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Sustaining and creating migration chains among skilled immigrant groups: Chinese, Indians and South Africans in New Zealand

Abstract: The concept of chain migration has played a central role in the study of international migration over several decades. Recent developments in the ease of movement and international transmission of information may have made the social networks that are at the heart of such migration redundant, especially for skilled individuals and their households. To investigate this claim, a small panel study of recent migrants to New Zealand from China, India and South Africa is used to explore both the importance of social networks in promoting their moves and their subsequent involvement in encouraging and assisting family and friends to join them. The findings show that most of their moves did not involve the typical chain migration process, but the participants who remained in the study for the full five years assisted on average 1.25 others to move to New Zealand also.
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A classic paper by MacDonald and MacDonald (1964) identified two separate international migration streams – chain migration and impersonally organized migration. This provided the template for much subsequent research on chain migration, defined as ‘that movement in which prospective migrants learn of opportunities, are provided with transportation, and have initial accommodation and employment arranged by means of primary social relationships with previous migrants’ (MacDonald and MacDonald, 1964: 82: their emphasis). The importance of such migration has subsequently been identified in a large volume of research, with Boyd (1989: 638), for example, summarising a wide-ranging review with the statement that ‘Family, friendship and community networks underlie much of the recent migration to industrial nations’ (see also Massey et al, 1993).

One of the main findings of research set in this framework is the role of positive feedback. Movers who are satisfied with conditions experienced in their new country of residence, and who thus intend to remain there (for significant periods, if not permanently), are more likely to sponsor relatives, friends and neighbours to join them than are those who are less satisfied with the experience (see, for example, Khoo, 2001, 2003, on recent migrants to Australia; Shah and Menon, 1999, on migrants to Kuwait; Liu et al, 1989, on Filipinos in the United States; and Burholt, 2004, on Asians in Birmingham, UK). The result is that ‘Once begun, migration flows often become self-sustaining, reflecting the establishment of networks of information, assistance and obligations’ (Boyd, 1989: 641).

The empirical focus of MacDonald and MacDonald’s (1964) paper and much subsequent research has been on the social networks underpinning migration flows involving people in relatively low-status occupational groups, both past (Moretti,
1999; Price, 1963; Wegge, 1998) and present (Lever-Tracy and Holton, 2001; Chamberlain, 1999). Some of this research has been concerned with links between chain migration and the creation of ethnic enclaves in the recipient cities, as well as what Goering (1989) termed the potential ‘explosiveness’ of chain migration as a mechanism for increasing migrant flows. Less attention has been paid to the role of chains in the movements of those from higher status backgrounds, who make up a considerable and increasing proportion of contemporary international flows (Grillo, 2000). These individuals, it could be argued, are better able to access and evaluate information from impersonal sources, and are less likely to need either the information or the sponsorship and material assistance which is common to the chain migration networks analysed. It may be, therefore, that such higher-status migrant groups are characteristic of what Boyd (1989: 655) identifies as those within which ‘personal networks fail to emerge’. Furthermore, relevant information about the destination is now much easier for potential migrants to access than it was even a few decades ago, and prior visits to the potential country of destination are feasible for those with the available resources. (see Voigt-Graf, 2004, on migrant ‘transnational spaces’ and the ‘collection of dispersed but connected migrant communities’ – p. 45 – that she identified with Punjabi, Kannadiga and Indo-Fijian migrant groups in Australia.)

In this context, and as an initial exploration of the contemporary relevance of the chain migration model to socio-economic groups other than those most frequently studied, therefore, this paper takes advantage of a detailed panel study of three groups of skilled migrants from very different cultural backgrounds (the People’s Republic of China, India and South Africa) who moved to New Zealand in the late 1990s. These migrants were interviewed on five occasions over the period 1998-2002, using questionnaires that explored not only the situation regarding their own moves but also the degree to which they maintained contacts with social networks of kin and friends in their home countries and both encouraged and assisted members of those networks to join them in New Zealand. Using these data, we are able to establish how many of those skilled migrants used social networks in ways suggested by the chain migration model when they moved to New Zealand, and also how many, and with what intensity, stimulated further immigration through contacts retained in their home countries – both generally and among the three groups of migrants who were from very different national-cultural backgrounds. The generally positive responses to those questions suggests the desirability of deploying the chain migration model within the growing literature on migration and transnationalism.

