

TRANS-TASMAN MIGRATION: NEW ZEALANDERS' EXPLANATIONS FOR
THEIR MOVE

Alison E. Green¹

Mary R. Power

Deannah M. Jang

Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences

Bond University, Queensland

Australia

Correspondence:

Alison Green

Griffith Institute for Higher Education

Gold Coast campus, Griffith University

Queensland 4222, Australia

Phone: +61 7 5592 7055

Fax: + 61 7 5552 8979

Email: UUa.green@griffith.edu.au

About the authors:

Ali Green, Senior Teaching Fellow, Mary Power, Associate Professor, and Deannah Jang, Teaching Fellow, Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, Bond University, Queensland.

¹ Now at Griffith University, Queensland, Australia

Abstract

This study investigates why New Zealanders move to Australia. A survey of New Zealanders living in Australia found “pull” factors, notably greater opportunities and better climate, were the most common reasons. While desire for change or sense of adventure was important, dissatisfaction with life in New Zealand was also a factor. Results indicated a form of transnationalism as migrants felt at home in both countries. They maintained links with New Zealand evident in support for New Zealand sporting teams, expressions of New Zealand nationality, emotional connection, and regular contact with New Zealand.

Key Words

Trans-Tasman migration, New Zealand, transnationalism, national identity

Please include macrons on the words:

Maori

Pakeha

Introduction

New Zealanders are highly mobile. Bedford, Ho and Hugo (2003) estimated that almost 20% of New Zealand's four million population lived overseas, mainly in Australia. In June 2006, an estimated 471,000 New Zealand citizensⁱ were living in Australia (Department of Immigration and Multicultural and Indigenous Affairs, 2007), making New Zealanders about 2% of the Australian population, and the second-largest overseas-born group in Australia after the British (Hugo, 2004). However, despite the implications for both societies, the interplay of factors motivating New Zealanders to move across the Tasman or the impact migration has on migrants' lives has not been emphasised in research studies.

Consequently, this paper examines attitudes, feelings and motivations underpinning the migration of New Zealanders to Australia and migrants' subsequent views of life there. It is based on data from 309 surveys of New Zealand migrants to Australia and 103 surveys of New Zealand "stayers"ⁱⁱ (non-migrants) with questions derived from themes uncovered in prior interviews with 31 migrants.

Much modern day migration between first world countries is not intended to be permanent. Many view the move as something they will "try for a while" (Gold, 1997, para. 7), in the knowledge they can return "home" at any time. Due to cheap air fares and improved communication technology migration does not necessarily mean separation from physical and communication ties with one's country of origin, particularly when the two countries are as close as New Zealand and Australia. Thus the concept of transnationalism, which recognises that many present day migrants remain in

close contact with their “homeland” and may be attached to and feel at home in two countries simultaneously (Glick-Schiller and Basch, 1995), is a particularly useful way of analysing the experience of New Zealanders in Australia.

Increasing numbers of New Zealanders living in Australia have led policy makers on both sides of the Tasman to express concerns about the effects of such mass migration (Khoo, 2002, Zodgekar, 2005) on the economies and the structures of both societies.

Trans-Tasman Migration

New Zealand and Australia enjoy close physical, historical, and cultural connections. Indeed, as New Zealanders are allowed to live and work in Australia without the need to obtain visas or qualify on skills-based or humanitarian grounds, some commentators describe trans-Tasman migration as somewhat like internal migration between areas of the one country (Hugo, 2004) if concepts of nationality, identity, and access to social welfare benefits are not considered. The movement of New Zealanders to Australia has increased during times of economic buoyancy in Australia relative to New Zealand (Khoo, 2002). Since the 1960s considerably more New Zealanders have moved to Australia with 62,742 Australian-bornⁱⁱⁱ resident in New Zealand in 2006 (Statistics New Zealand, 2007).

People sometimes become migrants by default when they keep living in the country to which they moved temporarily. Conversely, migrants intending to stay permanently sometimes return to their homeland. Thus it is difficult to provide accurate statistics on the number of New Zealand “migrants” in Australia. Official Australian sources

distinguish between arrivals as being “permanent” and “long term” (those who do not intend to stay permanently but intend to stay for more than 12 months) (Department of Immigration and Multicultural and Indigenous Affairs, 2007). The number of New Zealanders entering Australia with the intention of remaining for more than 12 months fluctuates from year to year. “Migration” peaked at 42,254 (combination of permanent and long term arrivals) in 2000-2001 as New Zealanders, forewarned of legislative changes in 2001 which no longer automatically gave New Zealanders Permanent Resident status moved across the Tasman in large numbers. Subsequently, this migration dropped to 16,364 in 2002-2003. Since then the numbers have increased (35,325 in 2005-2006) but not to the 2000-2001 level (Department of Immigration and Multicultural and Indigenous Affairs, 2007).

