wider migrant group, it reiterates the role of globalisation at a macro level, particularly in regards to the internationalisation of services, such as higher education. Additionally, at the micro level, the emphasis on experiential goals may also find resonance with other types of EU migrants.

By drawing on the appropriate aspects of each of the above outlined theories then, a framework for understanding the motivations for contemporary EU-NZ migration is suggested below (Figure 3.2). A three level approach is taken for this framework as it is important to recognise that different levels of influence operate to facilitate or motivate this migration. Drawing on highly skilled migration and student migration theories, the broad macro level context of globalisation is noted. This is placed in the smallest part of the pyramid as, although important, it is seen as a background facilitator of EU-NZ migration.
flows, rather than a direct cause of them. For example, the processes of globalisation have helped to create a closely linked world where, with the advances in air travel, flows of people can quickly move between destinations and follow other flows such as of capital and information, but it does not necessitate that they do. Also in this broad, background context, the importance of colonial ties, noted by migration systems theory, are acknowledged. Colonial ties have given NZ an English-speaking advantage in the choice between migration destinations, and the colonial link also provides NZ with a high level of visibility in the UK.

Figure 3.2 Suggested framework for contemporary EU-NZ migration

At the meso level, several influences are suggested by the various theories. As per migration systems theory, the role of New Zealand’s immigration policy is an obvious but important context for EU-NZ migration as it sets the criteria that must be met in order for migration to occur. However, it is important to see that this policy is linked to a wider NZ domestic context, where a range factors combine to influence the policy direction. In addition to entry
requirements, NZ immigration policy also seeks to actively market NZ to potential migrants and so, together with other migration industry actors such as migration agents and recruitment agencies, acts as both a facilitator and as a stimulant for migration to NZ. The migration decision is set not only in the context of immigration policy and promotion at the meso level, but can also be influenced by the opportunity to move along particular institutional pathways such as institutional exchanges between the EU and NZ, or within the internal labour markets of TNCs.

Individual decisions at the micro level may be more consumption than production oriented, with a focus on factors that expand the migrants’ quality of life and future opportunities rather than just being concerned with strict economic goals. Thus, the counterurban notion of a desire for rurality is included here, along with the experiential motivations outlined by student migration theory. However, the role of employment at the micro level is not discounted, as due to the immigration policy, without work migration may not be able to take place. The influence of personal networks at this level of the decision making process is also accepted. The micro level motivations are situated in the largest part of the pyramid reflecting their direct importance for migrants’ decision making processes. The applicability of this proposed framework for understanding EU-NZ migrant decision making is revisited in the succeeding chapters as migrants actual experiences are examined.
Chapter 4

Historical and Policy Context of EU-NZ Migration

4.1 Introduction

As stated in the introduction to this thesis, the 2001 Census showed that people born overseas comprise 20 per cent of New Zealand’s total population. Their process of migrating to NZ, however, has not occurred uniformly, as the regulations under which people migrate to and gain residence in New Zealand have changed significantly over time, with major legislative reviews occurring in 1987, 1991 and 2003. These changes have in turn affected the composition and volume of migrant flows. As this research is concerned primarily with contemporary migration from the European Union, this section does not provide an in-depth account of each nationality’s history and place in New Zealand settlement. Such a task would be too large for this project and would overlap with the many existing studies which have already been undertaken in this area. Instead, this section gives a brief overview of New Zealand’s immigration history in order to contextualise the current situation. Where large numbers of European migrants have entered under particular government schemes or changes made to regulations have particularly impacted on migration from Europe, these are explored in more detail. Finally, the current migration regulations under which the survey sample migrated are outlined.

The data for this chapter is secondary in nature. Many accounts of New Zealand’s immigration history are available, as well as a significant body of literature regarding different national groupings.¹

¹ This chapter draws on work from Bedford, Trlin, Burnley, Trapeznik, Brooking and Rabel, and Ongley and Pearson. See References section for full bibliographic details.
**4.2 New Zealand’s early migration history**

Bedford et al.\(^2\), recognise five periods in NZ’s settlement history. They characterise NZ as: 1. an outlying island of Polynesia, settled by Pacific people who became known as Maori; 2. a British colony; 3. a destination for Chinese gold-miners in the 1860-70s; 4. a destination for ‘new’ Polynesian labour migration; and 5. following 1986 policy changes, a destination for middle class Chinese and Koreans. This broad representation usefully demonstrates the changing nature of NZ settlement but it overlooks any migration from continental Europe. This is perhaps understandable as this stream is most often numerically small. However, it did experience two significant periods; the first involved playing a role in diversifying the migrant intake in the early settlement period, and the second followed WWII. Bedford et al.’s depiction also does not acknowledge the ongoing significance of British migrants right up until the present day, though this may be implicit in the reference to NZ being a British colony, as they do not intimate that these periods are finite and separate\(^3\).

The early colonial settlement of NZ was characterised mainly by government assisted migration of British nationals. This migration was not only highly selective in terms of nationality, but also religion, “...none but persons of good character, as well as members of the Church of England, shall form part of the population, at least in its first stage; so that the settlement may begin its existence in a healthy moral atmosphere”\(^4\). However, some other national groupings did settle in New Zealand in its earlier years in addition to the Chinese gold-miners mentioned by Bedford et al. Before small numbers of independent continental Europeans also arrived to work in the gold-fields and then the kauri gum-fields, two small groups of European settlers arrived in the 1840s. Around 100 French migrants settled in Akaroa in Canterbury\(^5\), and just after this in 1843-4 about 350 German settlers arrived in Nelson\(^6\). However, more substantial numbers of continental

---


\(^3\) Despite not specifying it in their characterisation, Bedford et al. *Op. Cit.* (2001), pp. 590, do in fact mention the ongoing importance of Europe as a part of NZ’s contemporary migration system.


Historical and Policy Context

migrants arrived in the 1870s under the Vogel Public Work and Immigration Scheme. At this time, it was also recognised that there were not enough suitable British settlers to meet needs in NZ and so agents were sent to actively recruit in Northern Europe\(^7\). Approximately 3000 and 3500 Germans and Scandinavians respectively came to NZ under this programme to work on the construction of railways and roads and clearing of scrub and forests and by the end of the decade the numbers of Germans and Scandinavians were estimated to be about 5000 and just under 5000 respectively\(^8\). Small numbers of French, Italian and Polish migrants were also assisted under the Vogel scheme\(^9\) and other continental migrants did arrive independently. The majority of continental European migrants in this early stage were male. This led to the establishment of chain migration, the sponsoring of family relatives such as wives and brothers, for certain nationalities, in particular the Greek, Italian and Yugoslav or Dalmatian communities\(^10\) which contributed to ongoing flows of migrants to NZ. While significant, however, these numbers of continental Europeans do need to be put in context with the overall migration of the time which remained overwhelmingly British.

The attitude towards migrants in New Zealand during the early settlement period – prevailing until the 1970s – was influenced by two major factors. The economic situation played a significant role, because when there was job scarcity migrants were unwelcome, and secondly attitudes were influenced by a societal desire for migrants to assimilate quickly into the predominantly British NZ population. This desire for assimilation led to a hierarchy of migrants with British at the top but where northern and western Europeans, for example Dutch, Scandinavian and German (except during the war periods in the early twentieth century) migrants, were also considered acceptable. Catholic Irish, Southern and Eastern European migrants however, were not especially desired, but they were viewed with higher regard than were Chinese, Indian or Lebanese migrants\(^11\). These

---

attitudes towards the desirability of certain national migrant groups over one another is readily apparent in the writing of Lochore\textsuperscript{12} whose 1951 book weighs the various assimilation capacities and skills based merits of a range of European national groups. He concludes that 

\begin{quote}
“\textit{[a]ll Europeans are assimilable. We naturally prefer northerners, because experience has shown that they find their place more easily in our community. But given fifty years’ breathing space and a will to the task, we can also impress thousands of southerners, if need be}”\textsuperscript{13}.
\end{quote}

Attitudes like Lochore’s were reflected in an immigration policy which favoured British citizens, particularly from 1920 when the Immigration Restriction Amendment Act was passed meaning only people of British or Irish parentage could enter New Zealand without a permit, whereas all other groups, including non-white citizens of the British Empire, had to obtain a permit before entering the country. Further to this, these permits were only available at the discretion of the Minister for Immigration rather than being assessed against a standard set of criteria and were therefore left open to the exclusion of certain groups\textsuperscript{14}. However, as noted above, family reunification or sponsorship policies allowed some chain migration of continental Europeans to occur, but it was not until after World War Two (WWII) that the next significant intake of European migrants occurred.

Following WWII, the official preference for white British migrants and restrictive immigration policies continued. However, in the post-war social and economic environment, a booming economy meant more workers were required. In 1947 assisted migration from the UK was again undertaken. Under this scheme migrants’ passages were paid for but on arrival they were bonded to work in a Government assigned job for two years. Over almost thirty years, more than 75,000 British migrants came to NZ under this programme\textsuperscript{15}. Other European countries also participated in assisted passage schemes in a very minor way, with around 200-300 migrants each arriving from Germany, Austria, Denmark, Greece and Switzerland. The most numerically significant continental flow, however, was from the Netherlands. From 1950-63 the NZ Government

\textsuperscript{12} Lochore, R. (1951). \textit{From Europe to New Zealand: An Account of our Continental European Settlers}, Wellington: AH & AW Reed.
\textsuperscript{13} \textit{Ibid.}, pp. 91.
assisted 6261 Dutch migrants\(^\text{16}\). However, when the Dutch government introduced a more general emigration subsidy in 1955, many more Dutch migrants decided to use this to come under their own auspices, because they were then not committed to the two year Government placed work requirement, that was entailed for migrants assisted by the NZ Government\(^\text{17}\). Over 28,000 migrants arrived in NZ from Dutch territories between 1956 and 1968\(^\text{18}\). During this period NZ established a quota of 1000 Dutch migrants per year without further restrictions and this was maintained until the early 1990s, though all places were not usually filled\(^\text{19}\).

During the post WWII period, the NZ government also accepted refugees largely from Southern and Eastern Europe. The first of the refugees, 755 orphaned children from Poland, actually arrived in 1944 just prior to the end of the war\(^\text{20}\). Though it was initially intended that the children would be returned to Poland after the war, the inclusion of Poland into the Soviet Union led the government to allow them to stay in NZ. Subsequently, if they could be found, some of the orphans' parents and other relatives were allowed to come to NZ on humanitarian grounds\(^\text{21}\). Following this, from 1949-51, under its commitment to the International Refugee Organization Group Resettlement scheme, a further 743 displaced Polish people were accepted into NZ. Under the same programme over 1000 Greeks entered NZ, though the majority of migrants from the scheme were from Romania, rather than mainland Greece\(^\text{22}\), in addition to approximately 300 Yugoslavs\(^\text{23}\). Additionally, around 1100 Hungarian refugees were permitted asylum in NZ following the Hungarian revolution of 1956\(^\text{24}\) and a small number of Czech refugees came in 1968 after the Warsaw Pact invasion\(^\text{25}\). As with other small migrant clusters, these refugee flows again contributed to starting flows of chain migration of relatives from these countries.


\(^{21}\) Ibid., pp. 131.


Along with the above discussed refugee flows, and a moderate number of Asian migrants who came through family reunification refugee intakes in the late 1970s and through student programmes, the main post-WWII non-British migrant flow stemmed from the Pacific Islands after temporary work permit programmes were started to allow Polynesian migrants to enter New Zealand to work mainly as unskilled labourers. However, it was not until 1974, when permit-free access for British migrants was removed, that moves were made to lessen the policy preference for British migrants. The following year, 1975, signalled the end of assisted migration from the UK and from 1978 official policy statements ceased to consider the desire for assimilation and racial harmony. These changes were premised on several factors, among them Britain’s entry into the European Economic Community (EEC), and the emerging questioning of NZ national identity and its basis on Britain. However, despite removing permit free entry to UK citizens – a move which was also economically motivated as it occurred at a time of rising unemployment – for migrants entering NZ on occupational grounds, preference was still given to those from ‘traditional source countries’ i.e. Northern and Western Europe and North America. Furthermore, while all potential migrants were meant to have a pre-arranged job in NZ, exceptions were made for British, German and Swiss migrants in certain industries and occupations. This preference was finally removed in the 1986 Immigration Policy Review.

4.3 Moving away from a white NZ

The 1986 Immigration Policy Review and the subsequent Act were introduced as part of the economic restructuring of NZ implemented by the fourth Labour Government. The

28 At this time migrants could enter NZ if they had skills in an area on the Occupational Priority List (this list changed over time depending on employment requirements) or if a NZ employer demonstrated they could not find a NZer to fill the position. However, applicants from developing countries would only be considered if it could be shown that their skills were not required in their home country and that no-one from a developed country could fill the position. Migrants could also enter on family reunification grounds, humanitarian grounds, other grounds such as talent or under a quota, or under the very restrictive entrepreneur criteria from 1979. There was also some allowance for temporary migration at this time, mainly for South Pacific workers, university students and managerial staff or intra-company transfers. (Trlin, (1986). Op. Cit., pp. 6-8).
29 Ibid., pp. 9.
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free market ideals behind this period of change led to the privatisation of many state assets, tax and currency reforms and the desire to reorientate NZ, moving closer to Asia, and away from a reliance on the traditional links of Europe and in particular the UK. Migrants from Asia were seen as an important way of promoting links with Asian markets and to bring people to NZ who understood the culture and language. In order to achieve this, the 1986 Review abolished the ‘traditional source country’ preference in the occupational category and instead focussed more upon on skills, qualifications, personal characteristics and investment capital. The 1986 review also for the first time officially introduced the desire for immigration to “…enrich the multicultural social fabric of New Zealand society…” It also asserted that “…the old notion of assimilation is no longer seen as the desirable outcome of immigration…” These changes finally brought NZ into line with Australia and Canada who had abandoned their ‘white-only’ policies earlier. Aside from these underlying shifts in philosophy, and the ensuing policy criteria changes, the overall mechanics of the policy remained similar with retention of the Occupational, Family and Humanitarian Categories and continuation of the Samoan and Dutch quotas along with entry for temporary Pacific workers and South Pacific and South East Asian students.

Despite the move away from a ‘traditional source country’ preference, at least one element of the new immigration policy was viewed as potentially discriminatory. This was the introduction of an English language test for all migrating family members over the age of 12 years. The purpose of this criterion was to ensure the migrant would settle well in NZ, would be able to understand the societal rules and be able to communicate

---

33 Ibid.
34 This review stopped short of actually introducing an official multicultural policy for immigration as exists in Australia and Canada. This is because NZ is already a bicultural society. In fact some Maori academics see the immigration policy as “…a covert strategy suppress the counter-hegemonic struggle of the Maori by swamping them with outsiders who are not obliged to them by the treaty.” (Walker, R. (1995). ‘Immigration Policy and the Political Economy of New Zealand’ in Grief, S. (Ed.), Immigration and National Identity in New Zealand: One People – Two Peoples – Many Peoples?, Palmerston North: Dunmore Press, pp. 292.)
with the NZ community\textsuperscript{36}. The necessity of having English language skills was not disputed in itself but the necessity of having them before entry into NZ was, as it was considered that this would make it very difficult for potential migrants from countries which did not have English as an official language, or use English widely, or who did not teach English as a compulsory school subject. Additionally, Trlin\textsuperscript{37} queried whether it was necessary to employ that language test in every case as there could be situations where the employer can communicate effectively with the employee in their native language and the job did not require English language skills. These concerns were upheld in 1987 when some allowances were made for certain occupations (chefs and market gardeners). Furthermore, Trapeznik speculated that in the case of Eastern European migrants another aspect of the policy – the introduction of compulsory interviews for applicants – was discriminatory as the costs involved for applicants from non-traditional countries to travel to traditional source countries where the migration officials were based, would be largely prohibitive\textsuperscript{38}. In spite of these reservations, levels of migration from non-traditional source countries did increase following the 1986 Review with the percentage of permanent entry approvals for Europe and North America dropping from 61 percent (1983/84) to 48 percent (1987/88) and those from the Pacific and East and South East Asia growing from 36 percent (1983/84) to 46 percent (1987/88)\textsuperscript{39}.

Immigration policy underwent another substantial change in 1991, again in relation to a change in government and a change in direction. At this time, the National Government wished immigration to become an economic stimulus, rather than using it simply to fill gaps in the labour force, and to this aim wished to increase the number of migrants coming to settle in NZ, particularly those who would bring skills and new ideas. They identified that while there had been growth in the number of migrants and diversification of their national origins under the 1986 policy, increase in the Economic Category was only 89 percent compared to the 153 percent increase in the Family Category\textsuperscript{40}. Also causes for governmental concern were the old occupational priority list, identified as a limiting factor to the types of migrants being approved, and the business immigration

\textsuperscript{36} Ibid., pp. 5.
\textsuperscript{37} Ibid., pp 5-6.
programme not ensuring that funds were being used in NZ. Therefore, while the family
reunification and humanitarian policies remained largely unchanged, significant changes
were made in the economic categories.

The 1991 policy review saw a points system introduced for the first time in the new
General Migrant Category, which replaced the former Occupational Priority List. The
points system was based upon three broad criteria; employability, age and the ability to
settle, though it was heavily weighted towards the employability criterion which was
essentially based upon qualifications and work experience. Another important change
was the English language requirement that now only applied to the principal applicant,
not the whole family. However, no points were awarded for English language
competence. Migrants who had enough points to meet a certain ‘autopass’ level were
granted residency. Because of the emphasis on employability which was geared towards
those with professional qualifications particularly in science and engineering, the range of
professions and occupations of approved migrants was quite narrow and oversupply
developed in some areas such as GPs\textsuperscript{41}. This problem was compounded when the
‘autopass’ level was raised to control the total number of migrants\textsuperscript{42}. The Business
Investor Category, which was assessed on business experience and the amount of money
the applicant could invest in NZ for at least two years, was also criticised as being too
restrictive and requiring too much money to be invested (minimum amount $500,000).

The effect on migration from Europe in terms of actual numbers from these changes is
hard to assess but numbers of migrants from Asia increased substantially, particularly
under the General Category and, even more markedly, in the Business Category, while
European migrants were more prominent in the Family and Humanitarian Categories
reflecting their dominance prior to 1986\textsuperscript{43}. The increase in the number of Asian migrants
was viewed negatively by some members of the public and media as an ‘Asian invasion’
that put pressure on schools, increased house prices, and was associated with criminal
activities\textsuperscript{44}.

\textsuperscript{41} Ibid., pp. 14.
\textsuperscript{42} Ibid., pp. 20.
\textsuperscript{43} Ibid., pp. 9.
\textsuperscript{44} Ibid., pp 18.
In 1995 further policy changes saw the opening of a new General Skills Category replacing the former General Category. While grounded in similar concepts, this new category exchanged the ‘autopass’ level for an ‘autofail’ level, and amended some of the criticised criteria by flattening the points awarded for different levels of qualifications, requiring professional registration where applicable and awarding more points for skilled job offers. English language requirements were also reintroduced for non-principal applicants over 16 years, although a $20,000 bond per person who did not comply at the time of entry could be paid and then refunded in whole or part if achievement of the required English level was made within a year\textsuperscript{45}. Settlement factors were also given increased weighting in the General Skills Category and were introduced into the new totally points based Business Investment Category\textsuperscript{46}. These 1995 changes appear to have had little impact on migration from Europe, with the continued growth in migrants from Asia until the Asian economic downturn in the late 1990s. The most significant policy change in terms of migration from Europe was that which occurred in 2003 under a Labour government.

4.4 Current immigration policy

When the NZ Labour Party won the 1999 government election, a new slant was again taken on immigration policy. There was a larger focus on temporary migration\textsuperscript{47} which saw the number of work permits, working holiday visas and student permits issued increase substantially\textsuperscript{48}. Additionally, several migration categories that allowed transition from work to residency were introduced, and an increased commitment to improving settlement outcomes for new migrants was made. While continuing the three streams through which people could gain residence (general skills/business, family and humanitarian) in 2001, the Labour Government started the New Zealand Immigration programme which allocated a target proportion for each of these streams, with 60 percent of residence approvals being allocated to general skills, 30 percent to the family sponsored stream and 10 percent to international/humanitarian. The aim of these targets was to balance migrants across all categories and to allow family reunification and meet

\textsuperscript{45} Ibid., pp. 20.  
\textsuperscript{46} Ibid., pp. 20.  
\textsuperscript{48} See Chapter 5 for further information.
international responsibility with the intake of refugees while still ensuring that New Zealand’s skill requirements were met. The biggest change in terms of residence, however, occurred in 2003 when the new Skilled Migrant Category was introduced to replace the General Skills Category. An overview of the current migration policy is given below for all migration programme types (residence, work and students) with particular regard to the new Skilled Migrant Category in the residence programme due to the impact of this change on migration from Europe, and in particular from the United Kingdom. It is necessary to outline the ways in which people can currently enter NZ in order to fully understand the complex nature of the contemporary migration flow from the EU.

4.4.1 Residence Programme

As stated above, New Zealand’s immigration scheme underwent its last major adjustment in December 2003. At this time the Skilled Migrant Category came into existence superseding the old General Skills Category. However, in addition to the Skilled Migrant Category there are numerous other residence categories spread across the migration streams. All applicants for residence must meet health and character requirements and for those entering under the skilled migrant and other business characters, all migrants over 16 years have to meet a minimum level of English.

**Skilled/Business Stream**

The aim of the Skilled/Business stream is to “...help talented and entrepreneurial migrants gain residence to NZ.” This stream is allocated up to 27,000 places per year from the 45,000 target and has three categories within it:

**Skilled Migrant Category**

Under this points-based category potential migrants meeting a minimum level of points (100) are able to submit ‘expressions of interest’ (EOI) to a pool from which NZIS selects applicants who reach a particular pass mark. This pass mark is floating and can be changed fortnightly to allow for more or fewer EOIs to be selected depending how many migrants are desired to synchronise with the yearly goals. Points are awarded on the basis of employment status (e.g. having skilled employment or an offer of skilled employment in NZ), work experience, qualifications and age. Bonus points are awarded for having a

---


job or job offer in an identified area of future growth or absolute skills shortage, for having a job offer outside of Auckland, for having a spouse or partner with a job or job offer, and for having NZ qualifications, qualifications in an identified area of future growth or absolute skills shortage area or having a spouse or partner with qualifications. New Zealand work experience brings further bonus points. The initial pass mark in 2003 was 190 points, and to reach this level prospective migrants needed to be highly educated, have secured a job or job offer and have extensive work experience in an appropriate field. However, because of a decline in the number of those seeking residence, the pass mark has gradually been reduced to a minimum of only 100 points in 2005, and it is now possible to be asked to apply for residence without having a job offer. Once an EOI is selected from the applicant pool, the application is checked and the prospective migrants are invited to apply for residence.

The new Skilled Migrant Category replaces the old general skills category which was also points based, but under the General Skills Category the pass mark was established in the policy and any applicant reaching this mark was granted residence. Policy makers argued that such a system did not allow them to adequately control the numbers of migrants or to respond to changing circumstances in the NZ market. The new category, it was argued, allowed greater control because of the floating mark for expressions of interest.

The impact that the introduction of the Skilled Migrant Category had on NZ migration was marked. Applications from Asia and India decreased after its introduction, which led some people to suggest that the new category reflected a de facto ‘whitening’ of the policy. This issue was raised following the presentation of research at the 2004 “New Directions: New Settlers: New Challenges” seminar that showed that NZ employers discriminate on the basis of accent, placing NZ-accented English at the top of a hierarchy followed by British accented English before South African, Indian and Chinese. Critics claimed that such discrimination then impacted on the ability of migrants to get jobs and thus deemed them ineligible for residency as they would not earn enough points to qualify for residency under the Skilled Migrant Category. These claims were refuted by the migration service representatives present at the seminar, who asserted the category was open to all migrants equally. But nevertheless, the UK is now the top contributor of

migrants through the new category by a substantial margin where it was not previously under the general skills category. Furthermore, for the first six months after its introduction, only 37 percent of the EOIs came from the UK under this category, but of the people selected and invited to apply 50 percent were from the UK\textsuperscript{52}. It should be noted, however, that the UK was also consistently in the top three contributors under the old policy.

**Business Categories**

The possibility of gaining residence through a commitment by investors or business people to invest money in NZ has been retained in the new business categories. A new Entrepreneur Category allows for people who have been successfully operating a business in NZ for at least two years under the long-term business work permit to change to residence status. Finally, the Employees of Relocating Business Category allows key employees of a business that is relocating to NZ to be granted residency provided that they do not qualify under a different category.

**Residence from Work Categories**

These categories, consisting of the Talent (Accredited Employers), Talent (Art, Culture and Sports) and Priority Occupations List residence policies enable migrants who have been working in NZ full-time, for at least 24 months on a related work permit and who have ongoing employment situations, to gain residency. They are part of a new immigration strategy to draw on expertise which migrants already in NZ on temporary permits hold.

**Family Sponsored Stream**

This immigration stream allows for family members of NZ residents and citizens to come to live in NZ, provided that the NZ sponsor is eligible. There are currently 13,500 places allocated to this stream from the target of 45,000. Under the Partnership Category, a partner of a NZ resident or citizen can gain residency provided they have been living with their partner in a stable relationship for at least 12 months. Parents, siblings and adult children can be sponsored to live in NZ as long as the ‘centre of gravity’ for the family is

in NZ\textsuperscript{53}. In addition, siblings or adult children must have an offer of employment in NZ to be sponsored under this category. Family members who are not eligible under these categories may enter a ballot in the Family Quota Category provided they have a suitable family member to sponsor them.

**Humanitarian/International Stream**

The purpose of this stream is to “...fulfil New Zealand’s obligations as a good international citizen”\textsuperscript{54}. It comprised of a variety of categories that are together allocated up to 4500 places from the total 45,000 migration target. For Pacific peoples, 650 (total) people from Tuvalu, Tonga, Fiji and Kiribati can join a ballot for NZ residence provided they have a job offer and meet a minimum income level if they have children. There is a separate ballot operated for people from Samoa. Family members of people granted refugee status in NZ may also be sponsored for residency provided their sponsor meets various requirements. Victims of domestic abuse by a NZ citizen can apply for residence if they are unable to return to their home country. As will be seen in the Chapter 5, relatively few EU migrants now enter NZ under the Humanitarian/International stream.

**4.4.2 Work Programme**

Permits issued under the work permit programme are issued in similar streams to the residence programme and are also subject to health and character requirements. They are seen as a means of “...contribut[ing] to developing New Zealand’s human capability base”\textsuperscript{55}. Under the Skilled stream of the work programme, there are a variety of categories under which a permit can be granted but for all of these the permit applicant must have an offer of employment. The work to residence permits (based on talent), the priority occupation list and business categories, correspond to the residence from work categories described above. Under the general work permit, people can be approved if their job is on the occupational shortages list or if the employer can demonstrate there is no suitable New Zealander to fill the position. Specialist permits for Japanese translators, crews of foreign fishing vessels and religious ministers exist along with special purpose

\textsuperscript{53} For parents this means that they must have either no non-dependent children living in their home country or have an equal number or more adult children living in NZ than in their home country. Siblings and adult children must have no other siblings or parents living in their home country.

\textsuperscript{54} NZIS, (---)\textsuperscript{a}. Op. Cit., pp. 20.
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or event work permits which can be issued when a person is coming to NZ for an event which benefits NZ but does not put employment for New Zealanders at risk. Under the Family Stream, work permits can be issued to the partners of NZ residents or citizens, on the condition that they subsequently apply for residence. Partners of work permit holders can also get an open work permit for the same duration as that their partner holds. Unlike the Skilled Stream, neither of the Family Stream work permits requires the applicant to have a job offer.