The data

The data used in this paper come from a study of 107 recent immigrants and their families to New Zealand. The principal applicants (36 each from China and India and 35 from South Africa) were the main source of the data;¹ the great majority of them

¹ 81 of the original participants were male and 26 female; the percentage female was 33 among the Chinese participants, 20 among the South Africans and 19 among the Indians. The three countries were selected because they were the most prominent extra-European sources of migrants when the study was initiated, China having replaced Taiwan after a change in the immigration policy and recommendations in October 1995. The choice also reflected a desire to contrast those from English- and non-English-speaking backgrounds, as well as between ‘traditional’ and ‘non-traditional’ sources in terms of cultural background.
were approved for entry and residence under the ‘General Skills’ category of the immigration regulations introduced in 1995 (New Zealand Immigration Service, 1995) with the remainder approved under similar regulations introduced in 1991 (New Zealand Immigration Service, 1991). They were assessed using a points system which emphasised age, educational qualifications, work experience and the capacity to settle. Though not awarded points, proficiency in the English language was also taken into account, especially after October 1995 (Henderson et al., 1997). All took up permanent residence in New Zealand between late July 1997 and the end of July 1998. Most went to Auckland, the country’s major metropolitan area, with a few to the capital city, Wellington.

Panel selection involved two mechanisms: the South Africans plus some of those from India were recruited through a letter inviting them to participate; the remaining Indians and all but five of the Chinese, were recruited by advertising, network contacts and snowball sampling. Following the initial interview in 1998, usually within three months of taking up residence, four further annual interviews were conducted over the period 1999-2002. The retention rate was high, with 80 of the initial 107 participants interviewed in the final wave – comprising 86 per cent of the South Africans, 72 per cent of the Indians and 67 per cent of the Chinese. A decision either to return to the ‘home country’ or onward migration, rather than the loss of contact or refusal to continue as a participant, accounted for the bulk of panel attrition.

Few of the participants already had relatives in New Zealand when they first arrived there – 13 of the South Africans but only 7 of the Indians and 5 of the Chinese. In only three of these cases were those relatives immediate family members (parents, children); most were siblings or more distant relatives. A majority of all three groups had friends in New Zealand (64 per cent of the total), however, and 17 participants (11 of whom were South Africans) had business contacts. The reasons for moving varied considerably. The South Africans moved overwhelmingly for political or institutional reasons and to improve their children’s prospects, whereas the Chinese and Indians were more likely to express dissatisfaction with their home environment and with the opportunities and challenges there. New Zealand was chosen by participants in all three groups because of its opportunities, its lifestyle and culture, the prospects for children, and for the environment.

The survey involved five substantial questionnaires that were typically administered in face-to-face interviews. Each collected personal data about the migrant and other

---

2 Under the 1995 immigration regulations, possession of a degree at bachelor’s level or above is a key issue: 94 per cent of the Chinese and Indians had such a qualification (in engineering for most of the Chinese), as did 66 per cent of the South Africans.

3 The letter was sent out with the assistance of the New Zealand Immigration Service.

4 The majority of Chinese and Indians who left New Zealand returned to their home countries, with only a minority (1 Chinese out of 10 and 2 Indians out of 5) proceeding to Australia. Three of the 4 South Africans known to have left New Zealand proceeded to Australia, however, and the fourth could not be traced back to South Africa.

5 These two sets of figures suggest that some at least of the migrants – especially those from China and India – may have been ‘scouts’ making initial evaluations of New Zealand for their families, but that few of them, because they had friends and business contacts there, had no personal contacts already in the country. Only 27 of the 107 respondents at wave 1 of the survey had neither relatives nor friends already in New Zealand: 13 of these were Indians, 8 Chinese and 6 South Africans.
resident members of her/his household, together with information about housing, language, qualifications, employment, social participation and general health. In addition, the first questionnaire had a long section on the immigration process, and each subsequent questionnaire had a section on ‘relatives, friends, visits and migration’.