Factors Motivating People to Migrate

Economic Push–Pull Factors

Economic considerations are important in the migration decision and have been the most common focus of theorising (Massey et al., 2006). For example, the macro world systems theory (Wallerstein cited in Massey et al., 2006), focuses on the movement of labour from poorer economies to those with greater job opportunities and prospects of higher pay. At the micro-level, earning capacity is a key factor in the commonly cited “push-pull” model which analyses motivation to migrate according to factors which push potential immigrants to leave their home and those that pull them towards their destination (Lee, 1966).

Migration between first world countries typically involves moving to a more affluent first world country. Studies of Canadian migration to the United States suggest greater earning capacity and lower taxes in the United States have contributed to a “brain drain” of Canada’s “best and brightest” (Iqbal, 2000). Similarly, studies of Scottish, Irish, and Welsh migration to England suggest this was motivated both by scarcity of suitable jobs and higher rates of unemployment at home (Migration Watch UK, 2004).

Despite frequently expressed concerns that New Zealand loses its best and brightest to Australia, New Zealanders in Australia are representative of the entire New Zealand population and the highly educated and skilled are not over-represented (Hugo, 2004). However, earnings differentials between New Zealand and Australia are significant, with “real incomes” estimated to average 32% higher in Australia in 2006 (New Zealand Herald, 2006, May 13). Migration from New Zealand to Australia causes a loss of human resources in general; New Zealanders were moving at a rate of more than 600 a week in 2005-6. However, some economists argue that the movement of large numbers of New Zealanders to Australia has a positive effect on the New Zealand economy as New Zealanders tend to move in times of economic recession, thus reducing the number of jobless in New Zealand (Bushnell and Choy, 2001). Such migrants could return if the New Zealand economy improved.

Wider Push-Pull Factors

Along with economic considerations, cultural, environmental, family life cycle, quality of life, and social reasons are recognised as important factors in the migration decision. For example, migrants to Australia from the United Kingdom cited lifestyle benefits

more frequently than economic ones (Eccleston, 2006, February 4, Madden and Young, 1993). In addition, desire for greater personal development and satisfaction often underlie migration from one first world country to another (Conradson and Latham, 2005). The current study examined whether perceived personal satisfaction and lifestyle benefits such as the desire for change, sense of adventure, and opportunities afforded by a warmer climate were factors in New Zealanders' decisions to move to Australia.

Usefulness of Push-Pull Migration Model

The classic push-pull migration cause and effect model oversimplifies the migration decision-making process, overemphasises rational cost-benefit calculations, and fails to explain why people move from some economically disadvantaged countries and not others, why some people leave a country while others experiencing the same circumstances stay, and why some migrants subsequently return to their homeland. As Lee (1966), the originator of the push-pull theory, noted the migration decision is emotional as well as rational, and based on the potential migrant's imaginings about life in another country as well as the personality of potential migrants. In addition, push and pull factors are not always easily distinguishable. Job opportunities may be both push and pull factors. New Zealanders might simultaneously be pushed by limited job opportunities in New Zealand and pulled by perceived greater opportunities in Australia.

However, economic disparities between sending and receiving societies are common to most migration models and studies frequently consider push and pull factors in explaining migrants' reasons for relocating. As migrant interviewees in the current

study cited factors in both New Zealand and Australia among their reasons for moving to Australia, the push-pull model provides an effective broad categorisation of their reasons for migration as well as a useful framework with which to examine other analyses of motivations to migrate, such as Taylor's (1969) typology of dislocated, aspirational, and resultant migrants. Accordingly, in the current study an examination of push and pull factors is augmented by an assessment of the extent to which principles of transnationalism apply to trans-Tasman migrants.

The data summarised above led to the following hypotheses:

Hypothesis 1: New Zealand migrants to Australia will be more motivated by pull factors than push factors or personal satisfaction factors.

Hypothesis 2: Economic factors will be more important than lifestyle factors as reasons for migration.

Satisfaction Level

Migrants responding primarily to pull factors are not forced migrants. They tend to be in comfortable circumstances in their country of origin and contribute human capital of skills and education in their adopted homeland in contrast with less advantaged migrants responding primarily to push factors whose immediate contribution may be less positive (Lee, 1966). Refugees or those dislocated by war are obviously pushed to migrate. Less obviously, dissatisfaction at home can push migrants to seek a potentially more satisfying location. Lee (1966) suggested that migrants who had been dissatisfied with aspects of at home were likely to be less satisfied in their new country than those who did not leave out of dissatisfaction. This led to the following hypothesis:

Hypothesis 3: Migrants to Australia dissatisfied with aspects of life in New Zealand will be less satisfied with life in Australia than migrants who did not express dissatisfaction with New Zealand.