Working holiday permits are the main type of permits issued under the Humanitarian/International stream under the work programme, and they are one of the most important work permits for EU migrants. There are currently 25 working holiday schemes, 12 of which are with EU member states (see figure 4.1). Another five schemes with EU countries are currently being negotiated. These programmes allow young people between ages 18-30 to visit NZ for up to 12 months (or 23 months for the UK), to travel and work in NZ. For most countries only incidental work, for a maximum of 3 months with any one employer, may be undertaken. However, these work restrictions have been lifted for Belgium, the Netherlands and Sweden because these countries impose no restrictions on New Zealanders on working holiday schemes there. Participants cannot be accompanied by children and must show they have at least $4200 to live on while in NZ and also show evidence of sufficient funds to return to their home country. Only one working holiday visa can be issued to a person in their lifetime. These schemes all operate on a reciprocal basis, allowing young New Zealanders also to travel and work overseas. In 2005 the number of people allowed to participate in these schemes has grown considerably, in part because of severe shortages in seasonal and low skilled work where working holiday makers are normally employed, and also because they add to pool of potential longer term migrants. People in NZ claiming refugee status may also be granted a special work permit under the international/humanitarian stream.
Table 4.1: EU working holiday schemes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Places available from July 2005</th>
<th>Places available prior to July 2005</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Czech Republic</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>5000</td>
<td>1400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>Unlimited</td>
<td>2700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>2800</td>
<td>2700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malta</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>Unlimited</td>
<td>900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>Unlimited</td>
<td>700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>Unlimited</td>
<td>10000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>Under negotiation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hungary</td>
<td>Under negotiation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>Under negotiation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovenia</td>
<td>Under negotiation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>Under negotiation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.4.3 Student Programme

The aim of New Zealand’s student policy is to develop international links, promote foreign exchange earning and enhance the quality of NZ educational services\textsuperscript{56}. Foreign students can be granted a permit to study at any level of schooling in NZ; primary, secondary or tertiary, although children under 13 are required to have a guardian in NZ. Students do not require a student permit for programmes less than three months or if they are already a permanent resident of NZ or Australia. There are several categories of student permit, the most common of which is the foreign-fee paying student, but for EU migrants, private exchanges and dependents of work permit holders are also significant categories for student approvals. As well as being enrolled in a NZQA approved course, students must meet health and character requirement as per work and residence visas, although there are no upper-age limits for student visas. Students must also be able to prove they have made arrangements for accommodation and be able to financially support themselves during their time in NZ.

Recent policy changes announced in early 2005 which came into effect on 4 July 2005 are designed to make it easier for international students in several respects. First, and

probably most significantly for encouraging more EU students, international students undertaking PhD studies in NZ will only have to pay NZ domestic fees. Importantly, the changes also allow partners of post-graduate students to apply for open work permits and for their children to attend primary schools without paying foreign fees. These additional features are important for encouraging students with families to come to NZ. Secondly, the changes ease the restrictions on working while studying in NZ, so students on long courses may now work for up to 20 hours per week instead of 15 and can also work full-time during the summer holidays. Third, it has been made easier to transfer from a student policy into a work permit at the completion of studies, and so meet the aim of the immigration programme to use temporary permit holders as a possible source of new residents.

4.5 Conclusion

This chapter has shown that New Zealand’s colonial links with Britain, coupled with New Zealand’s economic requirements, have played a large role in shaping the historical flows of migrants to NZ. Until 1986, if migrants were required, those from Britain were sought first. However, while smaller than that for British migrants, there has also been a place for other EU migrants, most significantly as the result of government assisted schemes, first in the 1870s and then in the post-WWII period. These programmes, in addition to the significant post-WWII refugee migration to NZ, led in turn to processes of chain migration for some national groups – in particular Greeks, Italians, Poles and Yugoslavians – that sustained these groups despite highly restrictive immigration policies.

The change in philosophy from the late 1970s and early 1980s undoubtedly caused a major change in the source countries from which migrants to NZ come, thus resulting in the overall share of migration from Europe falling in favour of migrants from Asia and the Pacific. However despite this, Britain remained consistently near the top of national contributors of migrants to NZ and the most recent policy change served to once again propel Britain to the number one contributor position. The current policy, as did previous policies, reflects the current NZ Government’s philosophy and beliefs regarding the purposes of migration and its role in the economic and social life of NZ. These various policies discussed in this Chapter have had direct implications for the recent flows of EU migrants to NZ which emphasises the need to take into account NZ immigration policy
when examining the causes of EU-NZ migration, thus underlining the decision to place NZ immigration policy within the suggested EU-NZ migration framework in Section 3.4.
Chapter 5

Migration from the EU to NZ: Recent trends and characteristics

5.1 Introduction

Recent migration to NZ from the EU is examined in this chapter. Initially, data on permanent and long term net migration are presented, showing migration from the late 1970s until 2003. Following this, two other types of data are primarily used. Firstly, statistics published by NZIS on the approvals of various visas and permits are presented to show more recent trends of where EU migrants are originating, and how they are entering NZ. Secondly, data from the 2001 Census of Population and Dwellings are utilised to outline general demographic and labour force characteristics of recent EU migrants.

5.2 Overview of longer term trends in migration from the EU to NZ

One means of illustrating longer term trends in migration is to examine net migration figures. Net migration is calculated by subtracting the total departures from a country from the total arrivals and is usually drawn from arrival card data. When the resulting figure is negative it shows that there has been a net loss in migrants from the particular country or area being examined. Figure 5.1 (below) is reproduced from Bedford et. al. and shows the permanent and long term (PLT) net migration of citizens from the UK and Europe. As can be seen, migration from the UK was actually undergoing a net loss in the late 1970s and has

---

1 This information is gathered every time a person enters or leaves the country.
3 Permanent and long term refers to people who indicate on their arrival cards that they intend to stay in NZ for 12 months or more, or those who indicate on their departure card that they intend to leave NZ for 12 months or more. It does not relate to a specific type of visa or permit and students, workers and residents could all be classed as PLT arrivals. It should also be noted that these figures are indicative as people do not always fulfil their intentions.
4 Here the total is for the whole of Europe and not just the EU24.
5 This possibly reflects the end in the visa free entry for UK citizens that occurred in 1974, see Chapter Four.
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experienced relatively marked fluctuations throughout the following two decades. In contrast to this the European trend is slightly more settled with a slowly increasing level of net gain. Both the UK and Europe had peaks in net migration around 1996 which correspond to a period of high total migration to NZ when overall PLT net gains almost reached 30,000\(^6\). Despite peaks in PLT migration from almost all national groups during this time, the period was mainly characterised by a public and media outcry against a so-called ‘Asian invasion’\(^7\). The climb towards the end of this period reflects another record total PLT net gain of 41,590 at the end of March 2003\(^8\), which according to Bedford et. al. is due largely to a significant increase in the number of work and student permits issued\(^9\). As will be discussed below, the UK is an important source of work permit holders for NZ.

**Figure 5.1: PLT Net Migration of Citizens of the UK, Europe and North America (1979-2003)**

![Figure 5.1: PLT Net Migration of Citizens of the UK, Europe and North America (1979-2003)](source: Bedford et. al (forthcoming). Figure 4.)

5.3 Migration approvals from 1997/98 to 2004/05

Turning from the long-term trends shown by the PLT data above, the following discussion relates to more recent data on permit approvals drawn from the NZIS statistics published on

---


\(^9\) Ibid., pp. 7.
the NZIS website\textsuperscript{10}. Although this project is concerned with migrants who have arrived in NZ in the past five years, figures are presented from the earliest available year of 1997/98 to establish a slightly longer trend. From this period permit approvals for the EU have grown in all categories; that is to say, residential, work and student permits (also see Figures 5.3, 5.5 and 5.6 below).

\textbf{Figure 5.2: Residence, Work and Student Approvals 1997/98 to 2004/05}

Data source: www.immigration.co.nz – General Information – Statistics

\textbf{5.3.1 Residency Trends}

Residency approvals per annum for the EU25 have almost tripled from 6000 in 1997/98 to just fewer than 17,500 for the year ending July 2005 (Figure 5.3).

\textsuperscript{10} Data retrieved for all graphs in this section (unless otherwise stated) on June 14, 2005 from the NZIS website – General Information – Statistics section: http://www.immigration.govt.nz/community/general/generalinformation/statistics.\"
Most of this growth is on the strength of approvals from the UK but approvals for the EU24 have also shown steady growth throughout this period, at approximately 6 percent per year to 2003/04. These gains had been largely obscured by extremely strong growth in approvals from other countries, in particular China and India (also included in Figure 5.3) both of which overtook the UK in providing the greatest number of residence approvals in both 2001/02 and 2002/03. However, following changes to immigration regulations in 2003 as discussed in Chapter 4, the UK is again the biggest contributor to residence approvals. Additionally, approvals for the EU24 have shown a substantial increase in their rate of growth following these regulatory changes, leaping from approximately 6 percent per year to approximately 50 percent growth from 2003/04 to 2004/05.

Some EU member states have shown more growth than others, and their relative shares of the EU24 total for 1997/98 and 2004/05 are shown below (Table 5.1). The UK has been excluded from this table to allow changes from the remaining member states to be more easily identified, but for 1997/98 the UK contributed 81 percent of the total residence approvals for the EU25 and this percentage increased in 2004/05 to 86 percent. It is likely
that the change in the way that skilled migrants entered NZ at the end of 2003 contributed to this change, and also to Ireland’s increased share of the total, up over 6 percent in 2004/05. Ireland, the Czech Republic, Hungary and France have also increased their share of the total, while more traditional contributors Germany and the Netherlands, as well as Austria and Italy, have all shown a decline. Whether these changes will be sustained in the future will depend on any future policy changes as well as global events and likely the experiences of the migrants currently in NZ.

Table 5.1: Number of Residence Approvals for EU24, 1997/98 and 2004/05

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>1997/98</th>
<th>2004/05</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cyprus</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Czech Republic</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estonia</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td>218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>341</td>
<td>29.7%</td>
<td>608</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hungary</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>13.1%</td>
<td>473</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latvia</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lithuania</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luxembourg</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malta</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>20.6%</td>
<td>440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovakia</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovenia</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total        | 1147    | 100.0%  | 2448    | 100.0%|

Data source: www.immigration.co.nz – General Information – Statistics
Together with the total number of residence permits approved, the different streams under which people gained residency can also be examined. Figure 5.4 shows the division between different residency streams for EU member states from 1997/98 to 2004/05.

![Figure 5.4: Percentage of Residence Streams by Country 1997/98-2004/05](image)

Data source: www.immigration.co.nz – General Information – Statistics

While the current immigration policy is structured to balance these streams into a 60 percent, 30 percent, 10 percent split (as discussed in Chapter 4, Section 4.4), there is significant variation within the EU25 as to how they compare with this ideal. Only ten countries derive 60 percent or more from the skilled/business stream, while the remaining countries are all over-represented in the family sponsored stream. The Czech Republic was the only EU nation to supply a significant percentage of migrants under the international/humanitarian scheme, though the reason for this is unclear. While high numbers for several member states in the family sponsored migration stream may raise the possibly that a significant process of chain migration is occurring within some national groups, the predominant family sponsored categories being used are those stemming from the migrant’s partnership with a NZ resident or citizen. Indeed, for 2003/04, 70 percent of family sponsored approvals for the EU 25 were
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under the partnership policy compared with 58 percent for the total migrant intake for 2003/04\textsuperscript{11}. While it is possible that some EU migrants are establishing themselves as a NZ resident and then returning to their home country and finding a partner there – a situation that occurred during some earlier periods of migration – it would seem likely that the majority are in fact meeting (either in NZ or overseas) and starting a personal relationship with a New Zealander and subsequently making NZ their home. This is not to say however, that other networks of family and friends do not play an important role in these migrations, by facilitating information flows for example, and through visiting friends and relatives’ tourism, and such possibilities will be further discussed in Chapter 6.

5.3.2 Work Trends

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nationality</th>
<th>1997/98</th>
<th>2004/05</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Great Britain</td>
<td>9074</td>
<td>24798</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>827</td>
<td>4616</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>743</td>
<td>3331</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>511</td>
<td>1959</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>396</td>
<td>1633</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>365</td>
<td>822</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>686</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>599</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>497</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>453</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Data source: www.immigration.co.nz – General Information – Statistics*

Work permits approved for citizens of EU members states have tripled since 1997/98 when just under 13,000 were issued, to almost 41,000 in 2004/05\textsuperscript{12} (Figure 5.5). Most of this growth occurred after the election of the Labour Government in 1999 when the total number of work permits issued also rose dramatically reflecting “…the positive perspective the
Labour Government has consistently adopted towards the contribution that international flows of capital can have on the development of New Zealand’s economy.”

![Figure 5.5: Work Permit Approvals 1997/98 - 2004/05](image)

Data source: [www.immigration.co.nz](http://www.immigration.co.nz) – General Information – Statistics

The majority of growth in work permit approvals has been in skills shortage permits which are those that are deemed to be labour market related or necessary for filling specific industry gaps. Skills shortage work permits include the general and priority occupation category as well as some other specialised areas, such as machine installation and servicing. The UK contributes the highest proportion of any country to work permits in general and to skill shortage work permits in particular, with British citizens representing 22 percent of people granted a skill shortage work permit in 2003/04. In 2003/04 two additional EU countries were also in the top twelve suppliers of skill shortage workers: the Czech Republic supplying 3 percent and being the ninth highest contributor, and Germany supplying 2 percent in twelfth place. Germany was also twelfth in 2002/03 but the Czech Republic had had a significant increase in the number of workers it provides for skill shortage work permits,

---


from 155 in 2002/03 to 696 in 2003/04, a 350 percent rise\textsuperscript{16}. The reason for this particular increase is hard to determine as most of the permits were granted under the general category, and in 2004/05 skill shortage work permits issued to Czech nationals declined to approximately half the 20003/04 rate, though they did remain moderately higher than the 2002/03 levels. Fluctuations like this are problematic for analysing this work permit approval data, but do mirror the highly capricious nature of migration. Additionally, the number of work permit approvals can in some instances be a little misleading. In the case of Poland, for example, which consistently ranks eighth of the EU25 for work permit approvals, in fact has very few workers on shore in New Zealand, as usually over 70 percent (and in some years as much as 90 percent) of its work permits approved are for the crews of foreign fishing vessels. In this case, the workers are perhaps not experiencing NZ in the same way as other work permit holders.

Another major component constituting the total number of EU work permits are working holiday permits. NZ currently has working holiday schemes with twelve EU member states and is negotiating with a further five (for places available for different EU members see Figure 4.1). In 2004/05 working holiday permits made up to 34 percent of the total number of EU work permits issued. Although these work permits are for the dual purpose of holiday and working, and thus work tends to be restricted to more elementary and service occupations, they still play an important role in showcasing NZ as a destination and in turn raising its international profile among a young and mobile population.

Finally, partners of NZ citizens and residents compose another substantial group of EU work permit holders with 11 percent of work permits being granted on the grounds of partnership in 2004/05.

\textbf{5.3.3 Students}

Another important group of temporary permit holders in NZ are students. However, in contrast to both residence and work permit approvals, the EU is not a particularly high

\textsuperscript{15} Ibid., pp. 65.
\textsuperscript{16} Ibid., pp. 65.
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contributor of students when compared to the overall numbers of student permits issued. In this area, despite a significant drop in student migrants from Asia from 2003/04, the leading contributors in 2004/05 continue to be China, South Korea and Japan who combined supply 68% of a total of 104,757 student permit approvals. In comparison, in 2004/05 the EU only accounts for 7,046 approvals or 7 percent. However, these counts do not include students on short term programmes (fewer than three months duration) such as language courses, for which visas are not required. Nor do they include EU permanent residents who choose to study, so accordingly the actual number of EU students in NZ could be higher than this figure indicates.

![Figure 5.6: Student Permit Approvals 1997/98 - 2004/05](image)

Data source: www.immigration.co.nz – General Information – Statistics

While it may seem somewhat unusual that the UK supplies the largest number of student approvals from the EU member states, given that they do not need the same language experience that other foreign students may, the reason for this becomes more apparent when the categories under which UK students are being approved are examined more closely. For the UK, approximately 70 percent of student approvals fall under the criteria of dependents of work permit holders. This largely applies to those under 24 years of age, who are not married and rely mainly on their parents for financial support and these students only pay
foreign student fees if going into tertiary education. Thus, in light of the high number of work permits issued to British citizens, this finding is less surprising. For the EU24 by contrast, fewer than 10 percent of students’ approvals are made under the dependents category and instead 64 percent of approvals fall under full fee paying students.

New Zealand has the potential to become more important in the future for EU students as it is still a reasonably inexpensive place to come to improve and study in English, despite the distance from Europe. Furthermore, figures do suggest that there may be some differences within the distributions of EU students across different student fora. For example the top five EU member state contributors for student permit approvals are the UK, Germany, France, Sweden and the Netherlands. However, the 2005 annual survey of English Language Providers by Statistics NZ shows the top five EU member states in this forum to be Germany, France, the Czech Republic, Italy and Spain. Additionally, the figures for Czech, Italian and Spanish attendance at English language schools are considerably higher than the number of student permits issued for these countries indicating these students are likely to be in NZ for a shorter amount of time, three months or less.

5.4 Personal Characteristics of Recent EU Migrants

In this section the demographic characteristics of recent migrants from the EU to NZ are examined and, where appropriate, contrasted with established migrants from the EU to NZ. Figures are also provided for EU migrants to the Canterbury region in particular where these differ significantly from the national distribution. The data used in this section are drawn from the 2001 Census of Population and Dwellings. For the statistics on labour force participation and employment, comparison is also made with the total population of recent

---

19 English Language School numbers for the Czech Republic, Italy and Spain in 2004/05 were 188, 113 and 105 respectively, compared with the numbers of permits issued for these countries of 72, 75 and 25 respectively.
20 A proportion of respondents to the Census did not specify how many years they had been in NZ and therefore cannot be allocated to either the recent or established migrant groups. This percentage varies between the EU 25 at 3.7% and the EU 24 at 6.0%. These respondents have therefore been excluded from the following analysis.
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migrants to NZ. This information is useful for two reasons: first, it provides a snapshot of the EU migrant population in 2001, and secondly, it offers a framework through which to consider some of the survey findings.

5.4.1. Recent versus Established Migrants

In Chapter Two, the definition of and reasons for choosing to look at recent migrants were given. This section provides basic data of the relative distribution between recent and established EU migrants. The overall distribution is shown below in Figures 5.7 and 5.8. As is expected, given NZ’s settlement history (see Chapter 4), the proportion of established migrants far outweighs the number of recent settlers, though there is a marginally higher percentage of recent migrants for the EU24.

**Figure 5.7: Length of time of EU Migrants in NZ (EU25)**

![Pie chart showing recent and established migrants in EU25](chart5.7)

*Data Source: 2001 Census*

**Figure 5.8: Length of time of EU Migrants in NZ (EU24)**

![Pie chart showing recent and established migrants in EU24](chart5.8)

*Data Source: 2001 Census*
This situation is heavily influenced by the large scale movement of specific national groups, such as the UK and the Netherlands, and thus does obscure a different trend for some other countries. The Dutch population in NZ, for example, strongly reflects their heavy migration post-WWII with only 6.5 percent of their total number in NZ being recent migrants, but for seven EU member states – the Czech Republic, France, Luxembourg, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain and Sweden – their total populations are comprised of 40 percent or more recent migrants, with Finland slightly behind on 39 percent. While this presumably represents simply a more recent flow of migrants from these states, other factors could also contribute. A significant number of students or working holiday makers could raise the proportion of recent migrants for example, as could a significant number of recent migrants who are single or who have no children compared with established migrants who arrived with family. However, because of its limited nature, it is not possible to assess such considerations using the census data.

5.4.2 Gender
Gender is equally balanced for both recent and established migrants in the EU25. However, when the UK is removed, the EU24 shows a small difference with recent migrants being made up of slightly more females than males; 53 percent and 47 percent respectively, and established migrants showing the opposite trend with 52 percent males and 48 percent females. This pattern is repeated for EU migrants to Canterbury. These findings could be interpreted as an increasing feminisation of migration, but such assumptions should be treated cautiously due to the small populations involved. Additionally, within the EU group, some member states show more variation between the sexes. For example, recent migrants from Sweden are comprised of 62 percent females and only 38 percent males, and even established migrants from Sweden have a majority of females at 57 percent. In contrast to this, recent migrants from Italy are in fact weighted towards males with 56 percent compared to 43 percent females.

5.4.3 Age
Age distributions are, as expected, markedly different between recent and established EU migrants. As can be seen from Figure 5.9, the established group once again reflects the long
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Recent migration from the EU25 and has a significant proportion – 33 percent – of its population over 65 years of age. This figure is further exaggerated when the UK is removed, likely due to the large number of post-WWII migrants from the Netherlands and Poland in particular, who will now be entering retirement. However, some countries, Spain and Sweden for example, have a less top heavy age distribution for established migrants with only slightly over 50 percent of its population falling into the top two age brackets, compared with over 80 percent of 40+ year old migrants for the EU25. One explanation for this occurrence could be that these states have had a relatively steady level of migration, without the post-WWII bulge, and this level is now increasing. The recent EU migrant age distributions reflect the current NZ immigration policy, which largely excludes people over the age of 55, unless they are able to invest a large sum of money. It also suggests that recent migration from the EU25 includes families with children, as there are a large number of migrants aged under 14 years. The upper age ranges of recent EU migrants are similar to those of the overall recent migrant population, however there are comparatively fewer in the 15-24 year age group. This may be due to the very large number of Asian students in NZ who would likely fall into this age group and thus skew the figures for the overall NZ recent migrant population.

**Figure 5.9: Age Distribution of EU Migrants (2001 Census Data)**

(Data Source: 2001 Census)
5.4.4 Highest Qualification

Before examining the highest qualifications of EU migrants, an additional caveat must be outlined. As noted by Burgelt\textsuperscript{21} in regards to German migrants, differences in education systems between NZ and European countries can cause problems with migrants answering questions regarding qualifications. For example, additional levels between high school and university may not be recognised or could be devalued by the New Zealand Qualifications Authority and this may contribute to the reasonably high level of not stated or unidentifiable responses.

As can be seen below in Figures 5.10 and 5.11, recent EU migrants are considerably more qualified than established EU migrants. Given the age structure of the established EU population, this may be attributable to a change over time in education systems, which now place greater emphasis on gaining qualifications and provide more opportunities for tertiary studies. Both the recent and established EU 24 have a slightly altered distribution from the EU 25, with lower proportions of no qualification and greater proportions of overseas high school as the highest qualification. The EU 24 also has a higher proportion of not stated or unidentifiable responses which underlines the recognition problem discussed above. Highest qualification figures in the Canterbury region are in line with the national figures for both recent and established EU 25 and EU 24.

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=0.5\textwidth]{diagram.png}
\caption{Highest Qualification of Recent EU Migrants in NZ (EU25)}
\end{figure}

5.4.5 Location: Urban or rural?

Examining the nature of the locations in which EU migrants have chosen to settle provides an interesting backdrop to the discussion on the applicability of counterurbanization theory (described in Chapter Three), to the types of migration being discussed. One of the main points of interest of this theory is people who move down the population hierarchy to smaller settlements. While the information below cannot determine if this is the case for EU migration to NZ, it is still useful to see if, by NZ standards, new EU migrants are converging on bigger or smaller centres. Information drawn from the Census is broken down into five categories covering the spectrum of urban and rural locations. However, these have been regrouped to form a simpler urban-rural split, where urban areas are defined as having more than 1000 people living in an urbanised settlement. Figures 5.12 and 5.13 (below) show a significant majority of recent migrants from the EU living in NZ urban areas. Furthermore, the vast majority of those living in urban areas in fact live in centres with 30,000 people or more. The percentage living rurally in Canterbury is marginally higher than for NZ as a whole, but 73 percent still live in Main Urban Areas. There is little difference between recent and established EU migrants or between the EU24 and EU25, in terms of urban or

---

**Figure 5.11: Highest Qualification of Established EU Migrants in NZ (EU25)**

![Pie chart showing the highest qualifications of established EU migrants in NZ.](image)

*Data Source: 2001 Census*

---

22 Main Urban Area - Very large urban area centred on a city with minimum pop. of 30,000.  
Secondary Urban Area - Centred on larger regional centres with pop. of 10,000-29,999.  
Minor Urban Area - Urbanised settlement around small towns with pop. of 1,000-9,999.  
Rural Centre - Rural settlements of pop. 300-999.  
Other Rural - Rural dwellers in true rural areas, not rural centres.
rural location. Unfortunately figures are not available to compare with NZ’s total recent migrant population. So in NZ terms, these EU migrants do seem to be choosing large settlements, rather than the less populated areas counterurbanization might suggest, however, it may be that these settlements are still smaller than those the EU migrants have left.

**Figure 5.12: Location of Recent EU Migrants in NZ**

- Urban: 88%
- Rural: 12%

**Figure 5.13: Location of Recent EU Migrants in Canterbury**

- Urban: 85%
- Rural: 15%

*Data Source: 2001 Census*
5.4.6 Labour force status

Labour force status was examined for the recent EU migrant population\textsuperscript{23}. Recent migrants from the EU25 compare favourably with the total recent migrant population to NZ in terms of employment (see Figures 5.14-5.16 below) with 71 percent employed either full or part-time. Only recent Australian migrants had a higher proportion of employed (74 percent). The recent EU24 migration has a lower proportion of employed at 63 percent but is still ahead of other global regions ranging from 55 percent for South Asia to 28 percent for North Asia. These figures do, however, obscure the actual rate of unemployment for these regions. The EU25 actually has the lowest proportion of unemployed at 5 percent, marginally ahead of Australia at 6 percent and North Asia at 7.7\%, with the highest unemployed occurring for migrants for ‘Other’ regions at 13.5 percent\textsuperscript{24}. It should be noted that North Asia’s relatively low levels of employment and unemployment are likely to be largely a result of its large migrant student population.

As with the other demographic characteristics examined, figures for the Canterbury region are largely in line with the national figures, with marginally higher unemployment and part-time employment rates for the EU24 in Canterbury at 7 percent and 16 percent respectively.

\textsuperscript{23} Unfortunately due to an error in data supplied for this analysis, labour force status was given for all migrants over 15 years of age, rather than only for 15-65 years, the working age population. While this has little impact on the recent EU migrant population which has only approximately 4 percent in this non-working age bracket, the established EU migrant population is heavily skewed towards it, with between 32 percent and 38 percent falling into this group. Therefore, it is unsurprising that the majority (43-49 percent) of the established EU migrant population is recorded as not in the labour force and it is not possible to usefully compare how, or if, the proportion of recent EU migrant who are employed changes as they become established. It is possible though to compare recent EU migrants to NZ with recent migrants from other parts of the world and this comparable data was sourced from NZIS, (2003a). Migrants in NZ: An Analysis of 2001 Census Data, Wellington: Department of Labour, pp. 53-55.

\textsuperscript{24} The ‘Other’ grouping includes all countries not allocated to Australia, ESANA, North Asia, South Asia, SE Asia or the Pacific.
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Figure 5.14: Labour Force Status of Recent EU Migrants to NZ (EU25)

- Full-time: 59%
- Part-time: 12%
- Unempl'd: 5%
- NILF: 24%

Data Source: 2001 Census

Figure 5.15: Labour Force Status of Recent EU Migrants to NZ (EU24)

- Full-time: 51%
- Part-time: 12%
- Unempl'd: 6%
- NILF: 31%

Data Source: 2001 Census

Figure 5.16: Labour Force Status of All Recent Migrants to NZ (Ages 15-65)

- Full-time: 40%
- Part-time: 11%
- Unempl'd: 9%
- NILF: 40%

5.4.7 Employment status

Employment status in contrast to labour force status conveys how people are employed. Figures 5.15-5.17 (below), show the employment status distribution of the recent EU25, EU24 and total NZ migrant populations. For all of these groups the vast majority are paid employees. However, the EU24 has a slightly higher percentage of self-employed people without employees. This distribution though, changes depending on the duration migrants have been in NZ, with significant increases in the proportion of self-employed people and employers. For the established EU25, 17 percent are self-employed and 9 percent employers, and for the established EU24 these figures rise to 22 percent and 12 percent respectively. This is a trend that also holds true across other migrant groups and is likely related to the amount of time that is required to set up and build a business after migrating to NZ. Figures for the Canterbury region are largely reflective of the NZ distribution with the exception of a slightly higher percentage of paid employees with a corresponding lower proportion of self-employed across all groups not including the recent Canterbury EU25. This is wholly in line with the recent NZ EU25.