These data offer a considerable amount of information relevant to an exploration of the importance of social networks. Because they are part of a panel study, in which contact was maintained with a majority of those originally contacted throughout the data collection period of four years (five waves of interviews), they give information not only on contacts in New Zealand prior to moving there and the maintenance of contacts within the ‘home country’ for a period of time after arrival, but also on housing, employment, social participation and health for a number of years. As a consequence, the respondents’ evaluation of their move – and how that is passed back to relatives and friends – is more than instantaneous and does not just represent their reactions soon after arrival. Further, because the ‘samples’ were tightly controlled to cover migrants from three origins, together comprising a relatively homogeneous group meeting the criteria for entry under a specific set of regulations, contrasts within the ‘sample’ (notably among the three separate groups by country-of-origin) are more readily made than would be the case with a more open-ended selection procedure. As with most such studies, a longer time period and a larger sample would have been desirable, but the size and length of the data-collection phase of the research was very much constrained by available funding. The result is a very valuable data set which allows a number of important topics to be explored, as a foundation for further research – both regarding the importance of chain migration to New Zealand for this particular type of migrant and differences within that type according to country of origin/cultural background.

**Arrival, Contacts with the Home Country and Sponsoring Others**

**Getting to New Zealand**

Only one-quarter of the immigrants had been to New Zealand prior to moving there. Some 40 per cent of the South Africans had previously visited the country, however, approximately the same percentage as were actually in the country (14 of the 35) – either visiting or working – when they applied for permanent residence (Table 1). By contrast, just 3 of the Chinese interviewed and one Indian were in New Zealand at the time of their application, and 6 and 5 (17 and 14 per cent respectively) of the members of those two groups had previously visited the country; none of the South Africans who were already in the country when they applied had been there more than 6 months. Nevertheless, as noted above a majority of each group already had friends and fewer had relatives in New Zealand.

These personal contacts were of limited value to the migrants. A majority (64 per cent) said that they needed information about job prospects in New Zealand, but only one-third of these got such information from relatives and/or friends already in the country (Table 2). Similarly, half needed information regarding the recognition of their qualifications, but only five got this from friends and relatives. In other words, whereas friends and relatives may have provided general information about New Zealand, they were not an important source of specific material about qualification
recognition and/or job prospects, nor indeed did they play a prominent role in financing the move to New Zealand or in finding housing and/or jobs for their friends/kin. Unlike the chain migrations involving lower status immigrants (including many to New Zealand from Europe in the post-World War II decades: Thomson and Trlin, 1970; Trlin, 1973), these skilled migrants were much less dependent on their family and friends in accommodating to their new milieux. Most Chinese and South Africans and about half of the Indians used an immigration consultant to facilitate their applications, and this agent was also a limited source of other information.

**Keeping in touch**

Once in New Zealand, the great majority of the immigrants maintained regular contact with relatives and friends in their home country (Table 3). This contact took a number of forms, with telephone calls, e-mails and letters most frequently cited. In addition, the Indians and South Africans were much more likely to have provided assistance (including money) to relatives overseas than were the Chinese: over the three years after their arrival, 37 per cent of the respondents from India indicated that such help had been given, compared to 26 per cent from South Africans and 14 per cent from Chinese.6

Substantial numbers of participants travelled overseas in any one year. The South Africans were much more likely to journey away from New Zealand in the early years than their Chinese and Indian counterparts (Table 3) but rates of overseas travel increased among all three groups over the four-year period. Visiting family and friends plus holidays were the main reasons cited for overseas trips, though a small number indicated business reasons including, especially in the early years, completing the disposal of assets in their home countries.

Many participants reported an intention to travel to their home country in the coming year in each wave of interviews, with visits to family and/or friends the main reason for travelling. Interestingly, the percentages of both Chinese and South Africans intending to travel to their home country declined over time, whereas the percentage of Indians doubled. However, an intention to travel was not reflected in the actual trips reported, with Chinese generally making fewer trips than intended while the South Africans made more. Visits by kin and friends to the new residents were generally fewer than trips overseas by those who had moved to New Zealand. In general, the South Africans reported more visits from both relatives and friends than the Indians, who in turn reported more such visits than the Chinese.