In contrast, in a study of British migrants to New Zealand Zodgekar (1990) argued that people who are satisfied in their country of origin do not migrate. He found a “migration threshold” which was acted on only when dissatisfaction had built up to a crucial level. Emigration was motivated by the migrant feeling insecure and inadequate in their original setting (Zodgekar, 1990). This research led to the following hypothesis:

Hypothesis 4: Migrants will express more dissatisfaction with life in New Zealand than “stayers”.

Effect of Personality Characteristics on Decision to Migrate

Taylor (1969) categorised migrants as “dislocated”, “aspirers”, or “resultant”.

Dislocated, migrants are motivated to migrate to be reunited with family members who have already emigrated. Aspirers migrate because of overall dissatisfaction with how they have been doing. Resultant migrants are pressured by their situation to move and take advantage of opportunities to migrate without much prior consideration.

“Dislocated” and “aspirers” are motivated by pull factors and “resultant” by push factors.

People who are ambitious, innovative and diligent are considered likely to migrate from countries undervaluing their skills to countries valuing them more highly (Freeman, 1999). After considering Taylor's categorisation into dislocated, aspirers and resultant Boneva and Frieze (2001) proposed a set of personality characteristics that differentiated migrants from those who stayed in their country of origin, arguing that secondary migrants (those who migrated to be reunited with family members) would have higher affiliation motivation and family centrality than primary migrants (those making the initial decision to leave their country of origin). Boneva and Frieze argued that primary migrants were more work-oriented, had higher achievement and power motivations and lower affiliation motivation and family centrality than those who chose to stay at home.

New Zealand's two main cultural groupings, Maori and Pakeha^{iv}, have differing identities. While Maori differ in the extent to which they identify with traditional values (Fitzgerald et al., 2000), they are usually categorised as "collectivist" on Hofstede's (1980) "individualist-collectivist" continuum, while Hofstede categorised New Zealanders in general as highly individualistic. Thus Maori (collectivist) migrants to Australia might be expected to have higher affiliation motivation and family centrality than Pakeha (individualist) leading to the following hypothesis:

Hypothesis 5: Maori will be more likely than Pakeha to be "secondary" or "dislocated" migrants

Effect of Age and Life Stage

Age and life stage of migrants can influence migration decisions. Migration may occur in response to lifestage events such as marriage, divorce, changes in employment and retirement. While young people might see migration as an adventure and source of excitement and be attracted to the “bright lights” of big cities, as found in the case of young Scottish people moving to England (McCrone, 2005), older people might value family connections and interpersonal relationships and be expected to fear loss of those connections in migration. Accordingly, the current study examined whether New Zealanders’ reasons for moving to Australia differed depending on their age and lifestage.

Hypothesis 6: Age and life stage of migrants will influence reasons for moving to Australia (expected differences between age groups are elaborated in Results section).

Transnationalism Connections

The concept of transnationalism describing immigrants who build, maintain and reinforce multiple and constant economic, social and emotional interconnections with more than one country, whose personal and working lives involve “multiple & constant interconnections across international borders” (Glick-Schiller and Basch, 1995, p. 48), and who “remain intensely involved in the life of their country of origin” (Gold, 1997, p. 20) is relevant to the current study. Transnationalism was examined in relation to the “attachments” and “connections” New Zealanders living in Australia have with both countries. Kelly (2003) described transnationalism as a transient state which was part of the settlement process. Accordingly, this study examined the effect of length of time in Australia on migrants’ attachment to and contact with New Zealand.

Hypothesis 7: Length of time resident in Australia will reduce migrants' attachment to and contact with New Zealand.

Hypothesis 8: Migrants who had lived in Australia for 11 or more years will be more likely to have expanded their perception of "home" to include both Australia and New Zealand than those who had lived in Australia for 0-2 years.

Method

A survey was developed from key themes identified from interviews with 31 New Zealanders living in Australia. Data from 309 surveys of New Zealand migrants to Australia was analysed along with data from a comparison survey of 103 non-migrant New Zealanders with family or close friends who lived in Australia

Interviews with New Zealand Migrants to Australia

The first phase of the research used in-depth semi-structured interviews to view decisions and experiences from migrant perspectives. Interviewees were encouraged to tell their own stories through the interviewer saying "Tell me how you came to be in Australia". Interviews included questions about the similarities and differences between Australians and New Zealanders and interviewees' views on living in Australia. This phase of the study was confined to Pakeha and Maori New Zealanders as New Zealanders with, for example, Pacific Island or Asian origins may have dual national identities. Interviewees lived in South East Queensland and northern New South Wales. Efforts were made to access a diverse range of New Zealanders who varied in age,

length of time in Australia, part of New Zealand they migrated from, occupation, socio-economic background and experience of other countries.