Figure 5.17: Employment Status of Recent EU Migrants to NZ (EU25)
Error! Not a valid link.

Figure 5.18: Employment Status of Recent EU Migrants to NZ (EU24)
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Figure 5.19: Employment Status of All Employed Recent Migrants to NZ

![Employment Status Pie Chart]

- Paid Employee: 79%
- Unpaid family worker: 2%
- Employer: 3%
- Self-empl'd without employees: 9%
- Not stated: 7%

Data Source: 2001 Census

5.4.8 Occupation

Occupational data in the Census are classified into groups according to the NZ Standard Classification of Occupation 1999\textsuperscript{25}. Figures 5.20-5.22 (below), show the occupations of the recent EU migrant population in NZ and the total recent NZ migrant population. The largest occupational group of recent EU migrants is professionals. The proportion for recent EU migrants is significantly higher than that for the total population of recent migrants to NZ. It is also higher than for the established EU population, which may be a result of the change in highest qualification level. The recent EU25 also has higher percentages of legislators and associate professionals than the total population of recent migrants, with correspondingly fewer service and sales workers and elementary occupations. However, it is interesting to note EU migrants still contribute a comparable percentage of trades people; a field in which NZ is particularly short of workers.

The recent EU24 is marginally different from the EU25 distribution with 4 percent fewer professionals and higher rates of agricultural workers and service and sales workers – 6 percent and 14 percent respectively. A higher proportion of agricultural workers is also seen in the established EU24 (8.6 percent versus 5.3 percent).

\textsuperscript{25}Legislators, Administrators and Managers; Professionals; Technicians and Associate Professionals; Clerks; Service and Sales Workers; Agricultural and Fishery Workers; Trades Workers; Plant and Machine Operators and Assemblers; Elementary Occupations (incl. residuals)
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Figures for Canterbury are broadly in line with those for the rest of NZ, however one occupation that is consistently under-represented through all groupings of recent and established EU25 and EU24 in the Canterbury region is that of legislators, administrators and managers which is approximately 2 percent less than that for the whole of NZ. This may be attributable to Christchurch not being a major business and political centre compared with Wellington and Auckland.

**Figure 5.20: Occupations of Recent EU Migrants to NZ (EU25)**

![Pie chart showing occupations of recent EU migrants to NZ (EU25)]

**Figure 5.21: Occupations of Established EU Migrants to NZ (EU25)**
5.5 Conclusion

The number of EU migrants in NZ has been steadily increasing over the past eight years, and residence approvals in particular, have grown since the change in the skilled migrant category in late 2003. The UK continues to be the top contributor to approvals in all three PLT migration streams, and the distribution between member states is largely stable, though
there has been growth from Ireland and the Czech Republic in terms of residence approvals. Data from the 2001 census shows recent EU migrants to be highly qualified, with good rates of employment, often in professional and associate professional occupations.
Chapter 6

The Migration Decision: The Path to NZ

“The biggest sell [for NZ] has always been lifestyle and quality of life.”

“There’s no doubting the main motivation of prospective [UK] migrants: moving out of the British fast lane and into the slower lanes overseas. In other words we’re far too revved up and we want to relax.”

Paul Beasley, Emigrate Magazine

6.1 Introduction

The decision to undertake migration is influenced by many different factors, as shown by the difficulty in forming a general theory of migration. As can be seen in the above quotes, New Zealand is often reported to be a lifestyle destination yet at the same time has an immigration policy that is largely employment based, requiring most migrants to work or invest when they arrive. This paradox underlines the necessity to consider government immigration policy in a framework of EU-NZ migration, as the immigration requirements act as a filter for potential migrants. As can be seen in the following discussion, for many respondents, lifestyle considerations act as a key motivating factor for migrating to NZ, while employment acts as a facilitator as much as a motivation for migration. This chapter initially describes the characteristics of the survey respondents before examining the motivations of those respondents for leaving their home country and choosing to migrate to NZ. The difficulty in differentiating between these two decisions in the questionnaire is also discussed. The role of various influences involved in the identification of NZ as a possible migration destination is also explored and finally the choice of Canterbury as migrants’ ultimate destination within NZ will be discussed.

---

6.2 Characteristics of Questionnaire Respondents

This section provides an overview of the 52 valid questionnaires returned\(^3\). Demographic information was gathered on both the principal applicant (PA) – or the one against whom the migration criteria was assessed – and, where applicable, an EU spouse or partner\(^4\) who had migrated with the principal applicant (also called the secondary applicant or SA). Labour market information was also sought for both the PA and, where applicable, the SA. For other sections of the questionnaire, respondents answering as a couple\(^5\) provided a joint answer, so the total number of responses for these sections is 52.

It should be noted that throughout the presentation of questionnaire results, information relating to particular sub-groups within the respondents – for example work permit holders and residence permit holders or EU-partner and NZ-partner – is only divided when differences between the groups are evident. Where this occurs, the text will indicate as such. The exception to this format is the separate presentation of information for principal and secondary applicants in the results of the work experiences section and in the current section.

### 6.2.1 Migration Status

The sample includes both residents and work permits holders from the different migration streams, reflecting the goal of the study: to show the various types of immigration to NZ from the EU.

Of the 52 valid questionnaires, 37 were returned by residents, while 14 respondents were on work permits and one respondent had already become a NZ citizen (Figure 6.1 below).

---

\(^3\) Three invalid questionnaires were returned: one from a migrant living in NZ for 8 years, and thus outside of the monitored time frame; one from a Romanian migrant, thus not an EU citizen; and one from a student, who was subsequently forwarded the student survey to complete instead.

\(^4\) The term partner will now be used from this point and will apply to those in a long-term relationship, including marriage.

\(^5\) Respondents were able to respond to the questionnaire as a couple because the decision making was likely shared, and not made by the principal applicant alone. 14 of the 25 EU couples indicated that they had filled in the questionnaire together.
The respondents primarily gained their permits under the Skilled/Business migrant stream (shown above in green) with slightly fewer entering through the Family stream (purple above). It is interesting to note that, reflecting the trends noted in Section 5.3.1, the most common category under the Family stream is that of partnership with a NZ citizen or resident. This reflects a growing trend in the number of permits issued to migrants with NZ partners which have increased by more than 100 percent over the past four years. The only permits awarded through the International/Humanitarian stream were the two working holiday permits. This is not surprising given the extremely low number of people from the EU entering under this stream in any categories other than working holiday, as shown in Chapter 5.

Twenty-eight respondents applied for their current permit offshore, or before arriving in NZ, but 24 had applied for their current permit while in NZ. A variety of different permits were

---

previously held by the respondents, including visitor, student, temporary work and working holiday permits. One respondent also had Australian permanent residency prior to taking up NZ residency. This shows a high proportion of transition between permits and could indicate that either once people arrive in NZ for a temporary stay they then choose to remain on a longer basis, or that it is difficult to obtain the initial permit desired, for example residency, while offshore, so it is easier to come to NZ on a temporary permit and then convert once in NZ.

6.2.2 Time Lived in NZ

Figure 6.2: Duration of Stay of Questionnaire Respondents in NZ

Figure 6.2 highlights the length of time respondents had lived in NZ at the time they completed the questionnaire. As outlined in Chapter 2, respondents had to have at least six months experience of living in NZ but have lived in New Zealand no longer than five years to be eligible for inclusion in the survey. As shown above, most of the respondents had lived in NZ for between six months and three years.
6.2.3 Family Configuration

The sample included 44 couples, most with partners from the EU or NZ although four had partners from other parts of the world\textsuperscript{7}. Of the couples with both partners from the EU, seventeen were from the UK. In two further cases one of the partners was from the UK and the other partners were from Ireland and France. A high proportion of German respondents, five out of nine, were married to NZ partners. Eight of the 52 respondents were single at the time they responded to the questionnaire. The families sampled also included over 50 children, and the majority of these children (35) migrated to NZ with their parents. Ten were born in NZ after their parents’ arrival. A small number of respondents’ children remained in their country of origin and may have already been independent when their parents chose to migrate. Only two of the work permit holders had children, compared to 25 of the residence permit holders.

Figure 6.3: Family Configuration of Questionnaire Respondents

6.2.4 Gender

Of the PAs, 30 were male and 22 were female. However, this gender distribution was differentiated according to the family configuration of the PA. As shown above (Figure 6.3), just under half of the sample migrated with a partner or spouse from the EU and of this group

\textsuperscript{7} These partners were from Japan, the USA, Australia and the Ukraine.
only two of the PAs were female. However, of the fifteen respondents who had a NZ partner, thirteen were female. Slightly more of the single respondents were female than male, five and three respectively, while the respondents with non-EU spouses were equally divided with two males and two females being the PA. The decision as to who would be the PA largely depended on the respective jobs of the couple applying, with one of the female principal applicants stating that although she did not intend to work on arrival in NZ, her occupation gained more points and therefore she was the principal applicant. Corresponding to the mainly male principal applicants, the majority of the secondary applicants were female\(^8\).

6.2.5 Country of Birth

Principal applicants came from eleven EU countries (figure 6.4), but 50 percent were from the UK. While this does seem to skew the sample heavily towards UK migrants, it is in fact an under representation of the actual proportion of UK migrants in the total EU to NZ migrant flow (approximately 80 percent).

![Figure 6.4: Country of Birth of Principal Applicant](image_url)

\(^8\)However, the immigration policy does not differentiate between heterosexual and homosexual partnerships, so it should not be assumed that a male principal applicant applying with a partner automatically matches with a female secondary applicant.
Fewer EU states were represented in the birth places of secondary applicants compared to those of principal applicants. This is due to the prevalence of English couples among the questionnaire respondents, seventeen out of 25.

**Figure 6.5: Country of Birth of Secondary Applicants**

6.2.6 Age

The age distribution of respondents largely reflected the current NZ immigration policy for skilled migrants, under which the majority of the survey participants entered NZ, and which favours a combination of youth and work experience. Unsurprising, therefore, the largest EU migrant group falls into the 30-39 age group. Only ten respondents fell into the older 50-64 bracket, while none were older than 65.

---

9 Applicants under the skilled migrant category must have at least two years experience in a relevant field to claim points and the more experience an applicant has, the more points that can be claimed. For example, 10 points are given for two years’ experience and 30 points for ten years. Conversely, the younger the applicant is the more points they gain for age, for example 30 points for the youngest age group of 20-29 and only 5 points for the oldest bracket of 50-55.

10 5 PAs and 5 SAs.
6.2.7 Highest Qualification

The high level of qualifications of contemporary EU migrants to NZ again reflects the immigration policy for skilled migrants which awards a larger number of points for recognised qualifications at trade, diploma and degree levels, with bonus points for Masters or Doctorates and additional bonus points for spousal qualifications. Only three principal applicants and three secondary applicants had no post-secondary qualifications. This is in line with research showing that migrants tend to be more highly qualified than the NZ born population\(^\text{11}\).

---

6.3 Previous Migration History

Of the sample, 33 respondents stated that they had undertaken prior migration. These migrations ranged in length from short stays of three months to much longer term moves, with the longest being thirty years. The reasons for previous moves were varied, ranging from study, to the desire to live with a spouse or to have a new experience, however employment was the most common motivating factor. Twelve survey respondents were living away from their home countries prior to migrating to NZ and of these, nine had moved internally within the EU: four to the UK and three to Sweden. There is some research to suggest that previous migratory behaviour can indicate a propensity towards mobility\textsuperscript{12}, and the comments of one interviewee may serve to highlight such tendencies in the NZ-EU case. In one interview, a respondent noted how a student exchange trip to Australia over two decades previously left an enduring impact:

“\textit{I really loved it. I really enjoyed my time out there. And I had a feeling it’s a sort of virus. Since that time it never left my feeling. I’ve just always had the feeling I want to go, I want to do this.} ” (ID Int6, Netherlands)\textsuperscript{13}

6.4 Motivations for leaving home country

The decision to undertake migration is frequently seen to be associated with a feeling of dissatisfaction or hardship in the place of origin that can be mitigated by moving to another location. This dissatisfaction is often perceived to be financial in basis, though as shown in the introductory quotes to this chapter, in the case of migration from developed countries, the stress and pressure of a modernised world are identified as strong contributing factors. Respondents were asked to rate their ability to meet their needs and their satisfaction with life prior to migrating to NZ (Figures 6.10 and 6.11): as the results show, these assumptions do not appear to hold true for all of this sample. This is particularly the case in regards to financial needs with only two respondents unable to meet their basic needs prior to migration.

\textsuperscript{13} The ID system used for quotes throughout the discussion of the results of the surveys and interviews are as follows: Quote from open-ended survey questions ‘ID Q--, nationality’; quote from follow up interview ‘ID Int--, nationality’.
Additionally, while some migrants did express a degree of dissatisfaction with their life prior to migrating, over 50 percent of the sample rated their satisfaction with life prior to migrating to NZ as satisfied or very satisfied. Why then have these EU migrants made the decision to come to NZ? Is the prevailing opinion that the desire for a ‘Kiwi lifestyle’ is the key factor for stressed, over-crowded EU migrants to leave their home countries and move to NZ accurate? How do the aims suggested in the micro level of the EU-NZ migration framework, Figure 3.2, match up with respondents stated motivations?

**Figure 6.10: Standard of living prior to migration to NZ**

**Figure 6.11: Satisfaction with life prior to migration to NZ**
Two approaches were taken in the questionnaire to examine the reasons why respondents chose to leave their home country. First, respondents were asked to state in their own words why they decided to leave their home country; second, they were asked to rate on a 1 to 5 scale ten statements regarding specific factors that may have influenced their choice. These questions sought to draw out the reasons why people decided to undertake migration, before exploring their choice of NZ as the destination for their move, the latter issue being investigated subsequently using a similar format of questions. However, it is necessary to note that while the differentiation of the decision to leave and the choice of NZ as a destination was relevant for some of the respondents, for others it proved to be redundant as their choice of NZ as a destination was integrated into the reason they had decided to leave their home country. In fact, as will be discussed below, only nineteen of the respondents considered other possible destinations. This merging of the decision process was particularly evident in the case of respondents with partners from NZ. For other respondents, the decision making process appeared to occur in reverse as it was not until they had experienced NZ, that they decided to migrate. These issues highlight the complexity of the migration decision-making experience. These issues were further investigated in the follow up interviews, and quotes from these interviews are integrated below.

A variety of answers were provided in response to the open-ended question of what motivated the EU migrants to leave their home countries. These responses can be divided into six general categories, though in most cases multiple reasons encompassing more than one category were given. This is in line with other studies that have found that “…most migrants will have taken many issues into account…” in their decision to migrate. The first three categories relate mainly to reasons that are largely independent of the choice of NZ as the destination for migration. The subsequent three, in contrast, tend to link directly with the decision to live in NZ specifically.

---

14 However, it should not be assumed that a bi-national couple will automatically decide to live in one of their home countries. This can be seen in the four couples who responded to this survey, in which one partner is from the EU and the other from another country. As one respondent stated in her open answer to the question of why she choose to leave her home country, “My husband is Australian and we decided we like the lifestyle and the people we knew in Christchurch – neither of us really wanting to live in our own or each others countries.” (ID Q48, UK).
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6.4.1 Lifestyle

The desire for a better quality of life or a change in lifestyle was the most widely cited motivation for leaving the EU. Unfortunately, many of these statements were general and did not specify what was meant by a ‘better lifestyle’.

“We wanted a change of lifestyle, hopefully a better one.” (ID Q47, UK)

“To look for a better quality of life for my family and myself.” (ID Q33, Ireland)

When respondents expanded on what was meant by a ‘better’ or ‘change’ of lifestyle, environmental factors such as low population density and the aspiration for more space featured prominently. The desire to lead a more ‘outdoor’ life was also indicated as part of the targeted ‘lifestyle’.

“I wanted to get away from the crazy life we have in Europe and have a more balanced lifestyle with lots of outdoors activities.” (ID Q19, France)

Though couched in terms of what was desired in the country of destination, these responses do imply some dissatisfaction with life in the home country and this was stated more directly by some respondents.

6.4.2 Dissatisfaction with home

As shown in Figure 6.11, the general levels of satisfaction with life in the respondents’ home countries were quite high. However, twelve respondents rated their life as unsatisfactory, and three were very dissatisfied. These reasons were inversely related with the desires for
the abovementioned ‘better lifestyle’, in particular the issues of overcrowding, stress and the increasing cost and pace of living.

“Very expensive. Very crowded, high crime. Mad cows! Not valued – too impersonal.” (ID Q27, UK)

“...but the worst thing was just everything was so busy. I just felt there were too many people.” (ID Int1, Netherlands)

“That was the main reason though. Life is very stressful in the UK.” (ID Int11, UK)

“Husband had been suffering work related stress. Had to leave his job and repay back loan (sell house). Dissatisfied with pace of life etc in UK.” (ID Q2, UK)

“...my husband was very busy in Hungary. He started working at 7 o’clock in the morning and finished at 7 o’clock at night, with no time for family and our children.” (ID Int7, Hungary)

One issue not featured in the open-ended question responses was the impact on EU migrants’ decision to migrate because of other migrants coming to their own home countries. However, this issue was raised in two of the follow up interviews.

“I was quite shocked and, it sounds racist again, but it was quite a large factor for me to want to come over here. Just too many Muslims in England, I just got sick of it. In your face all the time, it’s on the TV and I didn’t even live in one of these really prevalent areas of where they lived, although behind there was a big Bangladeshi community.” (ID Int2, UK/France)

“...Dutch society has changed so much over the past decade and we were not feeling happy with quite a lot of things and it actually got worse after we left. It has got an amazingly large immigrant population which is mainly Muslim and there really, there was rising tension between the original population and the others...” (ID Int1, Netherlands)
Though only two of the respondents mentioned this motivation\textsuperscript{16}, such a connection has been made in other research, particularly in the case of the Netherlands, where a traditionally inclusive society was shocked by the murders of prominent right wing, anti-immigration politician, Pim Fortuyn in 2002\textsuperscript{17} and filmmaker Theo van Gogh, a “...fierce critic of fundamentalist Muslims...”\textsuperscript{18}, in 2004.

6.4.3 Travel, Adventure and Challenge

For just under a quarter of the EU migrants sampled, migration was a result of a desire to embark on a new adventure or to have new experiences rather than an underlying dissatisfaction with life. In particular, the challenge involved in migration itself was a key motivating factor for undertaking such a journey. The motivations expressed here appear to echo those given by EU student migrant respondents in Chapter 8. This strengthens the argument to include this kind of motivation in the individual level of the suggested EU-NZ migration framework.

“I want change my life, try new, try be emigrant, I want to see how is emigrant life, visit other country, culture, be faraway from my home.” (ID Q24, Poland)

“...you know the curiosity, to get to know a new country, new lifestyle, new culture and everything, it was a big challenge for me. It was my reason, the challenge.” (ID Int7, Hungary)

“To get a chance to meet people from different backgrounds and cultures.” (ID Q34, Spain)

“I wanted to see the other side of the world.” (ID Q43, Finland)

For some of these migrants, the need for this new challenge arose at the end of one period of the life cycle.

\textsuperscript{16} In one of the interviews, this issue was raised at the very beginning, however, in the other interview it was not raised until approximately one hour into the interview. At this time, it was clear that they were conscious of appearing to be racist. Whether this may have prevented other EU migrants from raising this issue or whether it was simply not a motivating factor for anyone else is not able to be known.

\textsuperscript{17} Fortuyn’s murderer was a white Dutch male who declared he carried out the assassination “...to defend Dutch Muslims from persecution”. (Wikipedia: http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Pim_Fortuyn).

“Mid life crisis – new challenge. We’d finished/achieved our goals in our home country”. (ID Q41, Netherlands)

“I just finished university in Germany and I had intended to do [further] study…and I didn’t want to start straightaway. I wanted to go somewhere else and do something else for a while”. (ID Int5, Germany)

“…I’d spent 23 years in one place and I thought that was quite enough and just wanted to get to know something else...”. (ID Int4, Poland)

For others, it was the wish for their children to have the experience of living in a foreign country that was a motivating factor.

“To provide my children with a choice to choose between different cultures and mentalities”. (ID Q39, Germany)

“We wanted our children to learn another language fluently without any accent, we wanted them to get to know other lifestyle and culture as well”. (ID Q44, Hungary)

**6.4.4 Economic Drivers**

As was noted in the introduction to this chapter, financial hardship and an inability to meet basic needs was not a motivating factor for migration for the vast majority of EU migrants. However, two respondents from Poland mentioned that economic prospects in their home country were a factor in the decision to migrate, with one respondent noting Poland’s high unemployment rate of approximately nineteen percent. Additionally, one UK farmer in the sample noted the poor prospects of his industry – farming – as the key motivation for his family’s migration.

“Poor economic and lifestyle prospects for people of my age group and educational background.” (ID Q6, Poland)

“We are a longstanding farming family and were disillusioned by our interpretation of what we felt was a rapid decline in the profitability of the industry. Subsidies
Finding suitable employment for both partners in a relationship was also an issue for two of the respondents.

“My partner is a New Zealander. We lived together in my home country for 2 years, where I was studying for my MA. My partner could only find temporary work as a city guide so we decided to try our luck in NZ.” (ID Q30, Germany)

However, employment played a more significant role as a positive motivation, where the desire to gain overseas work experience or a job offer in NZ contributed to the decision to migrate.

“Job offer from New Zealand. Shorter working hours – better for family life.” (ID Q10, UK)

“Employment opportunity at UC [University of Canterbury] plus a desire to spend time ‘abroad’…” (ID Q28, UK)

“The main reason why I left Germany is that I wanted to gather work experience in different countries.” (ID Q31, Germany)

6.4.5 Family Ties
As previously noted a significant proportion of the sample – slightly less than thirty percent – had New Zealand partners at the time of responding to the questionnaire. However, only ten of these respondents felt their partnership was a motivating factor in their decision to migrate. The remaining respondents with NZ partners instead met them while in NZ. Although a number of respondents gave their relationship with a New Zealander as the sole migration motivation, several others mentioned it in combination with other motivations such as NZ being a safe place to raise a family or because the couple had already spent time in the EU partner’s home country.
“I lived in Poland with my husband whose [sic] from Chch. We decided to see his ‘home’ after living in mine.” (ID Q18, Poland)

“My husband is a Kiwi from Temuka (we met whilst travelling and lived together in London) and we decided to return to his home for a better quality of life and to start our family.” (ID Q5, UK)

“To live with my Kiwi girlfriend. To have a fresh start. To experience NZ. More opportunities in NZ.” (ID Q46, Ireland)

Although the dominant family relationship providing a motivation for migration to NZ in this sample was that of partnerships between EU and NZ nationals, other familial relations also played a role, with the desire to be closer to children, parents and siblings.

“Both my daughters are now resident in NZ.” (ID Q4, UK)

“My sister lives here and we had no ties to the UK to prevent us trying somewhere different.” (ID Q8, UK)

“My parents migrated to NZ about 5 years ago, I decided to take advantage of the one year working holiday visa and come to NZ to see what it could offer me as they saw NZ as a better place to be.” (ID Q9, UK)

“My husband’s family encourage me a lot to make this decision.” (ID Q17, Poland)

6.4.6 NZ as a Beacon

For some respondents, the attractions of NZ, most often learnt through previous travel to NZ, were given as an answer to the open question of why the respondent left their home country. This category overlaps considerably with the ‘lifestyle’ reasons as outlined in the first category discussed, however the responses here were linked specifically to NZ, rather than being presented as a general desire.

“Attractions of NZ: more space, less competition, outdoor activities.” (ID Q40, UK)
There is also a substantial cross-over between this motivation for leaving and the choice of NZ as a destination. In light of this, this facet of motivation for migration is further discussed later in the chapter, when looking at the choice of destination. This issue further highlights the difficulty of differentiating between distinct phases within the decision-making process for some of respondents.

In addition to the open questions, participants were asked to rate the level of importance a series of statements had in their decision to undertake migration\textsuperscript{19}. The mean figures for all respondents are presented below in Table 6.1. Here, the desire for a change of lifestyle is again confirmed as a key motivating factor with a mean of four (very important). However, only two other statements; the experience of living abroad and stress and overcrowding in home country, were rated as important. These findings are also congruent with the open-ended questions results presented above. While it is tempting to try and explore differences between national groupings in terms of their rating of these motivations, for example fourteen of twenty-six UK respondents rated stress and overcrowding as very or extremely important while only two of nine German respondents did so, the number of participants in each national grouping is too small to test statistically and therefore no statistical significance can be inferred from such a comparison. Finally, the desire to earn money in order to send remittances home was a negligible issue for most of those questioned. It was not mentioned at all in the open-ended questions and was rated as unimportant in the closed question responses. This underlines the inappropriateness of the some of the economic theories previously discussed as a framework for understanding EU-NZ migration.

\textsuperscript{19} 1 = Unimportant, 2 = Less important, 3 = Important, 4 = Very Important, 5 = Extremely Important.
Table 6.1: Why did you choose to leave your home country?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Change of lifestyle</td>
<td>4.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience of living abroad</td>
<td>3.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stress and overcrowding in home country</td>
<td>3.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor quality environment in home country</td>
<td>2.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proximity to friends/family</td>
<td>2.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor economic conditions in home country</td>
<td>1.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retirement</td>
<td>1.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To learn skills to use in home country</td>
<td>1.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To earn money to send home to family members</td>
<td>1.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To save money for return to home country</td>
<td>1.08</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.5 Discovering NZ

Before deciding to migrate to NZ, NZ first has to be recognised as a possible destination. Respondents were asked how they learnt about NZ as a possible destination.

Figure 6.12: Means of learning about NZ as a possible migration destination

---

Respondents could provide multiple answers so the percentages do not equate to 100.
6.5.1 Personal recommendations

Importantly, but perhaps unsurprising given the high proportion of respondents with NZ partners, the most commonly reported means of finding out about NZ as a possible destination was from personal contacts with friends, family or work colleagues. This result is similar to other studies of migrants which also found personal contacts to be the leading source of information on the destination country and highlights the important role of social networks in contributing to migration\(^{21}\).

“Then his parents went to NZ on holiday and said ‘Oh, what a great place it is…’ and all this and I think that’s what started to stick in his mind really…and I worked with a couple of people from NZ as well so they gave me a lot of information.” (ID Int10, UK)

“But we just thought about Europe first, you know England or Germany because my husband can speak German as well and he just decided, no Europe is too busy, too many people, too many crime and violence and everything and he just heard about NZ from his colleague. Once they just talked about NZ looks for people, qualified people…and it became his passion, you know.” (ID Int7, Hungary)

“[NZ is my] husband’s home. He talked of it in terms of its geographic beauty as well as its conservative good citizenry.” (ID Q5, UK)

6.5.2 Previous travel to NZ

Previous travel to NZ was cited by 40 percent of the sample as providing them with information on NZ as a possible destination. However, over 70 percent of the questionnaire respondents had actually visited NZ prior to their current migration. The majority of these trips had been as tourists, with work or study undertaken by a minority, most often as working holiday-makers. The number of previous tourist trips per respondent varied, with three stating that they had been to NZ on five or more previous occasions.

\(^{21}\) For example: Institute of Employment Studies, (2002). Knowledge Migrants, London: Home Office, pp. 49; and NZIS, (2004a). Op. Cit., pp 41. Although these studies ask slightly different questions around this issue, enquiring more generally about how migrants found information about New Zealand prior to migration, the pre-eminence of personal contacts as a means of information is still highlighted.
For seven respondents their previous travel to NZ had the dual purpose of reconnaissance and holidaying.