**Bringing people in**

When asked whether they intended to encourage (by promoting the country) and/or assist (by arranging jobs and housing, for example) relatives and friends to move to New Zealand, there were substantial differences among the three groups. Many more of the South Africans indicated such an intention than did the Chinese, with the Indians occupying an intermediate position (Table 4). Among the South Africans and Indians, encouragement and assistance was much more likely to be offered to friends than to relatives, while among the Chinese the two groups were equally represented.

---

6 The question was not asked in the final questionnaire so we only have data for three years.
Whereas the South Africans’ intentions to encourage and/or assist others to migrate declined over time, those of both the Chinese and, especially, the Indians increased. By the last wave of the survey, for example, almost as many Indians intended to encourage and/or assist friends to move to New Zealand as had been the case with the South Africans three years previously.

These differences across the three groups regarding intended assistance and/or encouragement to relatives were equally marked in relation to moves encouraged during the year prior to the interview. The South Africans were initially more likely to have given encouragement than the Indians, who in turn were more likely than the Chinese, although the gaps closed in the later years. (Those persons assisted still needed to qualify for entry to New Zealand under one of the immigration categories. In many cases this was the same ‘general skills’ category under which the original migrants had entered the country, although some used the ‘family’ category.)

How many actually completed the task? With 24 households responding that they had assisted relatives to move to New Zealand during the preceding year, the South Africans outnumbered the Indians (16) and Chinese (10) in the number of separate migrant units (groups of any size) they brought to the country over the second-to-fifth waves of the study (Table 4). In percentage terms, however, in the later years more of the Indians were assisting relatives to move to New Zealand than was the case with the South Africans.

With regard to their relationships with those they brought to New Zealand, the Chinese participants only brought in members of their own families, whereas both the Indians and South Africans were more likely to bring in members of their spouse’s family than of their own. This partly reflects the participants’ circumstances at their time of arrival. Eleven of the Chinese migrated to New Zealand alone, compared to 9 of the Indians and 3 of the South Africans. By the end of the study, however, 23 of the 24 remaining Chinese panel members had a spouse/partner living with them in New Zealand, as had 25 of the 26 Indians and 27 of the 30 South Africans. In all, the Chinese assisted 19 individuals to move to New Zealand, the Indians 44, and the South Africans 41.

Summing up the patterns

The data reported in Tables 3-4 suggest considerable movement of both information and people through the international networks sustained by these migrants to New Zealand, though the volumes changed over time and among the three groups. To some extent, however, it may have been the same people in each year who were travelling, encouraging and assisting, suggesting that some of the chains were much stronger than others. To explore whether that was so, we identified the number of contacts in each of the categories for each person still participating in the study at the time of the final wave of interviews.

When asked if they had regular contacts with people in their former home country, the great majority in each group responded positively in all four interviews following the first (Table 5). But such similarity of experience did not extend to overseas travel. Only one of the 30 South Africans had not travelled overseas during at least one of the four years, compared to 7 Chinese and 5 Indians. Similarly, over half of the South
Africans had travelled overseas in three or four of the years studied compared with just over one-quarter of the Chinese and Indians. Intentions to visit their home country did not vary in the same way, however: the Chinese and Indians were much more likely to report such an intention than were the South Africans. On the other hand, the South Africans were much more likely to report having had visits from relatives during the previous year, with over one-third reporting such a visit in all of the three years in which the question was asked. Thus overall, the South African respondents were much more likely to have direct contacts with their relatives – either in New Zealand or in their home country – than were either the Indians or the Chinese.

Turning to the promotion of further immigration to New Zealand, there was substantial variation across the three groups in the frequency of positive responses to two questions regarding their intentions to encourage immigration to New Zealand by relatives and friends. None of the Chinese gave a positive response to either question on more than two occasions, for example, whereas in all four years one-third of the South Africans said that they intended to encourage friends (Table 6). These differences were matched by the frequency with which respondents said that they had provided encouragement: a majority of the South Africans had done so in either three or four of the years, unlike participants from the other two groups, especially the Chinese. However, while both the intentions to encourage and actual encouragement varied substantially among the groups, there was much less difference in the achievement rates: 12 of the South Africans reported assisting relatives to move, compared to 11 of the Indians and 8 of the Chinese.