Australian Survey

The survey's 29 questions asked about reasons for moving to Australia, maintenance of ties with New Zealand, current national identification, how migration had changed them, likelihood of returning permanently to New Zealand, and overall satisfaction with life in Australia. Survey respondents indicated their reasons for moving to Australia from a list of 18 factors generated from responses provided in migrant interviews and were also given the opportunity to add other factors.

The survey was distributed during 2005 to New Zealanders who moved to Australia as adults through convenience and snowball sampling. Of 633 surveys distributed, 320 (51%) were returned, with 309 included in the results (adult migrants to New Zealand were excluded as they may have had dual cultural and national identities). The majority (89%) were distributed to New Zealanders living in South-East Queensland, with small numbers sent to other Australian States. While more New Zealanders reside in Queensland than any other State (36% compared with 30% in New South Wales in 2001 (Hugo, 2004)), it is recognised that different locations within Australia may attract migrants for different reasons. Table 1 below summarises both migrant (309) and stayer (103) survey respondent characteristics.

New Zealand Survey

A survey of stayers asked parallel questions to those asked in the migrant survey. Response rate was 65% (103) of 158 surveys distributed. Of 103 survey respondents (69% with immediate family in Australia, 31% with either or both members of their wider family) ninety-five percent had visited or lived in Australia and 41% had lived in countries other than Australia and New Zealand.

INSERT TABLE 1 HERE

Methodological Limitations

Results from this survey are indicative of trends only as the sample is not representative of New Zealanders in Australia. More extensive studies of trans-Tasman migration are needed as this study's conclusions and generalisations are limited by the lack of a publicly available database of potential participants. In addition, comparisons made between the two surveys cannot be generalised because of the sampling limitations mentioned above and those acknowledged below:

- Women were over-represented. Women represent 49% of New Zealand migrants (Department of Immigration and Multicultural and Indigenous Affairs, 2003), and were 61% of migrant interviewees, 58% of migrant survey respondents, and 68% of stayer survey respondents.
- Stayers comprised both New Zealanders who had always lived in New Zealand (59% of survey respondents), and those who had returned to New Zealand after living elsewhere. Having two separate and larger groups of New Zealand respondents, stayers and returnees, would have been preferable.

- The two surveys differed in number of participants (103 in the stayer sample; 309 in the Australian survey), age composition (64% of the stayer sample was 45 or older compared with 44% in migrant survey), and proportion who had lived outside Australasia (41% in the stayer sample: 29% in migrant survey).
- The number of reasons for their migration presented by migrant interviewees varied widely. Although from a statistical point of view it would have been preferable to ask survey participants to rank these 18 reasons it was judged that the task of would prove difficult and a deterrence to survey completion.

Results

Quotations from migrant interviewees provide anecdotal support and add a qualitative flavour to the quantitative analysis.

H1: Relative Importance of Pull, Push, and Personal Satisfaction Factors

There was a ton of work over here and they paid you better. (*Mother of three school age children, referring to husband's wages as a psychiatric nurse*)

And the weather of course. I love the Queensland winters, with their nice sunny days. (*Man in mid-20s, from Wellington*)

Survey respondents were asked to choose as many as applied from 18 reasons for moving to Australia including nine pull factors, four push factors, and five personal satisfaction factors (see Table 2 below). The pull factor was significantly more

motivating than the push factor ($Z(n=309) = 4.988, p < .001$), with pull factor rank = 143.98 and push factor rank = 136.69 (Wilcoxon Signed Ranks Test).

The Friedman Ranks Test was employed to test the relative importance of push, pull, and personal satisfaction factors. There were significant differences between the three factors ($p < .001$). Pull factors (mean rank = 2.28) were higher than personal satisfaction factors (mean rank = 1.91) with push factors (mean rank = 1.81) the lowest.

INSERT TABLE 2 HERE

H2: *Relative Importance of Economic and Lifestyle Factors*

Jobs were so easy to get. (*Semi-skilled man in mid-20s*)

A lot of fellas come over and they get a job straight away. ... They can step off the plane, next day into a job. (*Maori^v man in late 30s*)

Among the 18 reasons for moving to Australia from which respondents could select were four economic factors (relating to greater opportunities and a higher standard of living) and four lifestyle factors (relating to Australia's climate and family members, or a partner, resident in Australia). Economic factors were significantly more important than lifestyle factors ($Z(n=309) = 6.174, p < .001$), with economic factor rank = 109.64 and lifestyle factor rank = 92.40 (Wilcoxon Signed Ranks Test).