“Visited winter ’04 to see my girlfriend and check out the country as a migration destination.” (ID Q46, Ireland)

“We spent a month travelling around the Southern Island to find out if we like it or not.” (ID Q41, Netherlands)

“We came for two weeks. Four days was the job interview, the rest holiday.” (ID Q22, UK)

These scouting trips may in part help account for the discrepancy between the percentage of respondents who had previously visited NZ and those who gave it as a means of learning about NZ as a possible migration destination, as those who used their trip for reconnaissance had, by implication, already discovered NZ as a possible destination. Furthermore, several respondents with NZ partners had visited NZ in order to meet in-laws but did not give their trip as means of discovering NZ as a destination, rather seeing their relationship with their NZ partner in that role. Additionally, not all previous travel to NZ was a positive experience that opened the possibility of future migration, as one respondent stated:

---

As some respondents had travelled to NZ on more than one occasion for more or for more than one purpose, the total does not add up to 52.
“15 day holiday in North Island in July 1996 – was raining all the time – it did not stimulate our wish to move here.” (ID Q39, Germany)

While some migrants whose previous travel to NZ sparked their desire to move acted on this decision fairly quickly.

“We came here on our honeymoon (NZ was a fairly arbitrary choice) and decided we wanted to come back within the year.” (ID Q25, UK)

For others, there was a substantial time between the initial consideration of migration and acting on it, often with repeat trips to NZ in the interim.

“I was fascinated by NZ on 6 holidays; I wanted the opportunity to live in a less crowded space; eg. to find a house with some space around it.” (ID Q11, Germany)

“Because you have such a good time when you travel. So [we] went back originally and we just said ‘Yeah, we want to go back there and live’. You know, the initial ‘Oh yeah, this is great, this is fantastic’ and I’d say it was just a light that was fused and it was burning for three and a half years. And then it diminished a bit because I think you get stuck in a rut...” (ID Int2, UK/France)

This more gradual approach to emigration was also noted by Bönisch-Brednich in her study of German migrants in the 1990s24.

6.5.3 Migration industry influence

The internet, magazines and books, and television and movies also played a small role in alerting respondents to the possibility of NZ as a destination. For example, one individual identified the film the Lord of the Rings as a possible source of inspiration for potential migrants.

“It’s [the Lord of the Rings] put it on the map definitely. People have seen it all over the world and its all about the scenery, wasn’t it? That must have had a factor in people thinking about moving here, definitely.” (ID Int2, UK/France).

23 This couple moved to NZ five years after holidaying here.
However, it may also be that these media were used to find out more information about NZ after the idea of NZ was introduced in another way.

“Once they just talked about NZ looks for people, qualified people and everything and he just, hmm, went on the internet you know, click, click, click and found out a lot of information about NZ and it became his passion, you know. Then, watch every movie about NZ, or buying books and a lot of things…” (ID Int7, Hungary)

Certainly there is currently a high degree of popular interest, particularly in the UK, in international migration between developed countries. For example, there are multiple television programmes that document the migration experience, such as *No Going Back* and *Get a New Life* which have featured families moving to NZ among other destinations, or programmes that focus on the purchase of homes in desirable locations such as *A Place in the Sun* or *Trading Up in the Sun*. Even a popular English drama series, *William and Mary* featured a story line in which the principal character decided to migrate to NZ after selling his business. Numerous websites, for example, [nukiwi.com](http://nukiwi.com), [move2nz.com](http://move2nz.com), [emigratenz.org](http://emigratenz.org) and [newzealandmigration.com](http://newzealandmigration.com), have also been formed to assist people who are thinking about moving, and to offer support to people in the process of moving and after arrival in NZ, both in terms of general information and by providing fora in which potential migrants can ‘talk’ to each other about their experiences. These fora can be very important for some migrants, particularly if they do not know people in the country of destination. For example one of the respondents stated that they initially chose to move to Wellington in NZ “...because we arrived in Wellington, we had just a couple of, not friends, but people who we knew from the internet. And they just helped us.” (ID Int7, Hungary).

![Figure 6.14: Cover of Emigrate NZ, a magazine for intending migrants](image)

---

Additionally, the Outbound Publishing group produces monthly newspapers, such as *Australian News*, *Going USA*, *Canada News* and *Destination NZ* and migration guides such as *Emigrate NZ* (see Figure 6.14), that are specifically designed to promote and offer advice to migrants\(^{26}\) as well as providing a forum for advertising for a large number of migration industry actors such as migration agents, moving companies, international recruitment agencies and even the NZ Immigration Service (see Box 1). Large scale expositions in the larger UK cities, the *Emigrate Show* and the *Opportunities NZ Expo* for example, also provide a forum in which people can find out about the possibility or feasibility of migrating to NZ, or another destination. Smaller seminars are also held by specific migration agencies which can highlight one particular country but are more likely to cover multiple destinations.

“They [migration agency] do a lot of seminars and they have people speaking that come over from here [NZ], and probably...Australia, maybe Canada and South Africa...we went to a seminar and there was a guy from Dunedin there trying to get people over there.” (ID Int2, UK/France)

Migration agents form another important component of the NZ immigration industry. Although only 8 percent of respondents noted they had learnt about NZ as a possible destination from an immigration agency, one quarter of the respondents stated that they had contacted a migration agent at some point in their visa application process\(^ {27}\). Again this discrepancy is likely to be due to the fact that many of the respondents had already decided to relocate to NZ specifically prior to contacting the agency. However, immigration agents have been shown, particularly in the case of Asian migrants to NZ to play quite a large role in the identification of NZ as a possible destination\(^ {28}\).

---

\(^{26}\) Information provided by Outbound Publishing states that they receive in excess of 250,000 enquiries per year related to migration.

\(^{27}\) The main reason for contacting a migration agency was due to their experience and knowledge of NZ’s immigration requirements which was perceived to make the process of application easier, quicker and with more chance of success, especially for migrants working up until the time of their departure. However, for some respondents who used an agency, their expectations were not met and the money spent was considered wasted. In recognition of some problems within this field, in 2005 the NZ Government introduced a bill requiring mandatory licensing of immigration consultants.

This use of migration agents and newspapers to promote migration is not a new phenomenon. In fact it has occurred in the NZ context from the time of original European settlement as Figure 6.15 shows.

Figure 6.15: Advertisements from 1849 for an early immigration agent, and for the New Zealand Journal, a fortnightly magazine regarding all aspects of emigration to ‘the Colony’

New Zealand’s migrant entry policies were discussed in Chapter 4, however, another important aspect of this policy was not identified in this section, and that is the active marketing of NZ as a migration destination undertaken by NZIS and the Department of Labour. As with immigration magazines and agents, advertising for migrants is not a new phenomenon and the government has been involved in schemes to promote movement to NZ in the past, through marketing assisted passages to attract migrants after WWII for example. A 2000 report on cultivating the knowledge economy recognised the need to attract skilled migrants to NZ and recommended “…aggressively marketing New Zealand as an appealing place to live, for example, the lifestyle that New Zealand can offer,” while simultaneously trying to raise the profile of NZ knowledge-based industries as being world leading, and identifying and marketing areas of skills shortage. Advertising through television, newspapers, road-shows and via consulates, as well as on the NSIZ website was advised.

These suggestions appear to have been largely implemented as is reflected in the current Department of Labour immigration marketing objective, “[t]o increase the quality and quantity of skilled migrants contributing to New Zealand by promoting New Zealand as a highly desirable immigration destination that provides great work and lifestyle opportunities.” To achieve this objective, the current marketing strategy focuses on three key target markets “…something old, something new and something obvious but untested,” representing the UK, the US and migrants already working in NZ respectively.

---

32 Ibid., pp. 20.
33 Personal communication with Lianne Dalziel, 15 August 2005.
34 This strategy is mainly aimed at attracting new residents rather than focusing on other temporary stays.
35 Personal communication with Lianne Dalziel, 15 August 2005.
In late 2005 the UK component of this approach was widened to incorporate advertising directed specifically towards ex-patriot New Zealanders working in the UK\textsuperscript{36}. Marketing in the UK was primarily focused on articles in newspapers, magazines and websites and advertising aimed at attracting potential migrants to immigration fairs, conferences and seminars. However, in the US, a market without traditional immigration connections to NZ and a lower level of awareness of NZ as a destination possibility, a different approach was utilised with three marketing directors based in the key West Coast cities, employed to raise New Zealand’s profile and target migrants with easily transferable qualifications.

However, while the NZIS is represented at road shows in Germany and the Netherlands\textsuperscript{37}, this marketing strategy does not place emphasis on any other EU country or region\textsuperscript{38}. This may be due to perceived difficulties regarding language or qualification compatibility for continental European migrants in some target industries, or the perceived lack of a ‘migrant market’ in these countries. Unfortunately, when combined with a possible low level of awareness of NZ in some EU states\textsuperscript{39} it may mean that NZ is missing out on potential migrants. However, the former Minister of Immigration did note that “[o]nce the recruitment approach has been tested in what are relatively safe locations, then I am sure the net will…

\textsuperscript{36} This campaign, New Zealand Now, was launched on 11 November 2005 with an associated website, www.newzealandnow.info, and poster campaign in the London underground.

\textsuperscript{37} For example, representatives from NZIS will attend the Emigration Fair 2006 in the Netherlands for potential emigrants from the Netherlands, Belgium and Germany (www.emigratiebeurs.nl).

\textsuperscript{38} However, the NZIS was involved with an employment exhibition in Germany in 2005 aimed at attracting German migrants to NZ and from a tourism perspective, Tourism NZ also undertakes advertising of NZ primarily through the 100\% Pure NZ campaign, and within Europe targets the UK, Germany, the Netherlands, Switzerland and Scandinavia, but none of the new EU member states.

\textsuperscript{39} This issue was raised in two of the follow up interviews with a French and a Polish migrant. The Polish interviewee (ID Int4, Poland) reported that NZ was not very well known but had the image of being an exotic, clean, green country. However, she also mentioned that NZ was seen in abstract, as perhaps a dream place, due in part to its distance from Poland. The French interviewee (ID Int2, UK/France) also noted that knowledge of New Zealand among her French co-workers and friends was low, “The funny thing is, you know, with things like “Oh, New Zealand, wow paradise country”, so you’d think they’d know a little bit but in actual fact when I was talking to friends or French colleagues…most of them didn’t even know that NZ is made up of two islands…they didn’t know what shape it is, or exactly where it is, you know.” Her English partner also added, “They think its half an hour on the boat from Australia…or its part of Australia.”.
be set wider”\(^{40}\), so there may be a possibility of investigating further European markets in the future.

Advertising for migrants is, however, not restricted to national government initiatives. During the recent British Lions tour of NZ that brought approximately 29,000\(^{41}\) supporters to NZ, campaigns targeting Lions supporters were undertaken by various regional and city councils\(^{42}\). Palmerston North encouraged supporters to “Move your pride to Palmy”, and the Canterbury Employers’ Chamber of Commerce printed 10,000 brochures highlighting the region’s economic strength and lifestyle potential as well as noting the unofficial description of Christchurch as ‘a little piece of Britain’\(^{43}\). Other initiatives have also been launched on a regional level, for example in 2003 the Napier city council ran a competition to “Win a life in Napier”, which generated approximately 2,700 entries from around the world and resulted in the winners and an additional fifty families moving to the Hawkes Bay area\(^{44}\). It also resulted in a database of entrants being created which matched their skills with job vacancies in the region. Another similar competition was run by the Napier City Council in 2005 where entrants could ‘Win a Dream Job’ in Napier, the launch of which was reported in The Times (London)\(^{45}\). Again, all of these initiatives concentrate on the UK as a potential source for migrants\(^{46}\), and thus fail to consider other potential source countries.

\(^{40}\) Personal communication with Lianne Dalziel, 15 August 2005.
\(^{42}\) These campaigns ran alongside a wider Department of Labour scheme to target the supporters mainly through key points on tourist routes such as airport and information centres. (Gregory, A. (2005, June 9). ‘Campaign woos Lions fans to return’, *The New Zealand Herald*).
\(^{45}\) Ibid.
\(^{46}\) Even though the Napier City Council competition was open to any country, personal interviews with final round entrants took place in London while final round entrants from other countries had to provide a video interview and both winners were eventually chosen from the UK.
6.6 The Decision to Migrate to NZ

As explained above, for some of the EU migrants questioned the choice to leave their home country and their choice to migrate to NZ were one and the same decision. This decision was often preceded by travel to NZ or a relationship with a NZ person which will be discussed subsequently. However, for respondents the decision to migrate was followed by active consideration of different destination options. Participants were asked to state any alternative destinations that they considered and to identify any particular strengths or weaknesses of these alternatives.

6.6.1 Alternate destinations

“We also had to find an answer to the question, where do we want to go if we want to go somewhere else? So at that stage we didn’t know that it would be NZ, or the Canterbury Plains.” (ID Int6, Netherlands)

Of the 52 questionnaire respondents, nineteen (or 37 percent) indicated they had considered other countries as possible destinations. It is not possible to determine if this proportion is typical of migrants to NZ. Two studies of other NZ migrant groups showed a higher percentage of respondents considering other countries, 72 percent in a study of Taiwanese migrants in Auckland\(^47\), and ‘most’ of the participants in a study of recent business migrants\(^48\). One reason the percentage may be lower in the current study is the relatively large number of migrants with NZ partners, which were not identified in the other studies mentioned. Unfortunately, it is not possible to compare these findings with those of the LisNZ pilot survey, which included family reunification migrants as well as skilled business migrants, as that survey asked only if a respondent had applied for residence in another country, not whether they had considered migrating to a different destination. The LisNZ pilot study found that 97 percent of their sample had not applied for residence elsewhere in the three years prior to the survey\(^49\). However, this result could be misleading if it is


interpreted to show that migrants to NZ only consider NZ as a destination, as applications for residence usually incur significant costs and as such would only be undertaken by those extremely seriously considering moving to that country.

However, as also shown in the two aforementioned studies, the range of alternative destinations considered is in fact generally narrow, incorporating mainly western, English-speaking countries. In the current study, Australia and Canada were the most common alternatives considered, with eleven and nine respondents stating them respectively. The next highest choices were the UK and the USA each with four mentions. The only non-western alternatives to be noted, once each, were the Caribbean Islands and Thailand.

The perceived strengths and weaknesses of these alternative destinations differed between respondents and the country concerned. Australia’s climate was seen as too hot by some respondents, but the warmer temperature was identified by another to be a benefit, and while the size of Australia’s economy was seen as beneficial by some, while the concentration of people in large cities was not. Australia was also perceived by one migrant to have an anti-English image. Canada was seen as offering similar benefits to New Zealand, in its low population and good environment, but the cold climate was the most often mentioned weakness. Negatives of the United States and the United Kingdom mainly related to the perception of strongly nationalistic tendencies and being too expensive respectively.

Language though, appeared to be the key consideration, as can be seen in the dominance of English-speaking countries as alternate destinations. This was also confirmed in the responses given to the open question of why participants chose NZ in which nine respondents specifically mentioned New Zealand’s English speaking status. Similar findings can be seen not only in studies of migrants to NZ, but also to other countries such as the UK\(^50\) and likely relates to the position of English as a ground-floor international language. The rate of acquisition of English in non-English speaking countries, as well as its position as the mother tongue of UK migrants, and the relatively lower rate of second language acquisition in the UK are also likely key factors in the selection of English speaking countries as migration

destination prospects. Importantly, however, this result underlines the competitive environment in which NZ is trying to attract skilled migrants.

Interestingly, none of the respondents who stated they had considered an alternative destination indicated that they had thought of moving internally within their country of origin. On comparison with the motivations for leaving their home countries for these respondents, nine stated that they were migrating to gain international experience or to have the challenge of international migration, which would have thus ruled out a possible internal move. However, six respondents considering alternative destinations were migrating for a better quality of life, which has been shown above to be associated with a less crowded place and less stress. Why, therefore, were smaller centres within their home countries not also considered before the decision to undertake an international move? Part of the reason may be found in the high profile of international migration in the media, particularly in television series as discussed above. This issue was also discussed in one of the follow up interviews with a respondent who wanted to less crowded, more relaxed location, but who not necessarily fixed upon NZ as a destination. This participant had in fact already migrated within her country – the UK – from Kent to Norfolk. The reason for that move was similar to the current reasons for moving to NZ, with the building of the Channel Tunnel road link resulting in “...everything being churned up” in Kent and Norfolk in comparison appearing “...really nice [with] open spaces...” (ID Int10, UK). Unfortunately, despite moving to Norfolk, this respondent’s partner faced a long commute due to work commitments in Kent and London, so the couple considered a further move to Derbyshire or Scotland, “...but then property prices got so expensive and jobs weren’t available, so we were stuck in Norfolk”, until deciding to migrate to NZ. The issue of expense as a barrier to moving internally for lifestyle reasons was also identified by Buller and Hoggart in their study of British migrants in rural France\textsuperscript{51}.

\textbf{6.6.2 NZ: Lifestyle and Climate}

As noted in the initial section of this chapter and again in Table 6.2, the attractions of NZ, in particular the ‘Kiwi lifestyle’ and New Zealand’s physical environment were the most

prominent reasons for migrants choosing NZ, and for some of the respondents it was the reason why they chose to undertake migration at all. As shown above, this knowledge of NZ was often gained from previous travel here. From the open question results it appears that several different factors make up the perceived ‘Kiwi lifestyle’, combining not only the supposed slower, more relaxed pace of life but a life more orientated to the outdoors and to family.

“NZ is still a “friendly” country, good for raising children and having an outdoor life.” (ID Q34, Spain)

Outdoor possibilities. Open, friendly people, multi cultural society, easy to integrate, good work-life balance.” (ID Q23, Hungary/Germany)

“After a holiday here my husband and I like the lifestyle and pace of life.” (ID Q8, UK)

The physical environment of NZ, both in the variety of scenery and the mild climate, as well as the low population density, was an extremely strong pull factor. While not mentioned as often, several participants did note that political and social factors such as freedom and safety did influence their decision.

“I liked NZ from holidays as it was “empty” and has a gorgeous landscape. Another country was never an option.” (ID Q11, Germany)

“NZ appeared to be a clean green country, lots of space, nice weather, lots of opportunity to access beaches, mountains etc. Lots of outdoor activities. Very much like the UK but different.” (ID Q47, UK)

“Clean environment. Safe with regard to warfare. Warmer climate. Farming system without subsidies distorting future profitability.” (ID Q38, UK)

“Personal freedom and relative democratic political system. Relatively clean environment and far from all politically unstable regions of the world.” (ID Q39, Germany)
6.6.3 The pull of employment

For this sample, employment both motivated and facilitated migration. Its role as a motivating factor was discussed above in Section 6.4.4, however, the offer of employment in NZ influenced the decision to migrate here, rather than to another destination, for some respondents:

“Mainly because a job was offered here, and it looked OK to live here.” (ID Q50, Austria)

“I applied speculatively for jobs in Australia and NZ and got my Christchurch Hospital job first, so came here.” (ID Q16, UK)

“Employment – the right job at the right institution was offered to me at a time when I was looking for work.” (ID Q28, UK)

Furthermore, the availability of employment and transferability of qualifications was often noted in combination with other reasons in response to the open question of why respondents chose NZ, likely meaning that without employment, many migrants would not be able to choose to live in NZ.

“Job opportunity. Been previously. Beautiful environment.” (ID Q27, UK)

“Because NZ is a green and wealthy country with an interesting history and culture. There were great employment opportunities and everybody whose’s [sic] been there said it’s a quiet, peaceful place with great nature and friendly people.” (ID Q31, Germany)

“Did not fancy doing the usual year in Australia and had always heard good things about NZ. Also my teaching qualification transferred easily.” (ID Q48, UK)

6.6.4 Recommendation and Reputation

The role of family and friends as conduits of information about NZ has been discussed above, as has the motivating pull of family already living in NZ. However, recommendations from friends and colleagues were also reported to have a role in the choice of destination and these factors highlight the influence of personal networks on the micro level of EU migrant
decision making. Furthermore, New Zealand’s international reputation, primarily relating to the issues of lifestyle and environment, was also noted to contribute to the choice of NZ as a destination.

“I wanted to do a specific course that was run in Hawaii or NZ. I met someone who just returned from NZ and it influenced my decision.” (ID Q35, France)

“Good reports from travelling friends.” (ID Q13, UK)

“Positive feedback from friends and colleagues of a good quality of life.” (ID Q33, Ireland)

“I went to Australia for a holiday and loved it. But realised it was a bit too big and hot to actually live and work in. And I’ve always heard good things about NZ and Kiwis.” (ID Q36, Sweden)

Respondents were asked to rate twelve statements for their decision according to the statement’s influence on their choice of NZ as their destination. Once again lifestyle and climate obtained the highest mean values. However, some of these mean figures can be misleading. In the case of ‘to marry/live with a NZ spouse/partner’, the low mean disguises a bimodal distribution with the responses split between those participants with NZ partners and those without.

Table 6.2: Why did you choose NZ?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lifestyle in NZ</td>
<td>4.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climate/physical environment in NZ</td>
<td>3.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NZ is an English speaking country</td>
<td>3.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment opportunities in NZ</td>
<td>3.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better future for family in NZ</td>
<td>3.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety from crime in NZ</td>
<td>3.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Similarity of NZ to home country</td>
<td>2.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political environment in NZ</td>
<td>2.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational opportunities in NZ</td>
<td>2.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To marry/live with a NZ spouse/partner</td>
<td>2.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NZ immigration requirements</td>
<td>2.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To join family in NZ</td>
<td>1.92</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

52 1 = Unimportant, 2 = Less important, 3 = Important, 4 = Very Important, 5 = Extremely Important.
53 14 respondents rated this reason a 5 (extremely important), two rated it 4 (very important) but thirty-six rated it 1 (unimportant).
6.7 Why Canterbury?

As discussed in the Section 2.4, the majority of new migrants to NZ settle in Auckland, at least initially. However, as also noted this phenomenon is slightly less applicable for EU migrants and Christchurch was in fact reported as the second most preferred destination within NZ for British people who attended the Opportunities NZ Expo in London in 2005\(^5\)&. The question must be asked then; why have these EU migrants decided to live in Canterbury, and for many of them in Christchurch, rather than other parts of NZ?\(^5\)

6.7.1 Employment

As with the decisions associated with migrating to NZ, a variety of reasons were provided for choosing Canterbury as the ultimate destination within NZ for migration. However, unlike the above mentioned decisions, employment played the primary role in this choice with 50 percent of the questionnaire respondents stating it, compared to only 23 percent of respondents giving employment as part of their reason for choosing NZ. Some respondents indicated that the choice of Canterbury was determined by their employer or their industry. However, for some migrants it seemed that the decision was not initially to live specifically in Canterbury, but rather stemmed from a desire to live in the South Island, with Christchurch (the South Island’s largest city of approximately 344,000\(^6\)), assessed to have more employment potential than other South Island centres. This highlights the desire or necessity for these EU migrants not only to live in NZ but also to work.

“The job location was Hornby. The company operates nationwide so [it] could have been anywhere, but they decided I was right for the job here.” (ID Q13, UK)

“My husband is a mechanical engineer. It was much easier for him to find a job in Christchurch than in Wellington.” (ID Q44, Hungary)


\(^5\) Only five of the questionnaire respondents had lived in other locations in New Zealand prior to moving to Canterbury; three in the North Island and two in the South Island. Their reasons for choosing to move to Canterbury were similar to the motives given by other respondents; two moving for work, two to live nearer to family and one to live in a city. The overall rate of movement of new EU migrant families between NZ centres unfortunately is not known.

“Wanted to be in the South Island, Christchurch for employment opportunities.” (ID Q20, UK)

However, not all EU migrants seeking work in Christchurch decided to also live in the city. Although not captured in the questionnaire respondents in this study, a Press article highlighted the recent migration of British families to North Canterbury towns such as Oxford, which has a population approximately 1500, for reasons of lifestyle and safety. In the example specified, the main income earner commuted daily to Christchurch for work. This 40 minute commute was seen as a “…small penalty for the lifestyle the family is able to enjoy.”

6.7.2 Proximity to Family
The desire to live near family or friends also played a significant role in the choice of Canterbury as the final migration destination, particularly for those with NZ partners who often chose to live near their family in the Canterbury region. This is perhaps unsurprising as it may have been these familial links that in part motivated the initial desire to migrate to NZ. Additionally, for some migrants, families were able to provide support while the new migrants found jobs and homes, which could ease the transition process.

“My sister lives in the area.” (ID Q8, UK)

“Family living here; wanted to be close to them and friends, esp.(sic) when we decided to start a family of our own.” (ID Q18, Poland)

“My ex-husband’s family lives here. We initially stayed with them…” (ID Q17, Poland)

6.7.3 Physical Environment
The physical environment of the Canterbury region also contributed to this part of the migration decision. For respondents mentioning the natural environment, the proximity of the sea, hills, lakes and mountains was the most important aspect of this, however, the

moderate climate was also seen as beneficial and the two farming couples in the sample stated the nature of the agricultural land available in Canterbury most suited their needs.

“Good size town, close to mountains and sea.” (ID Q29, Germany)

“Good crop farming area – good soil and climate…” (ID Q41, Netherlands)

However, the natural environment of the region was not the only feature commented on. Several respondents noted the low population density of the South Island was a positive feature in their decision, and this was often juxtaposed with the North Island, and in particular Auckland.

“Like the city and the South Island, not so populated as the North…” (ID Q37, UK)

“Not as big as Auckland – better life?” (ID Q27, UK)

6.7.4 City Life
Despite the emphasis on lifestyle and access to natural areas for leisure purposes, the majority of the questionnaire respondents actually lived in Christchurch, which is New Zealand’s second largest city. As noted above, the decision of where to live was often constrained by employment needs, though this could be alleviated by the choice to commute to Christchurch from a smaller rural community close to the city. However, several respondents indicated a specific desire to live in a city environment rather than the countryside. Often in these cases, easy access to the countryside was also an important consideration.

“If [Ashburton] was where I was going to end up I would have got on the plane and gone home. Why would I live there? There’s nothing there, it’s just a ghost town… It’s nice but its just too small.” (ID Int2, UK/France)

“Heard from various people that it was better than Wellington or Auckland and wanted a city.” (ID Q48, UK)

---

58 See Chapter 2 for issues of non-representative nature of sample.
59 Ashburton is a town of approximately 25,000 located an hour south of Christchurch.
“Best of the big cities, great lifestyle: Saturday snow-skiing, Sunday picnic on the beach.” (ID Q15, Germany)

Furthermore, one of the farming couples stated that their search for a suitable farm included the criterion of being close to a city so they could access good restaurants, theatre and even to take time out to people-watch.

“And we love to just sit down and look at the people walking around the city. Because city people are just so different from rural people. Just see them walking and doing, the atmosphere of the city. Not to live but just for a day to be part of.” (ID Int6, Netherlands)

6.8 Conclusion

The above findings highlight the multiplicity of factors contributing to the decision to undertake migration to a new country, as well as the difficulty involved in trying to differentiate and articulate the somewhat overlapping aspects of the decision-making process. Although the results lend support to the widely held belief that it is the stress and population pressure of EU countries that is ‘pushing’ migration from this area to NZ, it may be the large proportion of British migrants in the sample that is contributing to this, and thus wider exploration of EU migrants from other EU states is perhaps needed. Additionally, while the attractions of the perceived ‘Kiwi’ lifestyle and New Zealand’s physical environment with its small population are reported widely by this sample, other, often complementary, motivations can also be identified. For a sizeable number of the sample, undertaking migration was not necessarily an escape from their home country, but was fuelled by a desire for a new experience or challenge, and the importance of ‘love migration’, as termed by King\(^60\), as well as other personal network influences should not be overlooked. The role of employment is less certain as a motivating factor for EU migration to NZ. Clearly for some respondents, a job offer in NZ prompted their move, however, employment appeared to play a far more important role as a facilitator of migration, allowing a respondent to undertake a

quality of life orientated move without the necessity of having a large reserve of funds to finance living expenses over a long period. This role of employment is also reflected in the choice of Christchurch as the ultimate destination within NZ for a substantial proportion of the respondents.

The prominence of television programmes, both reality and fictional, that highlight quality of life migration, together with a high visibility migration industry promoting lifestyle moves has perhaps helped the possibility of international ‘lifestyle’ migration to become part of the UK psyche, in manner a similar to that of UK property ownership in France, as noted by Buller and Hoggart: “French rural property ownership is becoming incorporated into the cultural experience of middle class British nationals. Even for those who do not own a French home, contemporary fiction, television and store catalogues increasingly allude to living in France”\(^6\).