These patterns have been synthesised by summing the number of years reported in Tables 5 and 6 for each respondent to give a total contact-and-assistance score, which could vary between 0 and 35. Nobody scored over 30. The distributions for each group are given in Table 7, along with the means and standard deviations. The differences are clear, with the South Africans having a mean score nearly twice that of the Chinese and the Indians occupying a position between the two, though somewhat closer to the South Africans. The information-and-movement chains established by the South African migrants were stronger than those of the other two groups, particularly the Chinese. On the other hand, in terms of delivering new migrants to New Zealand, those differences were less as the Indians generated/stimulated more moves than their South African counterparts – who were also more numerous in the final wave of interviews. The weaker ties displayed by the Chinese were clearly reflected in their smaller potential contribution to future migration to New Zealand.

**Pattern dimensions**

The distributions and summary statistics reported in Table 7 suggest a unidimensional structure: the South Africans score highest on all nine questions summarised and the Chinese lowest. To explore whether there were differences between the groups in their responses to the various questions, we undertook a principal components factor analysis of each individual’s score on each of the nine questions; this is an ideal method for exploring both whether there are general patterns to the responses (i.e. that there were underlying general attitudes stimulating responses) and also whether members of the three groups varied in the strength of their responses. The variables were the number of years in which the individual responded positively to each of the
nine questions and the observations were the 80 individuals remaining in the sample by the final interview.

Three separate components with eigenvalues greater than 1.0 were extracted: the loadings are in Table 8, with those greater than 0.50 shown in bold. The first factor indicates a general migration-encouragement dimension, with high positive loadings on five of the nine variables, all but one of them referring to migration encouragement and assistance. Individuals with high positive scores on this factor were those who were most actively encouraging immigration of friends and relatives to New Zealand during the years of the panel study. The second factor has high loadings for the three variables relating to contacts outside New Zealand. Participants with the highest scores on the second factor were those who travelled most, intended to visit their home country most and were most likely to maintain close contacts with relatives and friends there. Finally, the third factor loads heavily on just two variables – assistance for relatives moving to New Zealand and frequency of overseas travel.

The bottom block of Table 8 gives the mean score for each national group on each of the three factors. On both the first and the third factors, the arrangement of the three groups matches the general interpretation of the data in the previous tables; the South Africans have high positive scores on average and the Chinese have high negative scores. The first factor indicates that the South Africans reported encouragement to migrate much more frequently than did the Chinese, with the Indians in an intermediate position. Similarly, the positive score for the South Africans on the third factor indicates that they were much more likely than members of either of the other two groups (both of which have negative averages) both to travel abroad regularly and to assist moves to New Zealand – though no causal link between the two can be assumed. In each case, analysis-of-variance (ANOVA) tests on differences between the three groups, which set the South Africans as the comparator, show significant differences between the South Africans and the other two groups.

Finally, the positive average score for the Indians on Factor II indicates that they had the highest levels of personal contact linked with overseas travel, both actual and intended. However, the ANOVA shows no significant differences among the three groups, the members of which all had similar patterns of contact with their home country.

**Keeping the chains alive?**

The preceding discussion has provided substantial evidence that some of the migrants had encouraged others – both kith and kin – to join them in New Zealand. Were they the ones who had themselves been encouraged to move by others already in New Zealand? Did they keep existing chains alive or did they forge new ones of their own? Once transnational networks have been established, are they maintained?

Of the 107 original panel members, who were interviewed at least once in the subsequent waves, 34 (32 per cent) had assisted at least one relative to move to New Zealand, as had 30 (38 per cent) of the 80 who were interviewed in all five waves.

---

7 Rotation of the factors – either orthogonal or oblique – did not enhance the structure and so the unrotated factors are interpreted here.
Among the latter, one person had assisted 12 kin to migrate and another five participants had assisted 6. Comparing the three separate groups, Table 9 shows that, both absolutely and relatively, more Indians helped kin to move to New Zealand than was the case with either the South Africans or the Chinese – even though one South African had assisted 12 kin to migrate; four Indians had each assisted six other family groups of various sizes.