H3: *Level of Satisfaction with Australia of Migrants Dissatisfied with Aspects of Life in New Zealand*

[Living in Australia] puts us in an environment where there are much greater opportunities for Maoris. ... It gets us away from all that Maori bashing. ... The Maori community in which we were raised was involved in a lot of ... protest ... didn't want any more to do with that. (*Maori man aged 60, resident in Australia for 16 years*)

The main reason we came was the racism in New Zealand. It was awful ... I was sick of going places and being intimidated ... [Here] I can go out at night with my family and feel safe. ... In New Zealand ... I was intimidated ... every day. (*35-year-old man talking about being a young male in a town where a third of the population was Maori*)

Respondents were categorised into two groups; “dissatisfied” (those who had indicated one or more of “social problems in NZ society”, “political problems in NZ”, and “dissatisfied with other aspects of life in NZ” as reasons for moving to Australia) and “not dissatisfied” (those who had not nominated any of the above as factors in the decision to move to Australia). “Satisfaction” with Australia was measured by answers to the question “How satisfied are you with life in Australia?” on a Likert scale of one to five. There was no significant difference in satisfaction scores for “dissatisfied” ($M = 1.87$, $SD = 1.134$), and “not dissatisfied” ($M = 2.08$, $SD = 1.287$; $t(307) = 1.38$, n.s.) on an independent-samples t-test used to compare satisfaction for these two groups. The

magnitude of the difference in the means was very small ($\eta^2 = .006$). The hypothesis was not supported.

H4: Migrants and Stayers' Relative Satisfaction with Life in New Zealand

We were tired of the political correctness. ... You can't get groups who have had an incredible payout at the expense of the whole country ... saying we want more. ... We were sick of being made to feel guilty about something beyond our control. (*Migrant: woman in early 40s, resident in Australia for four years*)

I love the Maori background ... if we can get it settled. ... If we can be adult enough to look at what happened and realise there was a lot of wrong doing. ... If you could take the best out of Maori culture and mix it with the other cultures ... it is a unique country. (*Stayer: woman aged 66, immigrated to New Zealand from Scotland in late 1950s*)

The stayers' survey asked respondents to indicate what was attractive about Australia by choosing as many as applied of 16 options. To compare stayer and migrant responses, dissatisfaction was measured by the number of stayers who chose one or more of: "social problems in NZ society", "political problems in New Zealand", and "dissatisfied with other aspects of life in New Zealand". The migrants' dissatisfaction score was significantly higher than that of stayers (Mann-Whitney U, $Z=5.166$, $p < .001$), with migrants rank = 220.48 and stayers rank = 164.55.

H5: *Proportion of Maori and Pakeha who were “Secondary” Migrants (migrated to be reunited with family)*

Son-in-law came first. My brother moved. ... We were the last of our family to come. ... My daughter who was already here had breast cancer. ... We came to be with her. ... All live close to one another, within 15 minutes of each other.

(Maori woman in late 50s whose eight children, their partners and children, had all moved to the Gold Coast)

Of all respondents 51% had family members living in Australia when they moved there. However, only 30% of respondents indicated that this was a reason for their migration (see Table 2). Of that 30% there was no difference between Maori and Pakeha. This hypothesis was not supported (Contingency Chi-Square Test, $\chi^2(2, n=301) = .339$, $p=.844$).

H6: *Effect of Age and Life Stage*

It was hypothesised the 18-24 age group would be more likely to have moved for “sense of adventure”, “stepping stone to further travel”, and “came temporarily and decided to stay”. The 35-44 age group was expected to be more likely to have moved for: “better future for self and/or children”, “job offer”, “more job opportunities”, and “better standard of living”, and the 55+ age group to have moved because of “family in Australia”.

Chi-square tests revealed statistically significant results for four of these factors:

- 35-44 year olds were most likely to come to Australia for “better future for self and/or children” ($\chi^2(4,n=309) = 24.944, p<.001$).
- As expected the 35-44 age group was likely to come to Australia for “more job opportunities”, at 5.2 raw score values higher than expected with 53% of this age group choosing this option. However, more job opportunities were also important for 53% of the 18-24 age group, at 7.6 raw score values higher than expected, while it was unimportant for those aged 55 and over at 10.1 raw scores lower than expected with 0% ($\chi^2(4,n=309) = 23.390, p<.001$).
- 18-24 year olds were most likely to have come “temporarily and decided to stay”, at 6.9 raw score values more than expected with 22% of this age group choosing this option ($\chi^2(4,n=309) = 11.848, p=.019$).
- 35-44 age group were most likely to come for “job offer” or “job transfer”, at 4.9 raw score values more than expected with 25% of this age group choosing this option, while the raw score for the 18-24 age group was 7.0 values lower than expected ($\chi^2(4,n=309) = 11.333, p=.023$).