However, this awareness of migration is not solely linked to NZ but also to other destinations with an agreeable climate, natural beauty and relatively cheaper property prices, such as Australia, Canada or internal EU destinations like Spain and France. It is therefore important to recognise the channels that encourage movement to NZ in particular. One such channel is NZ’s international reputation as a clean country with a friendly population and good lifestyle. This outlet, in particular, is often enhanced by the movement of international tourists to NZ who are subsequently able to spread New Zealand’s reputation to friends and colleagues, or undertake migration themselves. The movement of New Zealanders into the global community is another important channel for encouraging movement to NZ, as such New Zealanders have the potential both to disseminate knowledge of NZ and to form partnerships with foreign nationals who may then later choose to return to NZ. Because the awareness of international migration for lifestyle purposes does not seem to be as prominent in some EU member states other than the UK, it is in these countries that increased government advertising or involvement in employment expos either at a national or regional level, may help to boost New Zealand’s profile as a possible migration destination.

Finally, these findings emphasise the necessity for an inclusive multi-levelled framework for understanding EU-NZ migration and furthermore that the micro level motivational factors, as outlined in the suggested EU-NZ framework, interact within their level, as well as interacting with influences from the meso and macro levels.
“In a time of skill shortage and low unemployment it is important not only to attract skilled migrants to New Zealand, but to make sure their settlement experiences are positive.” – Deputy Secretary Workforce Group, Mary Anne Thompson

“If you don’t succeed in the labour market and you don’t succeed economically, then practically everything else is more or less doomed to failure.”

– Professor Paul Spoonley

7.1 Introduction

This thesis is concerned not only with the motivations for EU migrants to come to Canterbury but also the experiences they have had while working and living here, two key factors in migrant settlement. As shown by the above quotes, settlement is extremely important in the competitive global market for skilled migrants. Poor settlement can cause a migrant to choose to return their country of origin, or to move on to a third country, not only resulting in a loss of skills and networks for NZ and often significant financial and emotional cost to the migrant, but also potentially damaging New Zealand’s international reputation as a migration destination. Employment is a particularly important aspect of settlement in a new country, and this is explored in the first part of this chapter. On a financial level, without the ability to earn money, a new migrant may be unable to afford to live in NZ. However of perhaps more concern than this are the psychological factors linked with unemployment and other work related problems such as under-employment, as studies have shown poor employment outcomes can contribute to poor mental health. The second part of

---

3 Settlement in this context is not used to denote a permanent stay in NZ, but rather to represent timely integration into the labour market and social scene, so that even if a migrant chooses to move to a different country in the future it is not due to failure in NZ.
this chapter addresses the more social aspects of settlement; what EU migrants like and dislike about living in Canterbury, whether it has reached their pre-migration expectations, their integration into NZ social networks and their future intentions regarding length of stay in NZ.

Part 1: Work Experiences

“When we came here someone told me if they can’t pronounce your family name you can just forget it [getting a job], and it seems a wee bit like that.”

(ID Int1, Netherlands)

This section outlines the participants’ experiences in the labour market. The topics covered in the questionnaire related to the pre-migration intentions of the participants towards work, the methods used to find employment, the problems involved in finding employment, the types of employment undertaken, levels of job satisfaction and other work/migration related issues. Finally, the activities of non-labour market participants in the sample are outlined. Information regarding the labour market participation of secondary applicants was sought, but unfortunately, some of this data was incomplete.

7.2 Employment prior to migrating to NZ

As can be seen in Figure 7.1, the largest number of primary applicants were employed in professional occupations prior to migrating to NZ. The three PAs who stated they were not in the labour force were all involved in studying prior to migration. The prior occupations of the secondary applicants were also dominated by professionals, with clerks and service and sales workers the next highest categories.

---

5 In particular, the prior occupations and their pre-migration employment intentions were not well answered in the survey.
6 Unfortunately, prior occupations were only recorded for 16 out of the 25 secondary applicants.
7.3 Intention to work in NZ - continuation and change

Although most of the sampled migrants planned to continue working in their chosen profession on arrival in NZ, for some the move to NZ included a change in job. These changes could be precipitated by various factors, and could be either a voluntary action undertaken by the migrant or be a result of the certain conditions or issues in the NZ labour market.

The respondents were asked if, prior to arriving in NZ, they intended to remain working and if so, if they intended to do so in the same occupation. Of the 52 PAs only four did not intend to work on arrival in NZ. The primary reason for three of these migrants not intending to work was that they had initially come to NZ to holiday or to study, not aiming to stay in the country on a longer term basis. Only one PA intended to retire on arrival in NZ. This most likely relates to the specific immigration criteria – the family reunification parent category – under which this respondent entered NZ. Approval under other immigration categories, particularly the skilled migrant/general skills categories under which the majority of the sample entered NZ, is closely linked with entry into the workforce. Of the 25 SAs, ten intended to work, four did not intend to work, and the remaining eleven SAs did not record
their intention in their survey responses. The four respondents who initially did not intend to work were involved in other activities such as studying and caring for their children, however, of these two have entered the work force as their children have reached school age. Of the eleven SAs whose intentions were not known, five recorded their current labour force status as not in the labour force or gave their occupation as mother or housewife.

Of the 48 PAs who intended to work, most intended working in the same occupation as they had prior to migration. However, nine PAs intended to change their occupation and one was willing to take any job. Of the ten SAs who intended to work, half intended to remain in the same occupation, one intended to change occupation and three were willing to work in any job.

As indicated above, the reasons for a change in occupation varied among the respondents. As discussed in Chapter 6, some respondents undertook migration in part because of the desire to have a change in lifestyle and to experience new challenges. For some, this search for a new lifestyle was linked to the desire to change careers,

“I wanted to get out of my job as a secondary school teacher; I was fascinated by NZ on six holidays; I wanted the opportunity to live in a less crowded space.” (ID Q11, Germany)

For others the desire for new challenges was the primary motivation for migration and a change in career was seen as a part of this new challenge. This was the case for one respondent; a part-time cardiac nurse prior to migration, who chose to work full time on their new farm on arrival in NZ.

“…after the youngest one went to school…it was time for something new. And I think also the way we are running the farm at the moment, there are new challenges for me as well.” (ID Int6, Netherlands)

For another respondent it was a career move that resulted in migration rather than vice versa. The call to undertake Christian work meant a change from a previous job in IT for one UK
respondent. However, it was the location of the Christian organisation in NZ that resulted in the migration itself,

“I would have been very happy to stay in the UK but a lot of people had nudged me towards the organisation I work for and [consequently] NZ...”. (ID Int8, UK)

Other factors relating to the NZ labour market also played a role in respondents changing their career direction. English language skills were a barrier to continuing in the same profession for at least one respondent, a former primary school physics teacher,

“But I had to seriously think through what I want to do with my life. Because you know my work, we have a statement [saying] in Hungary, I earn my money with my talking, you know. But here I could chat with people, I could communicate or ask something, but it was not enough to go to a primary school or secondary school...” (ID Int7, Hungary)

For others, the NZ labour market did not have an equivalent job or require the same sorts of skills as the respondent had been employed in prior to migration, and this necessitated either retraining or seeking a different job in order to enter the work force.

“You could say my core skill is foreign languages even though I studied business administration and all that, this is really my core skill, and over here there’s no, you know, from an industry point of view, there’s no need for this.” (ID Int2, UK/France)

In all, 31 PAs and 4 SAs continued to work in the same occupation in which they had been employed prior to migration. Of the other five PAs who had intended to remain in the same occupation but did not, three had taken up different work and two were unemployed. The most common cause of an unintended change in occupation was non-recognition of overseas qualifications and experience, which will be further addressed below in Section 7.4.1. The one unintended occupation change for a SA, from housewife to farmer, was possibly due to increased involvement in the family farm.
7.4 Methods of locating a job

At the time of responding to the questionnaire, 46 PAs and 17 SAs were engaged in the labour market (Figures 7.2 and 7.3). Only five respondents recorded their labour market status as unemployed/seeking work, while nine indicated they were not in the labour force. Of those nine not in the labour force, seven were involved with caring for children, two were retired and one mother was also studying.

A wide range of occupations were included in the sample with most occupations only represented once or twice. However, an exception to this was the eight university lecturers included in the sample. This high number is likely due to the chain sampling or snowball technique that was used to recruit participants as the researcher had several contacts within the university environment. The other occupational grouping with larger numbers was the five engineers of various specialities. This figure is likely due to the location in Christchurch of several engineering firms, and that engineering is an industry which features on the Long Term Skill Shortage List.

Figure 7.2: Current Employment Status of Principal Applicant
A variety of methods were used by the sampled migrants to find employment in NZ, shown in Figure 7.4\(^7\). Fifty percent of the PAs who were working in NZ had secured a job prior to migrating, while only 30 percent of the SAs who responded to this question\(^8\) had a job to come to. Personal contacts formed the top or second highest means of connecting with employers, both before and after arrival. These contacts were described in various ways, ranging from friends and past employers from previous visits to NZ, to colleagues met while networking at conferences and while studying. Only one respondent mentioned the assistance of his national society in finding “...a job in my qualifications.” (ID Q24, Poland). One respondent noted that a lack of personal contacts actually caused difficulty in finding a job.

“[Its] actually nearly impossible to find a job in management without personal connections ...” (ID Q39, Germany)

This trend underlies the importance that social networks play in the migration process. In total approximately 26 percent of the respondents used their personal networks to find a job, which is comparable to the LisNZ pilot survey results which showed 27 percent of their total sample used personal contacts to secure their first job\(^9\). It may also reflect the high

---

\(^7\) This table shows responses for both PAs and SAs, n = 47. Respondents could provide multiple answers, hence the total of 53.

\(^8\) n = 10, from 17 who were reported to be working at the time of the questionnaire.

proportion of small and medium sized businesses in NZ, which have been shown to favour word of mouth as a means of locating staff\textsuperscript{10}.

Figure 7.4: Respondents’ Means of Securing a Job

Replying to advertised positions through the internet, professional magazines and newspapers was a successful means of finding employment for 24 respondents. However, for those who looked for employment after arriving in NZ, newspaper advertisements were the most common means of finding a job, ahead even of personal contacts. While this runs counter to some literature that suggests newspaper advertisements are one of the five worst ways to find employment\textsuperscript{11}, it may be a consequence of the extreme skills shortages which have been a feature in the NZ labour market for several years and which have been associated, particularly recently, with a significant increase in the amount of jobs being advertised in the paper: “[e]mployers are having to increase their efforts to find new staff by advertising and re-advertising positions they would previously filled by word of mouth”\textsuperscript{12}. The jobs located via the newspaper adverts were predominantly, though not exclusively, in service industries.


Cold-calling, or making oneself known to an employer speculatively, was another technique that was employed by five questionnaire respondents. Slightly more people used this technique after arriving in NZ, while one respondent contacted their future employer while on their honeymoon in NZ. For one participant cold-calling in person proved to be a successful technique, after trying other options had been ineffective.

“We tried the newspaper, you know, the internet, the search things, and he sent more than 40 CVs just around and it was no response at all, it was only one interview I think with an agency, not with an employer or somebody, no, just with an agency. And then, I’m not sure who it was or it was just a newspaper article which advised, go straight to the door, knock on it and go to the reception and say I’m here, I’m looking for a job. And it worked on the first day.” (ID Int7, Hungary)

Interestingly, the use of recruitment agencies was only reported for respondents who had secured their job on arrival in NZ, although one couple had initiated contact with the agencies prior to their departure. The use of agencies was not confined to a sole occupation or industry but instead covered engineering, human resources and administrative positions. This low level use of agencies may, however, be atypical. Newspaper reports suggest a high presence of agencies accessing migrants directly in their areas of origin\textsuperscript{13}, particularly through job expos in major English cities such as London and Manchester (Opportunities NZ Expo) and similar ones in Ireland (Working Down Under Expo) and Germany\textsuperscript{14}. For example, Drake, a multinational recruitment company, received in excess of 300 general applications and approximately 100 applications in the medical field from British people interested in moving to NZ at the 2004 Opportunities NZ Expo in London\textsuperscript{15}. While the conversion rate of interest to actual migration is not reported, it is likely that recruitment companies are playing a larger role in pre-migration job-hunting than suggested by this sample. Additionally, the results of the LisNZ survey pilot study suggested that private

\textsuperscript{14} The 2005 recruitment expo in Germany was an inaugural event, organised by the German Federal Employment Service and supported by NZIS, to try to aid both Germany’s high unemployment and NZ skills’ shortages. (‘NZ companies looking to Germany for skilled labour’, (2005, 5 August). \textit{Scoop Independent News}. Retrieved on 30/01/2006 from \url{http://www.scoop.co.nz/stories/BU0508/S00108.htm}.)
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employment agencies were responsible for placing approximately 13 percent of all new residents in jobs, and this figure rose to 15 percent when only skilled business principal applicants were considered\(^\text{16}\), compared with only 9 percent of this study’s sample. Again, unfortunately, these figures are not differentiated by region, so it is not possible to know to what extent European migrants are using agencies compared with other groups.

Only one respondent identified a company transfer as a means of finding work in NZ. This makes it difficult to reconcile some of the skilled migrant theories which recognise intra-company transfers as a key feature promoting migration. Furthermore, while this migrant did transfer his job within the company, his motivations for migrating were based on the desire for a better lifestyle that was able to be facilitated by an intra-company transfer rather than it being a company-led relocation. However, it is possible that more intra-company transfer occurs in other migrant groups, for example a study of Japanese migrants in Auckland in the mid 1990s found that just under 80 percent of the sample had migrated due to business or company duties\(^\text{17}\). Additionally, the LisNZ survey showed that 7 percent of skilled business principal applicants were transferred to NZ by their company, but as with all of their findings, this figure was not broken down by regional grouping, so it is not possible to see if there was a differentiation by region of origin, nor is it possible to know if these transfers were primarily employer or employee led. In view of these findings, the suggested role of transnational corporations in the proposed EU-NZ migration framework, Figure 3.2, may need to be revised.

### 7.5 Problems with working in NZ

As shown above, not all of the sampled EU migrants managed to find work easily or at all in NZ, despite an assumption that migrants from the EU, who are largely invisible within the host NZ population, have almost exclusively good settlement outcomes, including successful
access and integration into the labour market\textsuperscript{18}. When problems are reported regarding migrants and employment in NZ they are most often associated with certain groups of migrants, particularly those from Asia and the Middle East and also with refugees\textsuperscript{19}. Indeed, this assumption does appear to have some basis and several studies have shown that migrants from Europe, and other countries that are deemed ‘similar’ to NZ, do have more successful employment related outcomes compared with migrants from other areas. In addition to the study by Winkelmann discussed in the literature review, studies have shown that a bias based on ethnicity does exist amongst NZ employers, with people with Anglo-Saxon sounding names and accents being preferred above those with more ‘foreign-sounding names’\textsuperscript{20}. Additionally, the LisNZ pilot study showed skilled business (SB) principal applicants from ESANA to have the highest employment rate, 88 percent Wave 1 and 93 percent Wave 2\textsuperscript{21}, and lowest seeking work rate (Table 7.1 below) of the recent migrants surveyed. However, the LisNZ survey did show some variation in employment outcomes between different types of ESANA migrants with poorer outcomes for non-SB principal applicants and SB secondary applicants. Of particular note is the fact that after 18 months the seeking work rates for non-SB migrants from both ESANA and other regions are the same, indicating that the catch up rate of employment for ESANA non-SB principals is less than that for those from other regions. Unfortunately, no analysis of the possible reasons for this finding is given in the LisNZ pilot survey report. It is also impossible to know, from the presented data, whether there is any significant difference in employment rates within the ESANA grouping, let alone between British and other EU migrants.

\begin{table}[h]
\centering
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline
 & ESANA & & Other Regions & \\
 & SB & principals & All others & SB & principals & All others \\
\hline
Wave 1 & 3 & 15 & 13 & 21 \\
Wave 2 & 1 & 8 & 4 & 8 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\caption{Seeking Work Rates (%)}
\end{table}

\textsuperscript{18}Personal Communication with Lianne Dalziel, former Minister of Immigration, 15/08/2005.
\textsuperscript{20}Wilson et al, (2005). ‘A Rose By Any Other Name: The effect of ethnicity and name on access to employment’, \textit{University of Auckland Business Review}.
\textsuperscript{21}Wave 1 relates to migrants at six months after uptake of residence and Wave 2 relates to 18 months after uptake of residence.
Despite the evidence that shows the predominantly advantaged position migrants from Europe hold in the NZ migrant labour force, half of the questionnaire respondents in this study reported problems encountered relating to working in NZ (Figure 7.5). These problems ranged in severity and can be split into two main types; first, difficulty entering the work force and, secondly, problems encountered while at work. Most problems relate to the first group, though this may be because these problems are perhaps more related to migration, while other work related problems may seem to be standard in any new workplace.

**Figure 7.5: Problems Experienced Working in NZ**

![Bar chart showing the distribution of problems encountered while working in NZ.](image)

### 7.5.1 Problems with entering the workforce

**Barrier of work permits**

One of the problems encountered by respondents was the difficulty of securing a suitable permanent position while holding a work permit.

“There’s been jobs advertised and I find that a lot of people were tending to discount me straight off without an interview and I suspect it was because I didn’t have residency at the time and they seem to think that if you’re not a
resident you must just be passing through and you’re not going to stick around. That’s the impression I get.” (ID Int9, Ireland)

“Now straight from there for me [after gaining a work permit] I thought I could go out and apply for the job I wanted, and very soon I realised that the agencies had burned their wings with doing that, finding jobs for people who were on two years working visa with the idea they would be able to get residency...all of them were pretty much the same, very chilly about finding jobs for somebody on a working visa...except for temping.” (ID Int2, UK/France)

“I picked up temporary work without too much problem. But applied for lots and lots of permanent positions and didn’t get so much as an interview. Didn’t get any kind of positive response from anybody and I must have applied for, I don’t know, probably a hundred jobs... soon as I got residency I got two job offers on the same day.” (ID Int8, UK)

As is demonstrated by the experiences of the quoted respondents, uncertainty about the duration of stay and prospects for residency was a substantial concern for employers. Moreover, one respondent noted that upon enquiring why she was not considered suitable for a certain position, she was told that the employer had a previous problem trying to justify the employment of a migrant on a work permit over a New Zealander to the Immigration Department and was reluctant to try again. This situation seemed to be particularly the case for partners who had not secured a job prior to arrival and for those on working holiday permits. This reluctance from employers may prove to undermine the ability of the government to target people already in NZ on working permits to stay on a more permanent basis.

**Difficulties with NZ immigration**

However, for several respondents, the problems started prior to this and were instead related to the actual immigration process of gaining a visa or with the renewal or conversion of an existing permit. As discussed in Section 4.4.2, to be granted a skills shortage work permit, a job offer is necessary but as two respondents who were originally in NZ as students noted “...employers don’t want to give a job offer without a work permit but you can’t get a work permit without a job offer” (ID Q43, Finland). For another respondent an initial short term
move to NZ led to a return trip to live with her NZ partner. However, on her return she was unable to gain a work permit under the relationship policy because of a clause requiring the relationship to have been at least 24 months in duration\textsuperscript{22}. This situation led to:

\begin{quote}
\textit{...sort of a terrible time. I was getting really desperate. And I actually...worked under the table. ...I said, you know, I have to do something now. You know, I can’t just sit here all the time”}. (ID Int5, Germany)
\end{quote}

For others, the lack of recognition of their jobs as skilled or in shortage by NZIS caused disruptions when applying for residence. One respondent had secured work as a bar worker and subsequently worked up to duty manager while on a working holiday permit. However, she had to engage an immigration agency and to rely on the continued support of her employer to overcome the NZIS decision that her occupation was not one in shortage in NZ, despite her employer not being able to hire a New Zealander for the job due largely to its unsociable hours. Another respondent, also initially denied a residence visa because of his offer of work was deemed unskilled (despite the job going unfilled for a number of years and the employer requiring a candidate with a degree and related experience), also sought the aid of an immigration consultant to work on their case. For this respondent and his partner:

\begin{quote}
\textit{...it took somebody...the guy who is the civil servant in charge of the NZIS, it went up to him before he said...we need more people in the country, here are two people who are in their twenties, who are qualified, who for all we know could stay forever and raise a family...and he approved it.”}. (ID Int8, UK)
\end{quote}

\textbf{Transfer of overseas qualifications and experience}

For some respondents, the lack of recognition or understanding in NZ of qualifications and work experience gained overseas, was a barrier to finding appropriate work in NZ (Box 2 below). This problem was also the most noted in the LisNZ pilot study with 41 percent of the unemployed in the sample citing this as one of the main barriers to them finding employment\textsuperscript{23}.

\textsuperscript{22} This requirement has now been reduced to 12 months.

In January 2005, *The Christchurch Press* reported the instance of a GP from Europe working in a petrol station because he had yet to complete a year under supervision, a requirement of the NZ Medical Council. While happy to undertake this requirement, having already passed a NZ clinical registration exam, a shortage of available places under supervision in Christchurch meant he was contemplating returning to Europe to work. The consequent uncertainty of their length of stay in NZ also resulted in his wife, a social worker, working as an agricultural labourer instead of in her chosen profession\(^\text{24}\).

This lack of transfer of medical qualifications and experience also impacted on one of this study’s respondents as “…*my medical degree is not acceptable here.*” (ID Q42, Hungary). One reason given for the difficulty in transferring some qualifications earned overseas is the cultural differences between the country where the qualification was gained and NZ. President of the College of General Practitioners Jim Vause noted that “[c]ultural things are our biggest problem…certain countries are very, very similar to New Zealand such as Canada, the US and England, but most countries on the Continent are a bit different”\(^\text{25}\). This statement seems to be borne out by the questionnaire results, with the two doctors from the UK reporting no problems with working in NZ. However, one British health visitor did undergo a change in occupation because of a “[l]ack of understanding of English qualifications.” (ID Q8, England).

Teaching was another field in which the transfer of qualifications was not necessarily smooth and previous experience was not taken into account:

> “*They’re very pedantic as well about what documents you need...they require certified copies and then they need to get the original copies and then they need to contact all the people who gave the copies which is quite, which is really quite diligent I guess to the point of being anal.*” (ID Int9, Ireland)

> “*My pre-school qualification didn’t get recognised, I was recognised as a primary school teacher but all my experience was in pre-school work*” (ID Q35, France)

---


\(^{25}\) Quoted in *Ibid.*
The apparent requirement by employers for migrants to have NZ experience also proved to be a barrier when entering the work force:

“Employers are over careful with employing immigrants without NZ work experience” (ID Q23, Germany)

And several participants credited their entry into the full time work force to gaining NZ work experience in a part time position or in a temporary role:

“I think once you’ve got some NZ work experience on my CV you know people might think you’re a bit more committed...otherwise people think, oh she’s just arrived in the country, how long is she going to stay, is it worth taking the risk, does she know enough about NZ to actually work for us?” (ID Int10, UK)

“But I did get a job, a part-time job for a term and that worked out really well and that gave me some kind of work experience in New Zealand so I’ve managed to get a full time permanent job off the back of that.” (ID Int9, Ireland)

However, for one couple of self-employed farmers, their European networks and experience were considered to be an asset:

“That was one of our things we took with us. The knowledge and experience that we have back in Europe... And the networks, to take with us, to try to make that a benefit as well.” (ID Int6, Netherlands)
L. came to NZ three years ago with her NZ-born husband, whom she met while working in London. Unable to live together in her home country (one of the new EU member states) due to her husband’s health, they moved to NZ and initially settled in Kaikoura where her husband had connections, until she gained a suitable job. However, despite holding two Masters’ degrees in Economics and Management and International Finance and Accounting and having approximately ten years of work experience in both her home country and the EU as a government investment project manager involved with large scale multimillion dollar projects, L. was unable to gain work related to her experience on arrival in NZ, only finding a city planning position related to her first architecture degree.

Her job hunting included responding to over 60 newspaper ads, using job agencies and cold-calling to potential employers but this yielded only rejection letters with little feedback. This lack of progress promoted a visit to Jude O’Reagan, the Canterbury Migrant Project Co-ordinator. While Ms. O’Reagan was unable to suggest any obvious reasons for the continued lack of success in job hunting, she was able to alert L. to positions that would suit her skills. However, when a position came up that Ms. O’Reagan felt particularly matched L.’s skills, she still not receive an interview until after a follow up call from Jude, and this unfortunately did not result in a job.

Despite feeling she has skills to offer NZ, particularly in the area of exports with her knowledge of the EU and Eastern Europe, L. feels these skills are not valued, in part due to a lack of importance placed on the EU compared with Asia and, in particular, China. L. also feels her experience is not well understood by NZ employers who seem to want industry specific experience. Her difficulty in gaining employment has led L. to seriously contemplate returning to her home country. Not only would NZ lose out on the skills, experience and potential networks that L. would bring, it would also result in a very personal loss for L. with the possible end of her marriage. At this time, L. is still trying to pursue other options which include the possibility of starting her own business.
Under-employment

The problem of under-employment is closely linked with the above mentioned problem of non-recognition of overseas qualifications and experience as can be seen in the example of the European GP. Under-employment was specifically noted by three respondents, and additionally in one of the interviews, though this problem was anticipated for at least one respondent.

“It was difficult to find a job. My current job is on trade level whereas I have a degree and worked on management levels.” (ID Q29, Germany)

“Struggled to find a senior role but we knew this would be the case.” (ID Q5, UK)

Unemployment

As noted in Figures 7.2 and 7.3 (above), five of the 68\textsuperscript{26} respondents who were involved in the labour force were unemployed and seeking work at the time of the survey. Such a situation can have a severe impact on the settlement of not only the migrant concerned but their whole family (see Box 3). Of the unemployed people in the sample, four were female, three with NZ partners and one having migrated with her EU spouse. Only one male PA was unemployed at the time of responding to the questionnaire. Four of the unemployed had university degrees, three of these at a post-graduate level. It transpired that a variety of the factors discussed above combined to contribute to the unemployment of these respondents:

“Even after 200 applications, a master’s degree course and a very good CV, I am still unable to reach the interview stage. Very, very frustrating!” (ID Q15, Germany)

“I can’t work in my occupation. My medical degree is not acceptable here. I also have more than 3 years sales experience but companies say they want someone with permanent residence and NZ experience.” (ID Q42, Hungary)

\textsuperscript{26} Total number of principal applicant plus 25 EU partners minus those not in the labour force: 
52 + 25 − 9 = 68
“I’ve tried so many different jobs and they just... [I didn’t get] even the simplest one, even like a check out operator or what so ever, it’s amazing.” (ID Int1, Netherlands)

In an interview, one respondent described the measures she had undertaken to try and find employment:

“I have just tried so many things, like volunteer work, Work and Income, career services, Peeto, job training and projects. 99 out of 100 employers don’t even reply if you write them a letter.” (ID Int1, Netherlands)

As shown in this quote, various settlement services have been established by both government and private bodies to try and help new migrants find suitable work. The Peeto Multicultural Learning Centre is based in Christchurch and offers a wide range of services from English language tuition to career training and employment advocacy. In addition, the Canterbury Migrant Programme, an initiative set up by the Canterbury Employers’ Chamber of Commerce in 2003, is “...regarded nationally as one of the most efficient in terms of migrant placement and one with high quality outcomes for both migrants and employers.”27

It focuses on matching the skills of migrants with the needs of employers through customised management of each migrant’s case. Unfortunately, even these services are not always successful (see Box 2 above).