There was no significant difference between age groups for “sense of adventure”, “stepping stone to further travel”, “better standard of living”, and “family in Australia”.

H7: Maintenance of Social and Emotional Ties with New Zealand over Time

Attachment was measured by asking respondents where most of their closest friends were from, who they supported when Australia played New Zealand at sport, whether their heart (emotional attachment) was mostly in Australia or New Zealand, and how they would describe their nationality if travelling outside Australia or New Zealand.

Chi-square tests revealed significant support for hypothesis seven:

- More of the closest friends of respondents who had lived in Australia for 0-2 years were from New Zealand than those who had lived in Australia for 11 or more years ($\chi^2(6, n=307) = 21.575, p=.001$).
- Respondents who had lived in Australia for 3-10 years were more likely to support New Zealand when Australia played New Zealand in sport at 8.3 raw score values higher than expected, while the raw score value for those who had lived in Australia for 11 or more years was 8.9 raw score values lower than expected ($\chi^2(4, n=302) = 14.050 p=.007$).
- Respondents who had lived in Australia for up to 10 years were more likely to say their heart (emotional attachment) was mostly in New Zealand than those who had lived in Australia for 11 or more years ($\chi^2(4, n=301) = 15.429 p=.004$).
- Respondents who had lived in Australia for up to 10 years were more likely to describe themselves as a New Zealander if travelling to a country outside Australia or New Zealand than those who had lived in Australia for 11 or more years ($\chi^2(2, n=303) = 37.344 p<.001$).

Contact with New Zealand was measured by asking respondents how many visitors they had from New Zealand and how often they were in phone and email contact with New Zealand.

Chi-square tests revealed a statistically significant association for these factors:

- Respondents who had lived in Australia for 3-10 years were likely to have had more visitors from New Zealand than those who had lived in Australia for 0-2 years and 11 or more years ($\chi^2 (8, n=307) = 41.770, p < .001$).
- Respondents who had lived in Australia for up to 10 years were more likely to make regular phone calls (at least fortnightly), while those who had lived in Australia for 11 or more were less likely to make regular phone calls ($\chi^2 (10, n=307) = 32.804, p < .001$).
- Respondents who had lived in Australia for up to 10 years were more likely to make regular email contact, while those who had lived in Australia for 11 or more years were less likely to make regular email contact ($\chi^2 (12, n=307) = 33.098, p < .001$).

H8: Expanded Perception of “Home”

This hypothesis was supported. Using Chi-square tests there was a statistically significant difference between groups who had been in Australia 0-2 years and those who had been there for eleven or more years ($\chi^2 (6, n=307) = 39.714, p < .001$). Respondents who had lived in Australia for 0-2 years were more likely to see themselves as belonging in New Zealand (53%), at 16.2 raw score values higher than expected. Those who had lived in Australia for 3-10 years were more likely to see themselves as belonging in both countries (48%) at 7.8 raw score values higher than expected, while those who had lived in Australia for 11 or more years were more likely to see themselves as belonging in Australia (43%), at 13.7 raw score values higher than expected.

Maori respondents were more likely than New Zealanders in general to see themselves as belonging in New Zealand (56% compared with 28% for all respondents), and less likely to see themselves as belonging in both countries (32% compared with 42% for all respondents) or in Australia (12% compared with 30% for all respondents).

Discussion

Results from this study demonstrate the complexity of the migration decision when people move to another very similar, highly familiar culture in which almost a third had lived previously.

This study supports previous migration research in that it shows that New Zealand migrants to Australia were influenced by economic factors in their decisions to migrate, and that migrants were more likely to be dissatisfied with New Zealand than stayers. However, New Zealand migrants to Australia are not forced from their homeland. Factors that attract them to Australia are stronger than those that push them from New Zealand. They move to Australia because they find it attractive and perceive it to have opportunities not available in New Zealand. However, ambivalence about leaving New Zealand may be a factor in causing some migrants to return home.

Findings from this study indicate, as suggested by other authors, that the “push-pull” model incompletely describes the motivations of those who migrate from one first world country to another and those who are not necessarily either pushed or pulled, but instead, motivated by such things as a desire for a change or for more adventure in their lives.