---

BOX 3 - UNEMPLOYMENT AND RETURN

A move to NZ in 2003 did not work out as planned for UK migrants R. and C. and their two young children. Although R., an Emergency Department nurse, had secured a job before the move, C. found it very difficult to find work, “[t]errible, just terrible. I couldn’t get it. Well, it was just really hard to find a job with having children. If I didn’t have children, yeah, I could have walked into a job easily…I think that here they don’t take into consideration working mums as much as they do in Britain.” Due to her children, C. wished to work part-time but found even positions advertised as part-time actually equated to 30 hours plus providing extra cover. Despite looking at different jobs “I was willing to do anything from supermarkets to what I’m used to [working in hospital administration]”, and having some interviews, C. could not find a suitable position that fitted with her children and husband’s shift work and this resulted in depression and homesickness. After failing to get a filing job C. described her feelings “[a]nd then after that, when I didn’t get that, it just knocked me back again and I just thought… It just depressed me immensely. I thought, well if I can’t get a job so menial… I don’t know, it just really hacked me off.” Soon after this, the couple decided to sell their home and return to the UK, primarily because of C.’s continued unemployment. Although their return was intended to be permanent, it actually served to remind them why they had left the UK originally and within six months they decided to return to NZ, though this time with more knowledge of the pitfalls, “We knew that C. had to get a job. That was the number one top priority”. Fortunately, when they returned, with their youngest child in school, C. was able to find work and though they are unsure of their long-term future, for now “…things are going alright, actually” although they “…don’t like thinking about how much it has cost us”.

7.5.2 Problems in the work force

A small group of respondents also noted some problems related to the actual experience of working in NZ. As noted previously, these problems were much less reported than those associated with finding work. Several respondents noted different attitudes held by NZ co-workers and employers that made it difficult for them to contribute in the work place. One respondent felt that this was in part due to the organisation she worked for but also due to an attitude that she as a migrant was not able to offer anything to her employers as they would not listen to what she had to say.
“...so basically all my skills and attributes are worth nothing. Um, shut up, put up and get on with it. Um, you’re lucky to be here... Um, no contribution needed from me except just to do my job.” (ID Int3, UK)

Another respondent found a similar attitude while volunteering at her children’s primary school:

“But I helped at school with uniform sales and that was tucked away in a little cupboard and every time I tried to change that or get some more shelving I just wasn’t listened to. I mean in the end I just gave up.” (ID Int1, Netherlands)

One respondent found the belief in ‘Kiwi ingenuity’ to be overwhelming, where, again his potential to contribute was not recognised:

“...its just like, you know, you do something at work, and if they did something and it was good or whatever, it’d be like Kiwi ingenuity! ... and I did find that because I’m obviously foreign and coming in that at first they were all looking at what I was doing and how I was doing things and if I was doing something that was obviously different but worked or good, you’d never get a comment...” (ID Int3, UK).

Another respondent also noted this problem but felt that if he persisted then he could put forward his views:

“I’ve felt perhaps our knowledge is not acknowledged at work and I find that a little bit frustrating but once you say something about it, you know, say oh what’s going on, you know and its fine”. (ID Int11, UK)

A more structural difficulty encountered for some working migrants was the differences in the holiday allowances between their home country and New Zealand, which they were unaware of before their arrival.

For one couple, the three weeks of annual leave a year in NZ, compared to their four to five weeks, plus statutory holidays in Britain and France “...was a big shock, a big shock”. The impact of the reduced holidays was calculated in terms of travel home:
“...because we come from so far away, if we want to go home...you want at least to go for three weeks, and then there you go, your annual leave is gone.”

(ID Int2, UK/France)

7.6 Job satisfaction

Respondents who were working at the time of the questionnaire were asked to rate their current job satisfaction as compared to that of their previous job. For the majority of respondents, their new jobs in NZ were of similar or greater satisfaction than their previous job in their last place of residence. Nine migrants did, however, rate their current job as less satisfying. During interviews some people expressed why their new jobs were more satisfying for them.

“Because I just found their ages, it was around 3, just more, they’re always so open, so curious, they always love you. And its just completely different from a teenager, so I’m quite happy and if I would go back to Hungary I think I would go to kindergarten not back to a primary school”. (ID Int7, Hungary)
Working and Living in NZ

“It was one huge mess [the new farm] and we just started clearing...and it starts to work out really nice...it’s just, it’s awesome and we really enjoy it.” (ID Int6, Netherlands).

“Then I did some design as a part of that programme, just real basic but that was a complete surprise for me, I was like, you know, after about four months of struggling on the software and getting really frustrated I was going you know this is what I want to do for the rest of my life. I found it!” (ID Int4, Poland).

---

Part 2: Social Experiences and Settlement Intentions

7.7 Satisfaction with life in NZ

Respondents were asked to rate their overall satisfaction with life in NZ. As can be seen in Figure 7.7 (below), over 90 percent of respondents felt their life in NZ was satisfactory or very satisfactory and only two respondents indicated they were dissatisfied with life in NZ.

Figure 7.7: Satisfaction with Life in NZ

Respondents were asked to compare the best and worst aspects of living in NZ with living in their home country. These open-ended responses were coded and are presented in Tables 7.2
and 7.3 (below). The most popularly noted ‘best’ aspect of life in NZ was the physical environment. Within this category the most mentioned facet of the physical environment was space:

“So far it’s a country with lots of space for everyone to enjoy.” (ID Q19, France)

“The empty space around me.” (ID Q11, Germany)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 7.2: Best Aspects of Life in NZ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lifestyle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friendly people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduced stress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less traffic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low population density</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Big house/garden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job satisfaction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More time with family</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Two further features noted among the best aspects of living in NZ are also associated with a sense of space: fewer people and a large house with a garden. These aspects of NZ life seem to align well with the motivations for leaving the home country and for choosing NZ presented in Chapter 6, and this likely contributes to the sense of satisfaction shown in Figure 7.7. The high visibility of space among the ‘best aspects’ also gives strength to the seemingly ex-urban or even anti-urban desires of the some of the questionnaire participants, consolidating the role of the ‘search for a rural idyll’ noted in the proposed EU-NZ migration framework. The other noted ‘best aspects’ of life in NZ, lifestyle and friendly people, also closely relate to the factors considered in the decision to leave the home country and for choosing NZ, and again it could be interpreted that the congruity between these features indicates that at least some expectations of the respondents are being met.

“Yes, it’s [the lifestyle] probably better [than expected] actually. Yeah, because we do stuff with the children now that we’d never do [before migrating]...Like we go camping sometimes...I do a lot of cycling here and C. has just done some
marathon walks, you know. And we go cycling in the forest with the kids fairly regularly.” (ID Int11, UK)

“Have been made extremely welcome and NZ is living up to all our expectations. A truly great place to live.” (ID Q4, UK)

However, not all aspects of NZ life were so favourable. The most overwhelmingly acknowledged worst feature of NZ was the distance from friends and family in the respondent’s home country. Although this potential difficulty was recognised by respondents prior to arrival, the extent of homesickness was sometimes underestimated.

“NZ is too geographically far from family and European friends.” (ID Q51, UK)

“Did not realise how it would be difficult to leave family and friends behind (homesickness).” (ID Q3, UK/France)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 7.3: Worst Aspects of Life in NZ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distance from family/friends</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inferior food/drink</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Kiwi attitudes’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low quality housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of city culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low wages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor driving</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor health system</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other difficulties noted were the poor standard of housing, mostly relating to cold, damp houses with minimal insulation and heating, low standards of food and drink (in particular beer) and ‘Kiwi’ attitudes. This last category actually encompassed several ideas, including the binge drinking culture of NZ, the ‘she’ll be right’ attitude (which was interpreted by one respondents as ‘can’t be bothered’), and the emphasis of New Zealanders on ‘Kiwi’ ingenuity. The relatively small size of Christchurch as a city was seen a drawback for several predominantly continental respondents, mainly due to a lack of cultural events.

“One of the big things for me would be housing and how cold it is. It makes the winter, although it’s not long, it makes it seem long and its quite depressing
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actually...We did come out in March and stay with my Uncle and he had a log burner and it never twigged with me that that was all the heating they had.” (ID Int11, UK)

“Used to a large vibrant city life, a little on the quiet side in Christchurch.” (ID Q18, Poland)

Finally, associated with the problem of lower wages was the unexpectedly higher cost of living in Canterbury for survey respondents. This issue also arose in the interviews where several interviewees noted that while some items were more expensive, others were less so. However, other migrants were less equivocal, noting that life in NZ was more expensive than they had anticipated and one respondent commenting that another couple from their home country would soon be returning home in part due to this.

“Although we like the environment we live in, NZ has turned out to be more expensive than the UK and there have been times when we’ve thought ‘What have we done?’ Perhaps it’s still early days...” (ID Q47, UK)

“I’d say it’s slightly more expensive here in the fact that ...we were probably spending more than we earned. And that was a factor in me wanting to go back. Our disposable income is probably not as big...as it would have been back in Britain.” (ID Int11, UK)
7.8 Social contacts

For some respondents, the problem of distance from friends and family was exacerbated by the difficulty in replacing their home country social networks with NZ ones. Respondents were asked to indicate who they mainly socialised with in NZ. Only a small proportion of the respondents socialised primarily with migrants from their own home country (Figure 7.8). Instead, most participants socialised with a range of different people, incorporating New Zealanders, home country migrants and other migrants. For some migrants this may be because there are only a small community of compatriots in the locality, however, others choose not to seek them out.

“I actually only know one Polish person. I never tried, like I was aware of the Polish society but I …its all like old and they’re often quite religious and stuff and … I get invitations for Easter mass and Christmas mass yeah and something like celebrations of the 60th anniversary of the end of the second world war and it’s just, oh God no, I’d had enough of that in Poland.” (ID Int4, Poland).

For some migrants, however, making NZ friends had not been easy. A small group of respondents noted that breaking into NZ social groups, particularly those of Christchurch natives, was difficult as people already had their own established circle of friends:
“Developing social networks to replace those in the UK. NZ, or at least in Christchurch, mentality is non-inclusive.” (ID Q28, UK)

“Problems with making friends with Kiwis – they are reluctant to let people into their groups.” (ID Q46, Ireland)

“I’m quite good friends with one NZ woman, she doesn’t come from Christchurch either and the rest of our friends are all foreigners like we are. They come from South Africa, they come from Korea, they come from England, they come from everywhere but not from NZ. It’s almost impossible to get into this society.” (ID Int1, Netherlands)

Another migrant who had initially found it difficult to establish friendships with New Zealanders noted that this improved after the birth of her child, but she also noted that:

“...none of my new friends derives from Christchurch originally.” (ID Q5, UK)

Interestingly, several respondents with NZ partners indicated that they were able to access their partner’s NZ social networks and one migrant attributed this as a key factor to helping make her experience of settling into NZ a positive one.

“I think my overall experience of settling in NZ has been positive, which I myself attribute to three factors: I was fluent in English before arriving; I was familiar with and comfortable in Anglo-Saxon culture; I had a ready made family and network of Kiwi friends through my husband.” (ID Q6, Poland)

However, some benefits of having friends among other migrants were also noted. These centred around being able to talk to someone who had undergone a similar experience and by providing friends who respondents felt comfortable venting to without the fear of causing offence. Socialising with home country migrants also provided a means for non-English speaking respondents to maintain language and cultural links with their home country, particularly for their children.

“You know the English people that I know, it’s quite good that when we do get together we can sound off each other, whereas I might not necessarily be able to do it with a friend that I’ve made here. I don’t want them to think I’m insulting
New Zealand. I couldn’t say ‘Why did I come here? Why didn’t we just stay in the UK?’ because they could just say, ‘Well, if you don’t like it, go home’. And I understand that but It’s nice to talk to someone else who’s going through the same thing as me.” (ID Int10, UK)

7.9 Discrimination

The problem of discrimination towards migrants in NZ has been widely reported. A 2004 National Business Review poll revealed the anti-migrant views of some New Zealanders, with 45, 39 and 33 percent of those questioned stating NZ had too many migrants from Asia, the Pacific Islands and the Middle East respectively. While those from Britain were more welcomed, eleven percent still felt there were too many UK migrants in NZ. The LisNZ pilot study also revealed a level of discrimination against migrants, including those from ESANA for whom discrimination mostly occurred while applying for jobs or while at work. When asked if they had experienced discrimination on the basis of their nationality, just over half of the respondents involved in this study indicated that this had not occurred. However, a significant proportion, 40 percent, stated they had experienced discrimination once or twice, with three respondents noting they experienced frequent discrimination. For these latter respondents, difficulties at work were the major problem, and these have been discussed above in Section 7.4. Some of the discrimination noted by migrants was presented in the form of jokes but as one interviewee noted this could mask a more serious intent.

---

Additionally, an interviewee’s child, present at the interview, noted that she had been called a Pom\(^{30}\), showing that some older negative conceptions are still functioning in NZ.

“*We’re called Pommies, Poms which is horrible!*” (ID Int11, UK)

“*Banter wise, people have said things to me at work and in life, and you know some people are having a joke but some people are sort of serious.*” (ID Int2, UK/France)

One German respondent also noted while she did not face direct discrimination, when she was introduced to people in NZ, her nationality often engendered comment regarding WWII and the role which Germany played in it, something which had not occurred when she lived in England, and which made her feel uncomfortable. This could be attributable to the relatively low knowledge of some European countries in NZ.

“To talk about the Second World War and Germany being ... the aggressor force, which is of course a fact but for me it’s very strange to sort of be confronted with that. And sort of, in just about, yeah, all of the conversations I had it sort of popped up somewhere and I just really felt tired and upset about it, you know, because I felt like in my situation so many years later I still have to pay for it and I still have to react to that and justify myself for it.” (ID 40, Germany, interview).

### 7.10 Contacts with Home Country

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequently</th>
<th>Occasionally</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>No response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Email friends/family in home country</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone friends/family in home country</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Read home country newspaper</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have visits from family from home country</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have visits from friends from home country</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business involvement in home country</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{30}\) Pom was a derogatory term used to describe British migrants to NZ in the post-war period. While its origins are debated, it is generally accepted to mean Prisoner of Mother England ([http://www.en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Alternative_words_for_British](http://www.en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Alternative_words_for_British))
Contacts with a migrant’s home country are important both in terms of alleviating the loneliness and homesickness that is often associated with migration, and in promoting people-to-people links and increased awareness of NZ in the home societies. Respondents were asked what contacts they retained with their home country. As Table 7.4 shows, emailing and telephoning friends and family were the most used methods of maintaining links with home, and the vast majority of respondents used these methods frequently. This finding is likely related to the fast and relatively in-expensive nature of these means of communication, particularly with the advent of internet calling which has increased competition in the telecommunications market.

“Oh, email’s brilliant. I actually keep in touch with some friends that I didn’t keep in touch with then [before migrating].” (ID Int10, UK)

“Oh, I just buy a phone card for $10, it lasts for three hours and rather than phone once a month for two hours, I phone my mum once week, maybe twice a week.” (ID Int2, UK/France)

The use of letters to maintain contacts with home country family and friends was not specifically explored and was not spontaneously mentioned by any respondents. However, in two interviews (ID Int7, Hungary and ID Int11, UK) parcels and videos were noted to be also used, especially to maintain contact between grandparents and grandchildren. Respondents also reported a high incidence (81 percent) of following home country newspapers, although a third of respondents only undertook this activity occasionally.

Visits from friends and relatives from the home country occurred less frequently, although for both categories only 23 percent of respondents reported having no visits from home. The short time that some of respondents had been in NZ\textsuperscript{31} is likely to have influenced this figure, with several participants indicating that they expected visits from family in the near future. The cost of airfares from Europe was also noted as a limiting factor for some respondents. Whether the visitors would have visited NZ had the respondent not undertaken migration to NZ is not known, but is seems likely that the initial migration of these EU respondents is influencing further tourism. Business involvement in home countries was only reported by

\textsuperscript{31} Approximately 30 percent of the sample had lived in NZ for only 6 months-1 year at the time of responding.
around twenty percent of the sample. Unfortunately respondents were not asked to specify
the nature of this involvement but it may be dependent on the nature of careers of the
respondents.

Respondents were also asked about their frequency of return to their home countries\(^\text{32}\). Of
those migrants who had returned home, most had returned approximately once a year. While
a large proportion indicated that they had not returned home, several noted that they would
be going in the near future and so this finding is again a likely result of the recent nature of
the migration of some respondents. The most important reason for returning home was to
visit family and friends, and only six respondents noted their return trip was for work
purposes. Again the nature of the work connections in the home country were not explored
here and this is one avenue of research which could be furthered to understand the continuing
business links of migrants between the EU and NZ.

Figure 7.10: Frequency of return visits to home country

![Bar chart showing frequency of return visits to home country]

7.11 Settlement intentions

As has been discussed in preceding chapters, not all migration is intended to be on a
permanent basis and one of the particular trends in international migration currently is an
increase in temporary migration. This is highlighted in New Zealand’s case by the rapid

\(^{32}\) This question asked frequency rather than the number of times a respondent had returned in order to try and
compare between respondents who had been in NZ for differing lengths of time.
increase in migrants on temporary work permits from 1999 (see Section 5.3.2). However, it is not always possible to determine a migrant’s intended length of stay by their permit. Some may come to NZ on a work permit and subsequently decide to stay based on their experiences of life here:

“I came on a working holiday… I didn’t come here to live at first but I met my man!” (ID 44, France).

Alternatively, a migrant may deliberately enter on a temporary permit with the intention of seeking a longer term permit once at their destination. One interviewed couple used this technique, initially entering NZ on a visitor’s visa with the intention of seeking residency after they arrived.

“…the residency department [told] us the best thing to do is get yourself out there and get yourself a job. If you do, send the job application back and we’ll fast track your case”. (ID Int2, UK/France)

Conversely, resident permit holders may have applied for that permit due to considerations other than their intended length of stay, for example in order to find employment more easily in NZ (see Section 7.4.1) or because they were required to apply for residence by NZIS. After obtaining a work permit via the partnership category, one respondent was informed by NZIS that:

“…they expected me to apply for residency … I’d been very homesick and I was very reluctant to apply for residency and also there’s a financial sort of aspect to it… And I, yeah well at the end I had to do something and I applied for residency”. (ID Int5, Germany)

Rather than asking respondents how long they intended to stay in NZ, they were asked if they intended to stay in NZ on a permanent basis (Figure 7.11). At the time of response, 73 percent of participants stated that they probably or definitely intended to live in NZ permanently. When broken down between work permit holders and residence permit holders, this percentage differed somewhat with 81 percent of residence holders but only 50 percent of work permit holders indicating the were likely to stay permanently. The figure for
residence permit holders is similar to respondents in the LisNZ pilot study where 81 percent stated they would live in NZ permanently at the time of residence approval, a level which rose to 86 percent at the time of the first wave interview at six months of residence\textsuperscript{33}.

**Figure 7.11: Do you intend to stay in NZ permanently?**

Where respondents indicated they were unsure or did not intend to live in NZ permanently, they were asked to further explain their answer. The three respondents who did not intend to stay in NZ permanently had differing reasons for this: one felt a return Europe would bring “...better financial living conditions...” (ID Q32, Germany), and also wished to be closer to family; another desired to undertake further migration to Australia in order to have better career options, and to educate her children in a bilingual school; the third wished to return to Europe upon retirement. The seven respondents who were unsure if they wished to remain in NZ also noted varying reasons for this. For two, conditions in NZ did not meet their pre-migrations expectations and this caused doubt about their future:

> “Too early to say but cost of living more than expected, property more expensive, house is cold (!), miss family and friends, seems so far away from ‘familiarity’!” (ID Q47, UK)

> “We intended to live here permanently but are quite disappointed about NZ-attitude. It is impossible for someone average to find a proper part-time job,\textsuperscript{33}

not to mention the way Kiwis treat immigrants. We will try a few more years probably.” (ID Q1, Netherlands)

Others indicated that the desire to experience new countries, homesickness, better career opportunities elsewhere or even changes in New Zealand’s political environment may prompt them to leave NZ in the future. However, one respondent summed up the difficulty involved in predicting their length of time in NZ:

“To be honest it’s pretty tricky to look two years down the line ... You know I might be here for the next twenty years, might be back to Britain for twenty years. Equally it might be Bolivia...” (ID Int8, UK)

Furthermore, two respondents who indicated they would probably live in NZ permanently did note that they may return to their home country or undertake further migration for several years before returning to NZ again.

7.11.1 Uptake of residency

Despite a significant proportion of respondents on work permits being unsure of their long term intentions regarding their future in NZ, thirteen of the fourteen stated they would take up residency if it was possible. For some this was to reduce the inflexibility associated with remaining on a work permit, while for others it was a reflection of their desire to become more a part of NZ:

“It means more freedom. I can change my working place, I can move to another city if I want to.” (ID Q49, Hungary)

“NZ is my home now. I want to be a Kiwi, not a Pom!” (ID Q12, UK)

“Residency is necessary to fully establish life in NZ. On a work permit one is halfway between two countries – out of home but not yet fully accepted in NZ.” (ID Q50, Austria)

7.11.2 Uptake of citizenship

One respondent to the survey had already gained NZ citizenship. Those respondents holding residency permits were asked if they would take up NZ citizenship if they remained in NZ
for the required period of time\(^{34}\). 31 of the 37 residents respondents positively. The most prominent reason for this was to enable the respondent “to feel fully part of NZ” (ID Q2, UK), and to enjoy the rights, responsibilities and security that citizenship was perceived to bring:

“\textit{I want to participate in NZ life and be a citizen with 100\% rights to protect this country and make sure it stays as it is.}” (ID Q19, France)

“\textit{Because I have made a commitment to NZ and the ultimate way to demonstrate it is by accepting citizenship with all the responsibilities it brings.}” (ID Q6, Poland)

“\textit{Because it is more stable for family.}” (ID Q23, Hungary/Germany)

However, respondents also revealed more practical reasons to obtaining citizenship, particularly regarding the ease of travel and the possibility of future work in Australia.

“\textit{NZ citizenship is good to have internationally. Can work in Australia.}” (ID Q27, UK)

“\textit{For ease of travelling.}” (ID Q4, UK)

One major concern in taking up NZ citizenship was the ability to hold it concurrently with home country citizenship. Four out of the five respondents who stated they would not choose to take up NZ citizenship indicated that it was because it would require them to relinquish their home country passport.

“\textit{Keeping our Dutch citizenship makes it easier to trade and travel within Europe.}” (ID Q41, Netherlands)

“\textit{Germany does not allow dual citizenship.}” (ID Q29, Germany)

Conversely, several respondents who indicated they would take up NZ citizenship noted that they would be able to retain both passports.

“\textit{We would hopefully become joint citizens of both UK and NZ.}” (ID Q38, UK)

\(^{34}\) Prior to April 2005, people wishing to gain NZ citizenship had to have lived legally in NZ for 3 years, with no more than a specified time outside the country. Since April 2005, this time limit increased to 5 years.
7.12 Conclusion

Overall, the settlement outcomes for the EU migrants surveyed appeared to be largely positive. In terms of integration into the labour market, only seven percent of respondents were seeking work and the majority of those employed had a high level of work-place satisfaction. Additionally pre-migration expectations of life in NZ appeared to match well with life in Canterbury with a high level of satisfaction with life reported, and the majority of respondents indicating a long term stay in NZ, with a desire to take up citizenship and be a part of the country.

However, some issues are raised by these results. The good work-place outcomes do tend to disguise the problems encountered by some migrants along the path to employment. While none of these issues discussed above relating to employment are restricted to migrants from the EU, these results do demonstrate that migrants from the EU also encounter difficulties with regards to the labour market similar to those reported for other migrant groups, although these may occur less frequently. At particular risk it appears are those on work permits and secondary applicants who have not secured work prior to leaving their home countries. This risk is further exacerbated for those who have skills that are not readily translated to the NZ market, for example language skills. Anecdotally, it also seems that more amorphous professions, such as business consultancy or management, are less readily transferred into the NZ market than are other more distinct professions such as engineers or nurses. These difficulties in the labour market have been shown to have a significant impact on the settlement of some of the respondents and the continued under or un-employment, despite occurring for only a small proportion of the sample, does represent a loss of skills and knowledge for NZ. Socially, some respondents also noted facing difficulty in making friends with New Zealanders, in particular those from Canterbury. This contributed to a feeling of exclusion for some respondents, a problem possibly made worse by the feeling of distance from friends and family in the home country.
Chapter 8

EU Students in NZ: Learning Half a World Away

“There is no doubt that Europe [and] New Zealand…can all profit from dialogue, exchange of experiences and best practices, and above all, institutional cooperation. Education cooperation is a powerful tool to improve mutual understanding, reduce distance and build long lasting personal and institutional relationships” ¹

8.1 Introduction

The global international education sector is a strong but competitive market, with English speaking countries offering students of other nationalities the chance to learn an increasingly key global language, as well as gaining high quality qualifications. The USA, UK and Australia all have large intakes of international students; over 500,000 for the USA and approximately 200,000 in the UK and Australia. ² International education is also very important to NZ. In 2003/04, the foreign exchange earnings from international education reached over NZ$2 billion for the second year consecutively ³, making it New Zealand’s third biggest export earner, ahead of both wool and wine. ⁴ However, the impact of international education is not only financial. It also plays a key role in raising the global profile of NZ by exposing the country directly to young, internationally mobile individuals. This important function of “…foster[ing] the development of international linkages and mutual goodwill and understanding…” ⁵ is in fact provided by NZIS as one of the primary objectives of its student policy. Further, as there is a correlation between visiting NZ and the subsequent uptake of future work or residence permits, international student migrants can be seen as a potential pool of future migrants who already have knowledge and experience of NZ – an important

⁵ NZIS, (---)c, Op. Cit.
factor in successful settlement. Therefore, this chapter examines the institutional initiatives in place which facilitate EU student migration to NZ before reporting the results of the EU student survey.

8.2 EU-NZ Student Mobility Initiatives

8.2.1 Recognition of the EU as a Potential Student ‘Market’

As noted in Chapter 5, the number of international students in NZ who derive from the EU is numerically small compared with the overall international student intake, most of whom are drawn from Asia. However, shocks to this Asian significant market in 2003 ranging from the outbreak of SARS, to the collapse of major language schools such as Carich and Modern Age, and negative media reports of the treatment of Asian students\(^6\), highlighted the need for diversification within New Zealand’s international student market. Europe is recognised as one potential area for growth. In early 2004, the Labour Government announced a NZ$40 million increase in funding for the export education sector. One of its initiatives was the introduction of education counsellors to be placed into four key education markets in order to promote NZ and to “...develop bilateral international education partnerships with the key country or region in which they are based”\(^7\). The third of these counsellors is to be situated in Brussels with the position to be filled by the end of 2005\(^8\). Additionally, education agents from EU member states such as the Czech Republic, Hungary, Spain, Italy and Germany have all visited NZ since late 2004\(^9\). These education agents have been proven to play an important role in marketing NZ as a schooling destination, as they can access students directly and by travelling to NZ they are able to inform students of what NZ has to offer through first hand experience. This is important because, as Stuart Boag of Education NZ notes, “New Zealand is not always top of the mind for students in Central Europe!”\(^10\).

---

\(^6\) ‘$40m to boost language schools.’ \textit{Op. Cit.}


\(^8\) The first education counsellor was placed in Beijing in October 2004 and the second in Washington in July 2005. The fourth counsellor is to be placed in Kuala Lumpur.


\(^10\) Education NZ (2004, October 8). \textit{Op Cit.}
Individual institutions also recognise the potential of the European market, such as the English Language Providers interviewed by Lee and Gan\textsuperscript{11}, as noted in Section 3.2.3. At the secondary school level, Linwood College in Christchurch runs an outdoor education programme aimed at international students on their gap year. It credits its move into the European market, starting with Germany, with the minimal effect felt by the College during the Asian student downturn, and plans to extend its overseas marketing into Scandinavia and Italy\textsuperscript{12}. At a tertiary education level, in late 2005 representatives from NZ universities undertook travel to France to promote study in NZ, directly targeting universities and a French youth information network, as well as travelling to Germany where they participated in education road-shows. Both visits were felt to be successful with high levels of interest from students registered\textsuperscript{13}.

8.2.2 Exchange Programmes

In addition to independent international students, there are several existing schemes that promote educational exchanges between students from the EU and NZ. These primarily operate within the tertiary education sector. The most significant of these are the well established agreements between the French and German governments and NZ. These agreements began in 1977 under the auspices of the France-NZ Cultural Agreement and a similar NZ-German agreement, and allow German and French post-graduate students to study in NZ and pay only domestic fees\textsuperscript{14}, rather than foreign student fees. This is an extremely important factor as international fees for post-graduate study can be over NZ$20,000 per annum. As can be seen in the survey results below, this scheme is key in attracting French and German students to our tertiary institutions, instead of those in other countries. Recognition of the importance of these domestic fees schemes can be seen in the government’s introduction of domestic fees for all international PhD students, as discussed in Section 4.4.3. In 2005, 103 German students and 28 French students took advantage of the

domestic fees scheme to undertake post-graduate study at the University of Canterbury\textsuperscript{15}, and the scheme also provided a significant percentage of Lincoln University’s EU student intake.

Private exchanges form another important part of NZ-EU student relations. Such schemes cover the reciprocal exchange programmes between individual institutions and in 2004/05 they accounted for about 15 percent of student visa approvals. Under these exchanges, students may spend one or two semesters studying in NZ, although they remained enrolled in their home university and pay the fees of that institution. Both of the universities in the Canterbury region have exchange schemes with EU partners. The University of Canterbury currently has exchange schemes with 20 EU universities, in seven member states, although none are in the newer member countries\textsuperscript{16}. In 2005, 29 students participated in exchanges with Canterbury University, from Denmark, France, Germany, Sweden and the UK\textsuperscript{17}. Lincoln University, the smaller of Canterbury’s two universities, has exchange partnerships with 5 universities in three EU member states, but again none from the most recent enlargement\textsuperscript{18}. This lack of connection with the new, Central and Eastern European enlargement countries may simply reflect a lack of time for the coordination and initiation of such programmes. However, it may also be limited by the need for reciprocity which requires that a NZ student go to the partner institute in exchange. This is in turn limited by the language ability of the NZ student as they would have to undertake study in the language of the partner institute’s country if the course is not offered in English. However, it is also possible that students from Central and Eastern Europe are currently more numerous in English language schools, than in the tertiary sector of NZ.

In addition to these general exchange schemes, the EU Commission and the NZ Minister of Education agreed in 2003 to advance bilateral educational links by “…promoting student mobility and exchanges”\textsuperscript{19}, following the goals established in the 1999 Joint Declaration\textsuperscript{20}.

\textsuperscript{15} Personal communication with Jean Williamson, University of Canterbury International Office, 11/07/2005.
\textsuperscript{16} Cyprus, Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Malta, Poland, Slovakia, Slovenia
\textsuperscript{17} Personal communication with Jean Williamson, \textit{Op. Cit.}
\textsuperscript{18} Personal communication with Rhiannon McKenzie-Smit, Lincoln University International Office, 15/08/2005.
To meet this aim the jointly EU-NZ funded, three year, post-graduate (Masters level) European Union-New Zealand Exchange Pilot Programme was created, based on similar EU-Australia and EU-US schemes. Launched in 2005 this programme enables at least 24 EU students to spend from one semester to one year in NZ, with a similar number of NZ students travelling to the EU. The pilot, chosen following a tender process, joins three NZ institutions, the Universities of Canterbury and Waikato and the Wanganui School of Design with four EU universities, two in the UK, and one each in Slovenia and Austria. This project is intended to be “...a model for future substantive and long-lasting structural EU/New Zealand cooperation in higher education”\textsuperscript{21}. However, the programme is still in its extremely formative stages, so its impact cannot yet be assessed.

This pilot programme runs in parallel with another EU based exchange scheme, \textit{Erasmus Mundus}, which was launched in the 2004/05 northern hemisphere academic year and is projected to run for five years. This scheme again aims to encourage student mobility of approximately 11,000 students at Masters level\textsuperscript{22}, but unfortunately has less scope for EU students to come to NZ, than for NZ students to travel to the EU. \textit{Erasmus Mundus} is organised around consortia of universities from different EU member states which offer specially approved Masters’ programmes. These consortia can include partner institutes from third countries. However, while students travelling to the EU are required to study there for the entire length of their course, EU students are only funded for a three month period at a third country partner institution. Currently there are no NZ institutions involved with EU consortia meaning that no student could currently come to NZ under this scheme. However, two applications are in process\textsuperscript{23}, so this may change as the scheme becomes more established.


\textsuperscript{22} Hunter, L. (2005, 12 August). \textit{The European Community Programme Erasmus Mundus}. Public seminar given at the National Centre for Research on Europe.

\textsuperscript{23} Ibid.
8.3 Student Survey Findings

The preceding discussion has outlined the initiatives in place to encourage and facilitate international student migration to NZ, particularly from the EU. However, it is unable to fully address the question of why individual EU students have chosen to undertake migration to NZ, nor what their experience of studying has been. Thus, the remainder of this chapter discusses the results of the survey of EU student migrants attending Canterbury’s two universities.

8.3.1 EU Student Survey: Participant Characteristics

This section provides an overview of the characteristics of the 77 respondents to the EU student migrant survey (see Section 2.5.5 for methodological issues, and Appendix 2 for survey questions). The survey covered issues of motivation for studying abroad and for choosing NZ as the study destination as well as the particular choice of Lincoln and Canterbury Universities as the ultimate destination within NZ. The respondents’ experience of living and studying in NZ, and their future intentions were also examined. Unfortunately, it is not possible to know if the respondents were representative of the EU student population at these universities as overviews of EU student characteristics were not available.
As noted in Section 2.5.5, and reflecting the current trends in students from the EU and the domestic fees policy for their post graduate students, German students formed the largest group of respondents by a substantial margin with 41 responses or 53 percent in total. French students made up the second largest national group with fifteen responses (19 percent). It is interesting to note that despite both French and German students having only to pay the significantly lower domestic fees at post graduate level in NZ the number of French students studying in NZ is considerably lower than those from Germany (see Figure 5.6). It is difficult to discern a clear reason for this disparity, as French and German students have been shown to be similarly mobile in terms of studying abroad, with 25.5 and 26 students respectively travelling abroad to study per 1000 students enrolled in home tertiary institutions. Students from the UK formed the third largest group while the remaining countries were represented by only one or two students.

---

25 Through communications with the international offices at both Lincoln and Canterbury universities, it was found that enrolments from other not-specified EU members are quite low.
Gender and Age

Slightly more males than females responded to the survey (56 and 44 percent respectively). The mean age of respondents was 26.3 years, however, there was a large variation between respondents (Standard Deviation = 5.3 years) with the youngest aged 18 years and the oldest 43 years. Eleven respondents were over thirty years of age. The overall age distribution appears to be high compared with the findings of the recent national survey of international students in NZ which noted its tertiary respondents had a mean age of 23.1 years\textsuperscript{26}, and this may be associated with the proportion of post graduate students in the sample.

Course details

Figure 8.2: Respondents’ areas of study

Seventy-three percent of respondents were studying at post graduate level. This level differed somewhat between nationalities, however, with 80 percent of French and German respondents being post graduate students, compared with only 45 percent of British respondents. Again, this reflects the post-graduate domestic fees schemes available to French and German students. Respondents were distributed across a range of subject areas, with a considerable proportion studying science subjects (see Figure 8.2). Course length was fairly evenly distributed among the respondents, with twenty percent attending semester long courses, 44 percent year long courses and 36 percent studying for two years or longer. Some of the students were studying in NZ as part of their European degree, while others were undertaking a NZ-based programme, for example a Master’s or PhD.

8.3.2 Why Undertake Overseas Education?

Both open ended and closed questions were employed to explore why the respondents decided to undertake study overseas. This duality of methods revealed the importance of two key issues: first, the desire to gain overseas experience; and second, the desire to improve English language ability.

### Table 8.1: Student Motivations for Studying in NZ

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Motivation</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Experience of living in a foreign country</td>
<td>4.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To acquire academic skills</td>
<td>3.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To improve English language skills</td>
<td>3.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater availability of jobs after study abroad</td>
<td>3.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic fees scheme</td>
<td>2.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availability of scholarships</td>
<td>2.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higher salary following study abroad</td>
<td>2.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Influence of family/friends</td>
<td>2.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overseas Experience

The desire for foreign experience was expressed by 55 percent of the sample in the open-ended question as a motivation for overseas study and this influence was ranked the most important factor in Table 8.1. ‘Foreign experience’ encompassed the general ideas of travelling and learning about foreign cultures and people, together with more specific desires related to education such as experiencing research in a foreign country in order to learn different methods of studying.

“Gain the experience of a different culture, way of life etc. and get to know the country.” (ID S48)

“Adventure, love of travelling, curiosity for other cultures, meeting people, see the world.” (ID S13)

“Getting to know a different reality and different ways to work in my area of study.” (ID S55)

---

27 This table reports mean ratings where 1 = unimportant and 5 = extremely important.
28 This figures includes the results for the 12 native English speakers in the sample. When these respondents are removed, the mean value rises to 4.06, or very important.
“I considered to study one year in another country, because of the unique chance to get to know another country, language, culture and approach for planning [subject area of respondent].” (ID S68)

Several respondents indicated how they felt this foreign experience would benefit them. This benefit could be personal, in terms of giving a sense of confidence or achievement, educational, through serving to enhance or contextualise the subject under study, or employment related:

“It is also a challenge, just to know more about myself and to become more confident.” (ID S74)

“The overseas experience enriches the learning process.” (ID S2)

“I study English Literature, wanted to live in a country where English is the native language and live in one culture where the texts have its origin.” (ID S25)

“I am aiming to work internationally also and feel that being educated abroad will assist me when applying for jobs.” (ID S27)

“I wanted to have overseas experiences in my CV…” (ID S59)

**English Language ability**

Improving English language ability was the second most cited reason in response to the open-ended question of why study overseas and the second most important influence highlighted in Table 8.1 for non-English speakers. Similar findings have been noted in other studies of international student migrants and are seen to relate to the position of English at the top of a hierarchy of global languages. The perceived importance of having knowledge of English in the EU was underlined in a Eurobarometer survey which found that 75 percent of respondents believed English is useful to know. Most respondents noted their desire to

---

learn English in a general manner, while two noted why this goal was important to them specifically:

“English language, which is a fundamental requirement in my field of work/study.” (ID S77)

“Improve my English as [it is an] international language.” (ID S15)

Further influences
A variety of additional influences and motivations were also noted by smaller groups of respondents. For some, the experience of previous travel or study overseas stimulated a desire for further similar experiences. In three cases, travel to NZ sparked a desire to return to this country.

“I have already been to the States for one semester during high school which was a very good experience, so I wanted to go again during uni.” (ID S23)

“I was here [NZ] three and a half years ago as an exchange student. It was such a good time that I decided to come here to do a full degree.” (ID S69)

Ten respondents indicated they undertook study overseas to have a change or a break from their life in their home countries. “I wanted some time off from my life back home” (ID S39), was one respondent’s explanation. For another respondent this was associated with a change in career, while another felt the change of scenery would help motivate her to continue studying.

Four respondents noted that study overseas was a compulsory component of their course of study in the home country, while four others noted that limited opportunities for further study or for jobs related to their training in their home country prompted their decision to consider overseas options.

8.3.3 Alternative Destinations Considered
For some survey participants, the desire to visit NZ precluded consideration of any other destination country; “always wanted to see the country” (ID S39), noted one respondent.
However, 81 percent of the respondents considered alternate countries in which to study prior to choosing NZ. This figure is substantially higher than that noted for consideration of alternative destinations in the survey of EU migrants living and working in NZ (see Section 6.6.1), but similar to that survey, alternative destinations for studying were largely based on language choice, with English speaking countries again dominating the options. For EU student respondents, however, this dominance was based primarily on a desire to improve English language skills or gain an English language qualification, rather than owing to an existing working knowledge of English, as was the underlying reason for the importance of English-speaking destinations for EU migrant respondents. One non-native English speaking student respondent did note though that following a holiday in NZ, he felt happy to undertake study here, as he was confident he would be able to understand lectures (ID S19). However, English was not the only language considered and several students also mentioned considering Spanish speaking countries in order to learn or improve their Spanish language skills, another widely spoken international language. Additionally one respondent considered France for a similar reason.

Other reasons than language also played a role in the deliberation between alternative destinations. For some students alternatives far away from their home country were especially considered whilst for others destinations closer to home were more appealing. Similarly, previous experience of a country was an attraction for some students while others discounted destinations previously experienced in favour of new possibilities. Constraints associated with university exchange programmes, funding opportunities and desired country traits (such as Canada’s ‘peaceful nature’ or South Africa’s ‘outdoors’ image) also contributed to the consideration of specific alternative countries.

8.3.4 Choosing NZ

As with the other decisions discussed in this thesis relating to migration, multiple contributing influences and motivations played a role in the choice of NZ as a study destination for the EU students sampled. Funding, New Zealand’s physical environment and

---

31 ID S58
32 ID S53
lifestyle, along with the availability of courses played the primary roles in this decision from the open-ended question of why respondents chose to study in NZ.

**Funding**

Funding concerns were the most frequently mentioned motivation (40 percent of respondents) in response to the question of why respondents chose to study in NZ and they related mainly to the perception of lower fees in NZ, often due to the French and German post-graduate domestic fees schemes (see Section 8.2.2), and the availability of scholarships. Only one respondent noted that a lack of funding for her research area in her home country prompted the choice of NZ, though several more respondents did note this as a reason for deciding to study overseas.

“I am a post-graduate, and I am from France. Therefore it was cheaper for me to do my Masters in NZ than in the UK, as France and Germany have relationships with NZ.” (ID S21)

“Much cheaper than Aussie.” (ID S35)

“Gained the scholarship at a university that had the degree I wanted to study.” (ID S66)

This finding does not appear to entirely align with the answers given to the closed questions, reported in Table 8.1, in which both the domestic fees schemes and the availability of scholarships were rated ‘less important’ with means of 2.65 and 2.29 out of 5 respectively. However, when only French and German respondents are considered the mean does rise slightly to 3.2, with 51 percent rating the domestic fees schemes as very or extremely important. While the mean for scholarships on the whole was low, for a minority of respondents (24 percent), the availability of scholarships was very or extremely important.

**Physical environment**

The second key motivating factor for choosing NZ as a destination was its physical environment, indicated by just over 30 percent of respondents. This category included two
quite distinct concepts; the first, and perhaps the more often noted facet of New Zealand’s environment, was the natural and beautiful scenery. This was also noted to be a moderately important contributory factor in the 2004 National Survey of International Students in NZ conducted by the Ministry of Education\textsuperscript{34}.

“Many people had told me what a beautiful place NZ is.” (ID S72)

“Well, I think it is a usual answer. I wanted to discover the nature of NZ.” (ID S29)

The second aspect of the physical environment was the relative distance of NZ from Europe. For several respondents, study in NZ provided the means to undertake a journey that might otherwise not be possible due to this distance. For others, it seemed that the distance itself was a central part of the challenge and adventure they associated with overseas study.

“Very, very beautiful; too far away for a normal vacation.” (ID S9)

“I wanted to go as far away as possible and Australia didn’t attract me, so I chose NZ.” (ID S59)

\textbf{Lifestyle}

Further to New Zealand’s natural environment and position half a world away from the EU, the NZ lifestyle also drew a smaller proportion of student respondents. As was seen in the migrant survey, this attractive ‘Kiwi’ lifestyle was perceived to be relaxed, with an emphasis on outdoor activities. While this was usually mentioned in general, for one respondent the specific activity of kayaking led him to study in NZ. These lifestyle concerns, and the attractions of New Zealand’s physical environment discussed above, show a degree of overlap with the motivations of the respondents to the survey of EU migrants working and living in Canterbury and again indicate the importance of non-economic considerations for a framework for contemporary understanding EU-NZ migration.

“Right attitude, relaxed environment...” (ID S2)

---

“People seemed nice, the country is attractive because of its outdoor way of life, nice mountains and peculiar culture.” (ID S58)

**Academic Considerations**

While the preceding discussion has emphasised the role of non-educational factors in the choice of NZ as a tertiary study destination, the importance of the academic component in the decision was also influential; indeed the acquisition of academic skills rated a mean score of 3.64 or moderately important in the closed questions regarding the choice to study in NZ (table 1 above), and this was the second highest mean for the potential influences rated. For approximately 30 percent of the sample the reputation of education in NZ or of particular universities, programmes or staff, and availability of academic programmes in respondents’ areas of interest were motivating factors. Two respondents also mentioned that the start time of the NZ academic year fitted well with their home country degree.

“The level of education in NZ is roughly comparable with international standards...” (ID S12)

“The Masters course I found on the Canterbury website best fitted with the areas I wished to study. My choice was therefore based on the particular course offered.” (ID S27)

“Very good researcher in my field here at Canterbury.” (ID S47)

**Personal recommendations**

Fifty-seven percent of respondents indicated that they received personal recommendations regarding studying in NZ. These recommendations came from a range of sources, including family, friends, other students or home country faculty members, and divided into two main categories; recommendations regarding studying in NZ, or more general recommendations about NZ as a country. The recommendations regarding study often came from other students who had previously studied in NZ, however, contact with NZ lecturers visiting EU universities also impacted upon some students.
“Talked with a guy who had been in Auckland studying for a year, told me it was great here.” (ID S56)

“A friend showed me his slides from when he was studying at UC [University of Canterbury]; I asked him some questions about UC.” (ID S22)

“Fellow student was here. Good experiences about options choosing courses.” (ID S65)

“The course advisor for postgrads at Lincoln Uni has been promoting for studying at Lincoln at our uni in Germany two years before I came to NZ. His help and advice made me to come to NZ.” (ID S68)

More general recommendations stemmed from others’ personal experience of NZ and often highlighted New Zealand’s reputation for natural beauty and friendly people, as well as providing more specific recommendations of what to see and do during their stay.

“Both friends and family told me NZ was really nice and that the South Island is the most beautiful.” (ID S72)

“My mother travelled to NZ in the 70’s and really enjoyed and recommended travelling there.” (ID S19)

“Have a Kiwi friend now living in the UK who gave me a lot of advice about everything – where to go, things to do, etc.” (ID S76)

However, despite the large number of students reporting that they had received recommendations regarding studying in NZ and the country in general, the influence of family and friends was rated to be less important (mean 2.05, Table 8.1) in their decision to study in NZ. This discrepancy may be because the student was given recommendations about NZ which confirmed a decision already made rather than contributing to the initial choice of NZ.

“Many family friends told me when they found out I was studying in NZ of experiences they had in NZ and they all gave high recommendations.” (ID S66)
Previous travel to NZ

Eighteen of the respondents (23 percent) had visited NZ prior to arriving to study. This figure is considerably lower than those who previously travelled to NZ prior to working or living here, but this may be due to the different ages and life stages of student migrants. Of those that had travelled to NZ prior to studying here, two respondents had previously been high school exchange students. The remainder came to NZ as tourists, often backpacking as a part of a world tour.

8.3.5 The Choice of Canterbury

The main determinants of the decision to attend one of the two universities in the Canterbury region, the University of Canterbury or Lincoln University, related to academic factors such as course availability, existing exchange programmes or the location of university specific personnel. However, for a substantial subset, non-education related issues played an important role.

Course concerns

The availability of a specific course or subject and the size or reputation of a department prompted 57 percent of the respondents to choose to study at either of the two universities in the Canterbury region.

“No other university offers anything considerable in my field.” (ID S45)

“The special Masters that was only offered by the UC.” (ID S39)

“It seemed to have the best offers of courses for my studies and the most research in my field of interest.” (ID S17)

“The NZ embassy told me that Lincoln was the best university to study the environment in NZ.” (ID S74)

Exchange programmes

For just over twenty percent of respondents, the presence of exchange programmes and availability of scholarships contributed to their choice of university. The presence of private
exchange programmes seemed to be slightly more important for students at Lincoln University, although the sample number is unfortunately too small to test statistically.

“I was thinking of, and actually applied to, Unitec in Auckland, but Lincoln was the university which had an exchange programme with my home university.” (ID S73)

**University staff**

The influence of university staff on the choice of university was mentioned in two ways. First, and most significantly, the presence of specific members academic staff drew students to the university.

“I wanted to study with a specific lecturer I already knew from workshops and she is a lecturer with the University of Canterbury.” (ID S61)

“It had the project and the supervisor I wanted to work with.” (ID S32)

However, the response from staff regarding initial enquires from potential students also impacted upon several respondents’ choice of university.

“Quick response from academic staff in the department...” (ID S3)

“Had a very positive mail contact here.” (ID S7)

**Location and recommendation**

Finally, three non-academic factors also featured in the decision-making process of some students. The most mentioned of these, by twenty percent of respondents, is the location of the universities concerned, either specifically in Christchurch or, more generally, in the South Island. The size of Christchurch in addition to its proximity to other natural features such as the Southern Alps were identified as important motivating features. These considerations seem to mirror those expressed by respondents to the survey of EU migrants living and working in Canterbury.

---

35 This issue was noted as a motivating factor for 36% of respondents from Lincoln, but by only 6% of respondents from Canterbury.
“When I travelled I preferred the South Island, so I didn’t even consider the unis in the North Island” (ID S42)

“The South Island is quieter than the North Island, not so many people and tourists around; mountains as well as beaches nearby; like the idea of a ‘Garden City’, my programme isn’t available in Dunedin.” (ID S9)

“Christchurch appeared, from what information we could find, to be a very pleasant city. I did not want to come all the way here to spend my time in a big city and Christchurch’s size gives it the best of both worlds, enough variety but on a manageable scale.” (ID S18)

Other than the physical environment of the Canterbury region, two other influences relating to people were noted. The first, personal recommendations of either the university or the area, has been discussed above. The second relates to the presence of support people located near these universities.

“As this the area I knew people, don’t think I would have come had I not had that support.” (ID S6)

8.3.6 Overall Experiences

The vast majority of respondents were positive or extremely positive about their experience of studying in NZ, with only one respondent reporting an overall negative experience. The best features of studying in NZ noted by respondents were the relaxed, friendly atmosphere at
the universities and the easy and informal nature of student-lecturer interaction. Flexible working environments with freedom of topic choice and the ability to focus research on areas of particular interest were also positively noted together with the availability of resources and the experience of meeting new people. However, not all features of the study experience were enjoyed. Enrolment and visa-related issues created difficulty for some respondents, while others perceived the academic standard to be lower than at home with an emphasis on quantity rather than quality of assessed work.

Respondents were asked about the aspects of living in NZ that they enjoyed most and least. Here, the natural environment, friendly people, relaxed way of life and the ready opportunities to participate in outdoor activities were the most enjoyed features. Some respondents also noted they liked the ability to combine travel with study and the independence they had in NZ. Poor standards of housing, in particular the lack of insulation and central heating, was the least liked aspect of living in NZ most frequently noted by respondents. Low standards of driving, food, as well as the weather were also identified by participants. Interestingly, despite commenting on the natural beauty of NZ, several respondents noted environmental issues, particularly smog, and a perceived lack of standards for controlling pollution as negative features. Distance from friends and family, the isolation of NZ from other countries hampering additional travel and a lack of history or culture were noted by a small number of respondents.

These findings are largely supported by the respondents’ ratings of specific aspects of life in NZ as shown in Figure 8.4 (below). The low perception of the standard of living is likely attributable to the above-noted perceived poor housing standards, however, a small number of respondents also noted that NZ was more expensive to live in than they had expected.
Paradoxically, while one of the most enjoyed and highly rated aspects of NZ was its friendly people, one issue that was identified in both the negative sides of living and studying in NZ was the difficulty that some respondents had making friends with New Zealanders. This problem has been noted in other studies of international students in NZ\(^{37}\) and in other countries, as well as being noted by the participants in the EU migrant survey (Section 7.7).

EU student respondents were asked to describe the main type of friends they made while studying here in terms of nationality (Figure 8.5).

---

\(^{36}\) This tables shows the rating out of 3 (1 = better at home, 2 = about the same, 3 = better in NZ) given by respondents regarding the five aspects of life in NZ shown.

Just under 50 percent of the student respondents indicated their friends were mainly New Zealanders or a equal mix of different nationalities. However, the majority of respondents noted they formed friendships primarily with other international people. Proximity appeared to play a role in this, with the dominance of international students on particular courses, particularly among post-graduate programmes, and the university accommodation housing international students together, particularly in Ilam Village at the University of Canterbury, creating less opportunity for interaction with NZ students. Additionally, some respondents noted that friendships with other international students were easier to make as New Zealanders often already had their own groups of friends, and international students could better understand the experience of studying away from home.

“Whilst I’ve met a lot of New Zealanders I’ve not found them too open to forming new friendships, whereas other international people, probably because they have a greater understanding of being new to a country, have been a lot more welcoming.”

(ID S34)

Several respondents noted that friendships with NZ students increased over time especially if they moved into a situation of flatting with New Zealand flatmates, or began a relationship with a New Zealander, but others noted that friendships with New Zealanders tended to be less close than with other international or home nationality students.
“In the beginning I meet mostly international students, after moving out of Ilam flats, I meet far more New Zealand (sic) and made heaps of friends.” (ID S8)

“Friendships tend to be less close/serious (I’m saying this after two years at UC).” (ID S22)

8.3.7 Future intentions

It has been suggested that student migration is linked with an increased likelihood of future migratory behaviour. While this finding was not entirely supported by Li et al, the authors did identify that student migration to a particular destination can “…influence perceptions of the study location in a positive fashion [having] a potentially strong influence on the choice of destination those students who were likely to migrate”38. Respondents were asked if they would like to work or live in NZ in the future (Figure 8.6, below). Employment, the NZ lifestyle, attachment to home, and a desire to experience more of the world all figured significantly in the student’s expressed intentions. For those respondents who would consider relocating to NZ permanently in the future, the good work-life balance in NZ and lifestyle were important features. Additionally, several of these respondents noted that they felt particularly comfortable in NZ and one noted that she had met her future NZ husband. This group largely felt that employment was available in their field in NZ or was secondary to other issues.

“I just love it here and I think that I blend in quite well, too... It’s a way of living that I can identify myself with and feel very comfortable and confident in it!” (ID S59)

“The jobs in my area of study are more interesting over here and I’d prefer to bring up children in NZ, because of the better standard of living and opportunities.” (ID S4)

“I can easily imagine that I’d like to stay in NZ (with the drawback that I probably won’t get the job I’d like to have – for the simple reason that there are hardly any in that area in NZ).” (ID S22)

For those who would consider working or living in NZ for a limited period, the attachment to their home country and the distance of NZ from family and friends was a key limiting feature, as respondents felt they would miss family and friends too much to remain in NZ long term. Employment, in terms of availability, levels of pay and interest, was also seen to be an important influencing factor. For example, if work was available and interesting, then some respondents would consider working in NZ for a certain period. However, while other respondents were open to the possibility of some future involvement with NZ, either working or further study, they acknowledged that there were also other opportunities in new destinations, highlighting the ready mobility of international student migrants. For a small number of students, New Zealand’s perceived lack of culture or choice were also noted as factors that would limit time spent in NZ.

“I like NZ very much but I would not permanently move this far away from Europe as my family are too important for me. I would consider short term stays here anytime as long as the right job was available.” (ID S27)

“If there were any good jobs for people in Physics, I certainly would like to work here for some time.” (ID S11)

“I don’t plan on staying anywhere forever, but I like NZ and could well imagine spending some more time here, possibly even for a PhD.” (ID S12)
“At the moment I can see myself working here for a couple of years, but not my whole life, because there is not much choice. You live in Christchurch and you work here and around Christchurch there is nothing. Also the ‘bigger towns’ are still very small and boring after a period of time.” (ID S68)

Employment prospects were also a key influence for those respondents who indicated they would not consider living or working in NZ in the future, however, these respondents perceived that there would be no suitable work opportunities in NZ for them or that wages would be too low. Additionally, these respondents felt that while NZ could be a nice place to holiday or retire to, it was too small, isolated, and distant from friends and family in which to work or live.