Contrary to expectations, New Zealanders dissatisfied with aspects of life in New Zealand were just as satisfied with life in Australia as those who expressed no dissatisfaction. Data from interviews suggested one cause of dissatisfaction for both Maori and Pakeha migrants was racial tension in New Zealand (10 out of 31 interviewees volunteered this as a factor in their decision to relocate). These interviewees saw themselves as more able to be themselves, free of stereotypes, infighting, and “political correctness” in Australia.

Family ties were important for many migrants. While some interviewees suggested that Maori migration was influenced by networks and kinship ties, Maori in the survey did not differ significantly from other New Zealanders in the proportion that moved to Australia to be reunited with family. Maori were as likely as other New Zealanders to move for perceived economic benefits suggesting that Maori migrants to Australia are as work and achievement oriented as other New Zealand migrants.

While some expectations regarding age-related reasons for moving to Australia were supported, there were few clear-cut differences between age groups. A “sense of adventure”, expected to be a motivator for 18 to 24-year-olds, was more of a motivator for 35 to 54-year-olds who reported that the move to Australia, boosted their self-image by enabling them to “get out of a rut” and making them feel adventurous.

Overall, the results show a form of transnationalism (42% of respondents felt at home in both Australia and New Zealand). However, as expected, the data shows that that after

being resident in Australia for more than 10 years this transnational identity was replaced by a closer connection with Australia. These data support the view that transnationalism is a transitional state (Kelly, 2003). However, the study's participants maintained pride in their identity as New Zealanders. Loyalty to New Zealand was particularly strong among self-identified Maori. In addition, interviewees saw themselves as contributing significantly to their new country through their strong New Zealand work ethic.

The findings of this study could now be investigated further with a more comprehensive sample. Such a study that further considered the contribution of New Zealanders to Australian society and effects of the 2001 legislative changes on the long-term commitment of New Zealand migrants to Australia and its impact on the skills base and economies of both countries would assist planners and policy-makers on both sides of the Tasman.

New Zealanders choose to move to Australia, which they see as having similar values, attitudes, and history to their own country. In this study of the attitudes, feelings and motivations underpinning New Zealanders' migration to Australia and migrants' subsequent experiences New Zealanders were highly satisfied with their decision to relocate.

References

- Bedford, R., Ho, E. & Hugo, G. (2003) Trans-Tasman migration in context: Recent flows of New Zealanders revisited. *People and Place*, 11, 53-62.
- Bushnell, P. & Choy, W. K. (2001) Treasury Working Paper 01/07: "Go west, young man, go west!?" <http://www.treasury.govt.nz/workingpapers/2001/twp01-7.pdf>
- Conradson, D. & Latham, A. (2005) Friendship, networks and transnationality in a world city: Antipodean transmigrants in London. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 31, 287-305.
- Department of Immigration and Multicultural and Indigenous Affairs (2003) Community information summary: The New Zealand born community <http://www.immi.gov.au/statistics/infosummary.source.htm>
- Department of Immigration and Multicultural and Indigenous Affairs (2007) Population Flows: Immigration Aspects 2005-6 Edition, Chapter 4: New Zealand movement www.immi.gov.au/media/publications/statistics/popflows2005-6/Ch4.pdf
- Eccleston, R. (2006, February 4) Australia bound: Why Brits are relocating here in numbers not seen since the days of the ten-pound Pom: The British are coming. *The Australian Magazine*. Melbourne.
- Fitzgerald, E., Durie, M., Black, T., Taiapa, J., Durie, A., Christensen, I., Forster, M. & Rolls, R. (2000) Maori in New Zealand: Identity and diverse realities. Te Hoe Nuku Roa Research Team, Department of Maori Studies, Massey University, Palmerston North: NZ.
- Freeman, G. P. (1999) The quest for skill: A comparative analysis. In Bernstein, A. & Weiner, M. (Eds.) *Migration and refugee policies*. London, Continuum.

- Glick-Schiller, N. & Basch, L. (1995) From immigrant to transmigrant: Theorizing transnational migration. *Anthropological Quarterly*, 68, 48-63.
- Gold, S. (1997) Transnationalism and vocabularies of motive in international migration: The case of Israelis in the United States. *Sociological Perspectives*, 40, 409-427.
- Hofstede, G. (1980) *Culture's consequences: International differences in work-related values*, Beverly Hills, CA, Sage.
- Hugo, G. (2004) New Zealanders in Australia in 2001. *New Zealand Population Review*, 30, 61-92.
- Iqbal, M. (2000) The migration of high-skilled workers from Canada to the United States: Empirical evidence and economic reasons www.ccis-ucsd.org/PUBLICATIONS
- Kelly, P. (2003) Canadian-Asian transnationalism. *The Canadian Geographer*, 47, 209-218.
- Khoo, S.-E. (2002) Immigration issues in Australia. *Joint Special Issue of the Journal of Population Research and the New Zealand Population Review*, 67-78.
- Lee, E. (1966) A theory of migration. *Demography*, 3, 47-57.
- Madden, R. & Young, S. (1993) *Women and men immigrating to Australia: Their characteristics and immigration decisions*, Canberra, Australian Government Publishing Service.
- Massey, D., Arango, J., Hugo, G., Kouaouci, A., Pellegrino, A. & Taylor, E. (2006) Theories of international migration: A review and appraisal. In Messina, A. & Lahav, G. (Eds.) *The migration reader: Exploring politics and policies*. Boulder, CA, Lynne Rienner Publishers.

Mccrone, D. (2005) Young people and labour mobility: Summary of findings The Institute of Governance, University of Edinburgh Web Site: http://www.institute-of-governance.org/forum/Leverhulme/summaries/yp_mobility_summary.html

Migration Watch Uk (2004) Migration into Scotland
www.migrationwatch.org/pdfs/Other/10_3_MigrationintoScotland.pdf

New Zealand Herald (2006, May 13) Budgeting to beat the brain drain. The Factiva database.

Statistics New Zealand (2007) QuickStats about culture and identity
<http://www.stats.govt.nz/census/2006-census-data/quickstats-about-culture-identity/quickstats-about-culture-and-identity.htm>

Taylor, R. (1969) Migration and motivation: A study of determinants and types. In Jackson, J. A. (Ed.) *Migration*. Cambridge, UK, Cambridge University Press.

Zodgekar, A. (1990) British emigrants to New Zealand: Their motives and expectations. *International Migration*, 28, 417-441.

Zodgekar, A. (2005) The changing face of New Zealand's population and national identity. In Liu, J., Mccreanor, T., Mcintosh, T. & Teaiwa, T. (Eds.) *New Zealand identities: Departures and destinations*. Wellington, Victoria University Press.

ⁱ Comprised of New Zealand-born (389,466 at 2006 Census) and New Zealand citizens born overseas of which Australian-born children of New Zealand-born parents are the largest group (Hugo, 2004).

ⁱⁱ The term “stayer” is used as a shorthand way of referring to participants who lived in New Zealand because the term non-migrant places an unintended value on migration.

ⁱⁱⁱ This figure includes Australian-born children of returning New Zealanders as well as Australians moving to New Zealand.

^{iv} The term Pakeha is used in this article as a shorthand way of distinguishing New Zealanders of European extraction from self-identified Maori, although it is recognised it has negative connotations for some New Zealanders.

^v Quotations from interviewees which have been labeled Maori were from those participants who self-identified as Maori.

Tables

Table 1

Migrant and Stayer Survey Characteristics Expressed in Percentages

	Migrants		Stayers	
Sex	Male	42	Male	32
	Female	58	Female	68
Ethnic identity	Pakeha/ Caucasian	81	Pakeha/ Caucasian	82
	Maori	11	Maori	12
	Both Pakeha & Maori	5	Both Pakeha & Maori	4
	Pacific Islander	3	Other Ethnicities	2
Lived outside	Yes	29	Yes	41
Australia & New Zealand	No	71	No	59
Age when surveyed	18-24	4	18-24	8
	25-34	19	25-34	17
	35-44	33	35-44	11
	45-54	22	45-54	28
	55+	22	55+	36
Age on arrival	18-24	27		
	25-34	33		
	35-44	20		
	45-54	12		
	55+	8		
Years in Australia	0-2	21		
	3-5	18		
	6-10	27		
	11+	34		
Lived in Australia more that once	Yes	28		
	No	72		

Table 2

Percentage of Respondents Who Selected Various Factors as Reasons for Moving to Australia, Classified into Pull, Personal Satisfaction and Push Factors

Pull Factors	Percentage
Better climate in Australia	58
Better future for self and/or children	49
More job opportunities in Australia	44
Better standard of living in Australia	34
Family members living in Australia	30
Job transfer or job offer in Australia	17
Like Australians	9
Had/met partner in Australia	7
Larger population in Australia	6
Personal Satisfaction Factors	
Wanted a change	46
Sense of adventure	34
Came temporarily & decided to stay	14
Stepping stone to further travel	7
Came with partner, wasn't my choice	6
Push Factors	
Circumstances had caused a crossroads in life	23
Social problems in NZ society	23
Dissatisfied with other aspects of life in NZ	20
Political problems in NZ	16