“All my family lives in Europe. Considering that I am studying mainly international politics, I have much better job opportunities in Europe.” (ID S50)

“It’s too far away and too small (but very beautiful). I think it’s more the kind of country you want to live in when you’re retired.” (ID S13)

“I’ve seen enough of NZ, it is not that I don’t like it here, but sometimes NZ is a bit behind the pulse of time. For my future work place, NZ companies are mostly too small.” (ID S14)

8.4 Conclusion

Consistent with the discussion of micro level influences of student migration in section 3.3.5, the desire for overseas experiences and foreign language acquisition, in this case English, were the main motivations for EU students to study abroad. It is interesting to note that while this emphasis on the adventure and experiential goals of migration was particularly strong for the EU students surveyed, it was also noted by a substantial minority of respondents to the EU migrant survey and thus this seems to form an important micro level motivation for the proposed EU-NZ migration framework. While experiential and language goals dominated the motivations to study abroad, the choice of NZ and the particular institute within NZ at which to study were influenced by other factors including funding and academic considerations. This underlies the importance of fees agreements and exchange
programmes at both a national and international level for the facilitation of movement, as well as the reputation of both NZ education as a whole and the particular courses and universities specifically. In terms of the suggested EU-NZ framework, it would be possible to place these exchange programmes within the migration industry at the meso level. Although respondents were not directly asked how they initially identified NZ as a study destination, several mentioned the importance of meeting staff from NZ universities either while they were teaching or undertaking research in the EU, or while they were travelling specifically in order to promote study at their institution. This further underlines the importance of people to people contacts between the EU and NZ. However, further research about the impact of these forms of contact and other means of reaching EU students needs to be undertaken. Despite these personal networks playing a role in motivating EU students to come to NZ, respondents did report some difficulty with making strong contacts with other NZ students during their time here. As noted in the literature review, this lack of local friendships can have a detrimental effect on the levels of academic progress and satisfaction and while the satisfaction levels of the respondents were high in this case, this has the potential to reduce the positive impression and potential networks that EU students form with NZ. Finally, while some respondents do not believe they will live or work in NZ in the future, the markedly positive experience of the majority of respondents and the substantial number of respondents who would be open to extending their stay or returning to NZ in the future is encouraging for not only for the potential tangible contribution to New Zealand’s skilled work force but also for the intangible assets derived from this, such as positive word of mouth to stimulate further interest in NZ. Indeed, this implications of positive experiences need not be restricted to migration but may spill over into other arenas, such as tourism or trade.
As a traditional country of migration, New Zealand society has been shaped by the influences of those who have moved here from abroad. Many periods of migration have comprised this population evolution, including the original Polynesian settlement, British colonial migration, and more recently large Chinese, Korean and other Asian migration. This thesis provides an overview of a smaller stream of migration; the contemporary European Union migration flows to New Zealand, using a case study of these flows specifically to the Canterbury region of New Zealand. This particular group of migrants has often been overlooked governmentally and academically, and indeed there is currently a dearth of literature accounting for the motivations and experiences of EU migrants in NZ.

It is then out of this context of a lack of awareness and knowledge that the thesis investigated migrants to the Canterbury region, including people who were living, working and studying, who had moved to NZ from the EU within the past 5 years. Primary and secondary data was collected to examine these migrants’ experiences. Because of the often hidden nature of the target population it was necessary to utilise a snowball technique for identifying possible survey respondents. The use of such a technique, while necessary for this particular project, is acknowledged to have limited the size and representativeness of the sample. However, such difficulties are not uncommon in migration research, and even government-sponsored studies have encountered problems with questionnaire administration and migrant contact¹.

In order to investigate the experiences of these equally important but distinct groups of migrants, separate questionnaires were employed for migrants living and working in

¹ DOL (2006). *Skilled Migrants in New Zealand: Settlement Outcomes*. Wellington: DOL. pp. 2-8. This study was published a week prior to the submission of this thesis, and thus was unable to be included in this analysis, but does discuss the difficulty in timely and comprehensive
Canterbury, and those who were studying at a tertiary level at the Universities of Canterbury and Lincoln. 52 respondents participated in the survey of migrants in Canterbury, and 77 tertiary student participants for the student survey. To enhance the quality of information drawn from the questionnaires, supplementary interviews were also undertaken with a subset of the respondents. Additionally, the wider trends and characteristics of EU migrants in NZ were investigated, with emphasis on the distribution of EU migrants across New Zealand’s migration streams, and the various contemporary changes that these migration streams have undergone.

Since the turn of the millennium, the trends in migration from the EU to NZ have been tending upwards, and this is largely attributable to a sharp increase in migration from the UK, both in the residence and work streams. However, there has also been an increase in working holiday-makers from a number of EU member states and the extension of the working holiday programme would seem likely to continue to have a significant inflationary impact on the number of young Europeans who travel to NZ. Arguably, EU student migrants are also likely to increase in their numbers in NZ as NZ policy makers and individual institutions recognise the potential student market in the EU and further exploration of the potential NZ has for providing English language courses for EU students and in particular for the new member states, and the links this could generate with these countries may prove timely. The distribution of migrants to NZ across EU member states is reasonably consistent over the studied period with Britain continuing to supply the most migrants, and in fact increasing its share of the EU total, followed by Germany and the Netherlands, whose proportions of the total share of EU declined slightly. Other member states increasing their share of the total EU migration to NZ are Ireland, the Czech Republic, Hungary and France. Monitoring these trends over time to see if they are sustained will prove interesting and are opportunities for further research.

Understanding the motivations for EU migrants to come to NZ may help to target marketing campaigns in this region if NZ Immigration decides to expand its endeavours in this area. The results of the survey have shown that even within this small sample, the motives for moving to NZ are diverse and even for an individual respondent were usually
multi-faceted. At an individual level, while the most readily acknowledged motivations regarding New Zealand’s perceived lifestyle and physical environment were confirmed for this group, it is apparent, not only for the EU student migrants but also for migrants living and working in Canterbury, that experiential motivations – living with a new culture or undertaking a new challenge - are also important. The role of employment as a motivating factor was highlighted for some workers, although this was mostly noted in combination with other motivations, and for others work enabled, rather than motivated, their migration. Finally the role of personal networks in influencing the decision to migrate should not be overlooked. Family, friends, colleagues and even acquaintances impacted on the respondents choice to come to NZ.

The above noted micro level factors seem to go a significant way to account for the motivations for EU migration to NZ. Therefore, it would be pertinent to ask if it is necessary to have a broad framework for EU-NZ migration as suggested earlier to help contextualise this research. The benefit of such a framework is that it takes the perception of migrant decision-making beyond a simple push-pull analysis and acknowledges that wider macro and meso level factors can facilitate or inhibit movement. However, from the results of the survey some refinements to the proposed framework can be considered. At a micro level, the suggested framework does not acknowledge the importance of previous travel to NZ, which was shown from the survey to be an important factor in the decision of some migrants. Additionally, this factor has been noted by other studies of migrants, and thus may need to be incorporated into the framework. Conversely, the meso-level influence of the internal labour markets in transnational corporations is perhaps less applicable to the EU-NZ situation than for other migrant groups to NZ. Finally, at a macro-level the role of colonial ties in contextualising EU migration to NZ, while historically appropriate, may need to be reshaped to encompass current international linkages – that is, the context of New Zealand’s bilateral and multilateral relations including those with the EU – for the contemporary situation.
The settlement outcomes for the surveyed EU migrants were found to be largely positive. While a small percentage of respondents had yet to find employment, the majority had high levels of satisfaction at work, in addition to a high reported level of satisfaction with their life, or stay, in Canterbury. Although small, the group of EU migrants who move to NZ and are unable to find employment do represent a loss of skills for NZ. NZ currently has a skills shortage in a number of areas and these EU migrants, and indeed migrants of other nationalities, may be able to fill these gaps if their skills were recognised, and used.

Indeed, while the majority of participants were employed, these good work-place outcomes may also disguise issues that were encountered by some of these respondents in finding work, for example the difficulty experienced in transferring qualifications. Furthermore, despite the increase in temporary work permits issued to EU migrants to NZ, those work permit holders who did not have a job prior to arriving in NZ met with some difficulties in finding work, largely because employers did not want to hire staff who had a work permit. A report published as this thesis was being completed may provide some insight into this problem as it notes that small and medium enterprises, which constitute 99.5 percent of NZ firms\(^2\), prefer to hire people who have commitments - such as family - because they are perceived to be more settled and thus more likely to stay\(^3\). Additionally, often these employers have been found to favour employees who they perceive will fit into the workplace instead of relying solely on formal qualifications\(^4\). It is important that migrants are aware of these attitudes in order to maximise their opportunities when seeking employment in NZ.

Additionally, more detailed research into the knowledge transfer of EU migrants to NZ businesses and industries would be beneficial. Such knowledge may be of particular techniques and work practices, or may provide key home market insights. However, as

\(^2\) Small and medium enterprises are those who employed less than 100 staff.
shown by some respondents in this research, this potential knowledge transfer is not always appreciated or recognised by employers\(^5\).

While these issues are certainly not restricted to the experiences of EU migrants alone, this research does serve to highlight that EU migrants do suffer the same difficulties other migrant groups have done and theirs is not necessarily the ease of transition that it is often assumed to be.

Although student migrant respondents also noted a largely positive experience of their migration to NZ, both migrant groups noted some difficulty in forging strong friendships and connections with New Zealanders. This difficulty in meeting and making friends with New Zealanders is important as in addition to having a negative impact on the overall feelings of satisfaction about migration, it can also reduce the possibility of creating networks between EU migrants – both settled and student – and New Zealanders. While this research has shown that respondents are in close contact with friends and family at home, the implications of these links could be further explored. Furthermore, opportunities may exist to capitalise on these networks in a manner which would strengthen the wider EU-NZ relationship.

This thesis has remained intentionally limited in its scope, and in addition to providing the overall trends, motivations and experiences of contemporary EU migrants to NZ, it has also made clear a number of paths for future research in this field, several of which have been noted above. One further avenue is noted now. This thesis has deliberately not examined the counter stream of the EU-NZ migration, that is to say the movement of New Zealanders to the EU, however questions were often raised regarding this issue during the research process. This area would be an interesting avenue for future study in several different ways. Firstly, such research could explore whether the trends and characteristics of NZ migrants to EU have changed over time. While the overseas experience, or “OE”, undertaken by many young New Zealanders following school or

\(^5\) Research on the entrepreneurial activities and introduction of specialized knowledge of various European migrant groups from NZ’s settlement has been undertaken by Krivokapic-Skoko (2001), though in this case the migrants examined were employers rather than employees.
university continues to be part of the NZ psyche, there is anecdotal evidence that older New Zealanders are also undertaking similar trips after their children have left home. Second, examining the role of the UK in NZ-EU migration would also be interesting, to investigate if the UK is still used as a traditional gateway to Europe or whether New Zealanders are connecting more directly with the continental member states. Finally, it has been suggested that expatriates can provide valuable networks, resources and knowledge of their adopted homes to their countries of birth\textsuperscript{6}. There is a large NZ diaspora estimated at up to one million people\textsuperscript{7}. While NZIS is targeting these ex-patriot New Zealanders as a potential source of migrants to ease New Zealand’s skills shortages, an exploration of these networks and linkages could provide useful information regarding the possibilities of capitalising on such networks in situ.

This thesis has shown the types of migration that flow from the EU to NZ, examined the causes of this and the outcomes of this migration for the respondents. Additionally it has intimated at the possible impacts of this migration for the EU-NZ relationship, and this last aspect is particularly interesting and in need of further investigation. EU migration to NZ can have immediate tangible impacts such as helping to fill NZ skills shortages and contributing to our economy through educational and associated other spending. However, there are other avenues, perhaps more difficult to quantify, in which EU-NZ migration is important. Assessing the actual impact of the people-people contacts that migration brings is difficult but an increased awareness of the significance of all aspects of EU migration half a world away to NZ is crucial for maintaining New Zealand’s healthy relationship with the EU.


\textsuperscript{7} Ibid., pp. 4.
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Appendix 1

Survey for Recent EU Migrants Living and Working in Canterbury

INFORMATION

You are invited to participate as a subject in the research project:
Half a World Away – Contemporary Migration from Europe to Canterbury, NZ.

The aim of this project is to analyse the motivations for moving to NZ and the experiences of recent migrants from the European Union who are now living, working and studying in the Canterbury region. Migrants are very important to NZ, with people born overseas making up to 19% of the total NZ population. It is therefore very important to understand why migrants choose NZ and what their experiences of life here are like.

Your involvement in this project will involve answering a questionnaire which will take approximately 25 minutes. You have the right to withdraw from the project at any time, including withdrawal of any information provided.

As a follow up to this investigation you may be asked to participate in an interview to provide further, more in-depth information. However, you have the right to refuse to participate in such an interview.

The results of the project may be published, but you may be assured of the complete confidentiality of data gathered in this investigation: the identity of participants will not be made public without their consent. To ensure anonymity and confidentiality, all data will be stored securely without access to third parties. Data will be used primarily in aggregate form with any quotations remaining anonymous.

The project is being carried as a requirement for a Master of Arts degree, by Rosemary Tipples under the supervision of Professor Martin Holland, who can be contacted at (03) 3642348. He will be pleased to discuss any concerns you may have about participation in the project.

The project has been reviewed and approved by the University of Canterbury Human Ethics Committee.

Thank you very much for your participation.
CONSENT FORM

Half a World Away – Contemporary Migration from Europe to Canterbury, NZ

I have read and understood the description of the above-named project. On this basis I agree to participate as a subject in the project, and I consent to publication of the results of the project with the understanding that anonymity will be preserved.

I understand also that I may at any time withdraw from the project, including withdrawal of any information I have provided.

NAME (please print):………………………………………………………………

Signature:………………………………………………………………………….

Date: 221
EU Migrant Questionnaire

Introduction:

Thank you for agreeing to complete this questionnaire about the motivations and experiences of migrants from the EU currently living in the Canterbury region, New Zealand (NZ).

Please answer all the questions that are applicable to you. For questions A4 and B4, please circle the most appropriate response. For all other questions please tick the appropriate box or write the answer in your own words. If you need more space to write an answer, there is extra room in Section H, but please remember to give the number of the question you are answering.

If you migrated as a couple or as a family and would like to fill in this survey together, please do so. However, please have the principal applicant on your migration permit (the person against which the immigration criteria were applied) complete the first group of questions in Section I: Demographic information. Details for a spouse/partner (if appropriate) can be entered in the second group of questions Section I. (Please tick here if completed as a couple □).

When you have finished filling in your questionnaire please put in the pre-addressed, postage-paid envelope provided and mail it back to me. Thank you again for your time.

Section A: Motivations for migration

A1. Please state in your own words why you decided move from your home country:

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

A2. Before arriving in NZ, had you previously lived or worked internationally?

Yes □ No □ (please go to question A3)

If yes, please briefly explain where you migrated, for how long and for what purpose:

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

A3. Have any members of your close family or friends migrated internationally?

Yes □ No □ (please go to question A4)
If yes, in what way did their experience encourage or discourage your own decision to migrate?

A4. Please rate all of the following statements to indicate how much (if at all) they influenced your decision to leave your home country.
(1 = unimportant, 2 = less important, 3 = important, 4 = very important, 5 = extremely important)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Unimportant</th>
<th>Extremely Important</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To have the experience of living abroad</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To have a change of lifestyle</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To retire</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To be near friends or family</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor economic conditions in home country</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stress, overcrowding in home country</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor quality environment in home country</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To earn money to send home to family members</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To learn skills that will be useful in home country</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To save money for when I return home</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please specify):</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A5. Before migrating to NZ, how satisfied were you with life in your home country

- Very Satisfied
- Satisfied
- Neither Satisfied nor dissatisfied
- Dissatisfied
- Very Dissatisfied

A6. In the 12 months before migrating to NZ, how would you describe your standard of living:

- More than able to meet all basic needs
- Able to meet all basic needs
- Less than able to meet all basic needs

Section B: Choice of destination

B1. Please state in your own words why you chose NZ as the destination for your move:
B2. How did you learn about NZ as a possible destination for your migration? (please tick all relevant answers)

- Through an employment opportunity  □
- From books/magazines  □
- From television/movies  □
- On the internet  □
- From friends/family  □
- From an immigration agency  □
- Through previous travel to NZ  □
- Other (please specify):

B3. Did you consider alternative destinations to NZ?

- Yes  □
- No  □  (please go to question B4)

If yes, which countries did you consider and what were their relative strengths and weaknesses?

B4. Please rate all of the following statements on how much (if at all) they influenced your choice of NZ as your destination

(1 = unimportant, 2 = less important, 3 = important, 4 = very important, 5 = extremely important)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Unimportant</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Employment opportunities in NZ</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To join family in NZ</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To marry/live with a NZ spouse/partner</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climate/physical environment in NZ</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety from crime in NZ</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational opportunities in NZ</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better future for family in NZ</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lifestyle in NZ</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Similarity of NZ to home country</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NZ is an English speaking country</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political environment in NZ</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NZ immigration requirements</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other (please specify):

B5. Prior to moving to NZ on this occasion, have you previously spent time in NZ as:

- a) a tourist  Yes □  No □
- b) a student  Yes □  No □
- c) working   Yes □  No □
If yes, please briefly explain.

Section C: The migration process

C1. Did you apply for your current residence/working permit onshore or offshore?

Onshore ☐
Offshore ☐ (please go to question C2)

If onshore, what permit did you have prior to your current permit?

C2. Did you have any difficulties in meeting NZ immigration requirements?

Yes ☐
No ☐ (please go to question C3)

Please briefly explain your answer:

C3. Did you use an immigration agency to help process your visa application:

Yes ☐
No ☐

Please briefly explain why or why not:

Section D: Living in NZ

D1. How long have you lived in NZ?

6 months-1 year ☐ 1-2 years ☐ 2-3 years ☐
3-4 years ☐ 4-5 years ☐ 5-6 years ☐

D2. Why did you choose to live in Christchurch/Canterbury?
D3. Since arriving in NZ, have you lived/worked in any locations in New Zealand other than Christchurch/Canterbury?

Yes ☐
No ☐ (please go to question D4)

If yes, where else have you lived and why did you move to Christchurch/Canterbury?

D4. Do you plan to live in NZ permanently?

Yes, definitely ☐ (please go to question D5)
Yes, probably ☐ (please go to question D5)
No ☐
Don’t know ☐

If no, a) how long do you intend to live in NZ
b) why will you leave, and
c) where will you go next?

If you don’t know, what factors might influence your decision to stay or leave NZ?

D5. If you are currently in NZ on a work permit, would you consider taking up residence in NZ if it was possible?

Yes ☐
No ☐
Not applicable ☐ (please go to question D6)

Please briefly explain why or why not:

D6. If you currently have NZ residence, would you consider taking up NZ citizenship?

Yes ☐
No ☐
Not applicable ☐ (please go to question E1)
Section E: Employment experiences
(If completing the questionnaire as a couple, please respond to this section for both partners)

E1. What was your occupation prior to migrating to NZ?

E2. Before migrating to NZ, did you intend to work when you arrived in NZ?

Yes □ No □ (please go to question E3)

If yes, what occupation did you intend to work in?

E3. Are you currently employed?

Yes □ No □ (please go to question E5)

If yes, what is your current occupation?

E4. How does your current job compare with your last main job in your home country?

More satisfying □ About the same □ Less satisfying □

E5. If you have worked/are working in NZ, did you have a job secured prior to your arrival in NZ?

Yes □ No □ Not applicable □ (please go to question E6)

If yes, how did you find this job?

If no, how did you find your job after arriving in NZ?
E6. Have you experienced any problems associated with working in NZ?

E7. If you are not currently employed, what activities are you involved in:

- Retirement
- Caring for children
- Studying
- Volunteering
- Looking for work
- Not applicable

Section F: Social experiences

F1. In social situations, who do you mostly socialize with?

- Migrants from your home country
- Other foreign migrants (please go to question F3)
- New Zealanders (please go to question F3)
- All of the above

F2. If you meet socially with migrants from your own country then:

a) how and where do you meet them?

b) how often do you see them?

- Daily
- Weekly
- Monthly
- Less Frequently

F3. Which, if any, organizations associated with your home country do you belong to (for example Alliance Française, or the Greek Orthodox church)?

F4. Which, if any, NZ social clubs or organizations do you belong to (for example a local sports team, theatre group, the Rotary club)?
F5. What do you like most about living in NZ compared to living in your home country?

F6. What do you like least about living in NZ compared to living in your home country?

F7. What problems have you encountered since arriving in NZ?

F8. If you have experienced problems, did they make you consider returning home?

- No, didn’t consider returning home
- Yes, briefly considered returning home
- Yes, seriously considered returning home
- Not applicable

F9. Have you experienced any sort of discrimination or prejudice because of your nationality since your arrival in NZ?

- Never
- Just once or twice
- Frequently

F10. Overall, are you satisfied with your life in NZ?

- Very satisfied
- Satisfied
- Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied
- Dissatisfied
- Very dissatisfied

Section G: Links with home country

G1. How often do you return to your home country since arriving in NZ?

- More than once a year
- Once a year
- Less than once a year
- Not at all
G2. If you have returned to your home country, what was the main purpose of the trip?

To visit family □
To visit friends □
For business/work reasons □
Because I live both in my home country and NZ □
Other (please specify):

G3. What contact do you retain with your home country?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contact</th>
<th>Frequently</th>
<th>Occasionally</th>
<th>Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Email friends/family</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talk on telephone with friends/family</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Read internet/newspaper from home country</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have visits from family from home country</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have visits from friends from home country</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business involvement in home country</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please specify)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Section H: Additional Information

If you feel that you would like to add any other information about your migration experience and subsequent experience of living in NZ, please do so here.

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

Section I: Demographic information:

To be filled in by the principal applicant:

Sex:
- Male □
- Female □

Age:
- Under 16 □
- 16-19 □
- 20-24 □
- 25-29 □
- 30-39 □
- 40-49 □
- 50-64 □
- 65+ □

Country of birth: ________________
Country of residence prior to migration to NZ: 

Qualifications:
- Primary school or less than 3 years of secondary school
- 3-5 years of secondary school
- Trade qualification
- University or technical institute diploma
- Completed university degree
- Post-graduate degree

Current Employment Status:
- Employed full-time (more than 30 hours per week)
- Employed part-time (less than 30 hours per week)
- Employer
- Self-employed
- Unemployed (seeking work)
- Not in the labour force

Occupation (if not already stated): 

Migration status:
- NZ citizen
- NZ resident
- Temporary Work permit holder

If you have NZ residence, which category did you apply under:
- Skilled migrant/general skills
- Business
- Family Reunification
- Humanitarian

If you have a NZ work permit please specify what type: 

Do you own a house or rent?
- Own home
- Rent

Do you think the cost of living in NZ, compared with that in your home country, is:
- Much higher
- Higher
- About the same
- Lower
- Much lower

Do you think your income in NZ compared to your income in your home country is:
- Much higher
- Higher
- About the same
- Lower
- Much lower
Number of children:
0  □  3  □
1  □  4  □
2  □  5+ □

Did your children migrate to NZ with you?
Yes  □
No  □
No, they were born in NZ  □

Marital Status
Partner/Spouse  □
Single  □

If you have migrated with a spouse/partner please fill in the following section regarding their demographic information:

Details of spouse/partner:
Sex:  Male  □
       Female  □
Age:  Under 16  □  30-39  □
       16-19  □  40-49  □
       20-24  □  50-64  □
       25-29  □  65+  □

Country of birth:  __________________________

Qualifications:
Primary school or less than 3 years of secondary school  □
3-5 years of secondary school  □
Trade qualification  □
University or technical institute diploma  □
Completed university degree  □
Post-graduate degree  □

Employment Status:
Employed full-time (more than 30 hours per week)  □
Employed part-time (less than 30 hours per week)  □
Employer  □
Self-employed  □
Unemployed (seeking work)  □
Not in the labour force  □

Occupation (if not already stated):  __________________________
Would you be willing to participate in a follow up interview regarding your migration experience?
Yes ☐
No ☐

If yes, please provide contact details:
(This information will remain confidential and will only be used if a follow up interview is desired.)

Would you like a summary of the results of the study:
Yes ☐
No ☐

If yes, please provide details of where you would like the summary to be sent:
(This information will remain confidential and will only be used to send a copy of the summary to you.)

Thank you for your participation.

Rosemary Tipples
Appendix 2

Survey for EU Student Migrants in Canterbury

Half a World Away – Contemporary Migration from the EU to NZ

QUESTIONNAIRE INFORMATION

Dear Student,

My name is Rosemary Tipples and I am currently studying towards a Master of Arts degree in the National Centre for Research on Europe at the University of Canterbury, under the supervision of Professor Martin Holland.

My research involves exploring migration from the European Union to New Zealand. It will primarily focus on the question of why people from the EU choose to study, work and live in New Zealand and analysing their experiences. In order to address these issues, I am undertaking a survey of migrants in the Canterbury region. As such, I would very much appreciate you taking the time to complete this questionnaire.

The questionnaire is divided into three sections. The questions in the first section relate to your motivations for studying abroad and specifically why you choose to study in NZ. The second section relates to your experiences of studying in NZ. The questions in the third section will provide some background details on you to help me analyse the data.

The questionnaire will take approximately 10 minutes to complete. All answers will be treated confidentially. This research project is not associated with the NZ Immigration Service or with any other body.

The questionnaire is attached to this email as an MS Word document. Please enter your responses in the MS Word document, save your changes and then send it back as an attachment to rvt12@student.canterbury.ac.nz. Where a question asks you to tick a box or choose a number, please type an ‘X’ directly next to the box or number you wish to choose, or alternatively use the highlight tool to highlight the box or number you wish to choose.

Once again, thank you very much for your participation.

Yours sincerely

Rosemary Tipples

By completing the questionnaire it will be understood that you have consented to participate in the project, and that you consent to publication of the results of the project with the understanding that anonymity will be preserved.
EU Student Questionnaire:

Section 1: Motivations:

1. What made you first consider studying overseas?

2. Did you consider studying in any other countries as an alternative to NZ?
   Yes  □
   No  □  (Please go to question 3)

   If yes, which countries did you consider studying in and why?

3. Why did you ultimately choose to study in NZ?

4. Did you receive any personal recommendations from friends or family regarding studying in or traveling to NZ?
   Yes  □
   No  □  (Please go to question 5)

   If yes, please briefly explain your answer

5. Had you visited NZ before you came here as a student?
   Yes  □
   No  □  (Please go to question 6)

   If yes, please explain briefly:

6. Why did you choose to study at the University of Canterbury instead of another NZ university?

7. How did you find information about the University of Canterbury?
   Internet search engine □
   UC website □
   Education fair/information session □
   Through your home university international exchange office □
   Friends/family recommendation □
   Other (please specify):
8. Please rate all of the following statements to indicate how important they were in your choice to study in NZ (1 = unimportant, 2 = less important, 3 = important, 4 = very important, 5 = extremely important)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Unimportant</th>
<th>Less Important</th>
<th>Important</th>
<th>Very Important</th>
<th>Extremely Important</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Greater availability of jobs after study abroad</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higher salary following study abroad</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To acquire academic skills</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To improve English language skills</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience of living in a foreign country</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availability of scholarships</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic fees scheme</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Influence of family/friends</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please specify)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Section 2: Experiences:

9. How would you rate your experience of studying in NZ:

- Extremely Positive
- Positive
- Neutral
- Negative
- Extremely Negative

10. What aspects of studying in NZ have you enjoyed the most?

11. What aspects of studying in NZ have you enjoyed the least?

12. What aspects of living in NZ have you enjoyed the most?

13. What aspects of living in NZ have you enjoyed the least?

14. How would you rate each of the following aspects of life in NZ compared to those in your own country? (1 = Better at home, 2 = About the same, 3 = Better in NZ)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aspect</th>
<th>Better at home</th>
<th>About the same</th>
<th>Better in NZ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Standard of living</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climate</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friendliness of people</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of education</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
15. Of the friends you have made in NZ, are they:

- Mostly the same nationality as you
- Mostly other international people
- Mostly New Zealanders

Please briefly explain your answer:

16. What problems have you encountered during your time in NZ?

17. Would you want to work or live in NZ in the future?

- Yes, permanently
- Yes, but only for a few months or years
- No

Please briefly explain your answer:

Section 3: Personal information

Nationality:

Gender:
- Male
- Female

Age:

When did you arrive in NZ to start your study?

How long is your course of study in NZ?
- 1 semester
- 1 year
- 2 years
- Greater than 2 years

What Department/Faculty are you studying in?

What level are you studying at?
- Post-graduate
- Undergraduate
Would you be willing to be contacted for a follow up interview regarding your experience in NZ? If yes, please provide contact details:

Thank you for your time.