But were those who assisted their kin to move also those who already had family members in New Zealand? Table 10 shows that whether we look at all of the survey participants or just those who remained on the panel throughout the study, a larger proportion of those with family already in New Zealand had themselves assisted kin to join them than was the case for the remaining participants. The difference between the two groups was greatest among the Chinese, few of whom had family present in New Zealand prior to their own move.

Successfully assisting family members to move to New Zealand is, of course, only one way of sustaining the social networks involved in migration. Even if no family members actually moved, much effort may have been expended by individuals to keep the networks alive and encourage further movement. To see whether network intensity was associated with the existence of prior links with New Zealand, Table 11 gives the mean scores for each of the three groups on the three factors identified in Table 8, according to the nature of their prior links. In each case, a high positive score indicates a high-intensity network – i.e. a lot of contact – whereas a high negative score indicates a low-intensity network. If those with relatives and/or friends in New Zealand were more involved in promoting migration and sustaining contacts, they should have higher means on the factor than those who had no friends and/or family in New Zealand prior to migration. No overall pattern in line with that expectation stands out, however. Indeed, in several cases the differences are in the opposite direction to that expected.

**Exploring inter-country differences**

The results reported above indicate significant differences between migrants from the three countries on two of the ‘chain migration’ factors identified from analyses of their contact patterns – the extent of promotion of migration to New Zealand, and the number of times they succeeded in attracting a relative or friend to move to the country. Why should those differences have occurred? Do they reflect different responses to the migration experience?

At the end of the final interview in 2002, each participant and her/his spouse/partner was asked two questions regarding their experience of New Zealand:

1. On reflection, do you feel you made the right decision to come to New Zealand?
2. Finally, taking all things into account, how well settled do you feel yourself to be?

Responses to each question were coded on a five-point scale from 1 (completely settled) to 5 (very unsettled). The results were very positive (Table 12). Only two participants (both from India) and two partners (again, both from India) said that they had made the wrong decision to come (in one case, both participant and partner gave that response). Between a third and a quarter of the participants said that they were
unsure (in a majority of cases, both partners were unsure), but a clear majority felt they had made the right decision. There were considerable differences among the three groups in the level of certainty, however, with most of those who were unsure being migrants from either China or India.

With regard to the degree to which participants and their partners felt settled in New Zealand, again almost all gave a positive response. Just one participant and one partner recorded being very unsettled (they were from the same household). Again, however, there were clear differences between the groups; the South Africans were much more likely to feel completely settled than immigrants from either China or India.

Was this variation in the degree of satisfaction with their move to New Zealand reflected in their contacts with the home country and their willingness to promote migration by friends and relatives? Those who were content should have been more prepared to extol New Zealand’s perceived virtues to their kin and friends, whereas those less content may be reluctant to admit that to their contacts at home. Table 13 gives the mean score on each of the three factors identified in Table 8, according to responses to the two satisfaction questions. The patterning of those means is entirely consistent with a hypothesis that those who felt they had made the right decision and felt more settled would more actively encourage further migration to New Zealand. Thus those who said they had made the right decision averaged positive scores on Factor I, while others averaged negative scores. Similarly, the less settled they felt, the lower their score. Further migration to New Zealand had been promoted by those who, ‘taking all things into account’, felt most settled in their new homes. The same was true for their partners, with one exception – the large positive mean for the two with a score of 4 on the second question.

On Factor III, too, there was a clear relationship between the factor score and the perceived success of the move – a positive score indicates higher levels of travel abroad and more relatives successfully brought to New Zealand. Those who had made the right decision and who felt completely settled had positive average scores, whereas those who were not sure or were unsettled had negative scores.

Factor II indexed the amount of contact with the home country, and it is here that the clearest differences appear in Table 13: (a) between those who felt they had made the wrong decision and all others; and (b) between those who felt very unsettled and all others. There was, of course, a clear link between the two: those who were either unsure or negative about the move were much more likely to be unsettled. Those who regretted coming to New Zealand and those who felt unsettled had much less contact with home – as shown by the high negative average scores – than their counterparts who were more satisfied with the move. Maintaining contacts was greatest among those who were content with their move to New Zealand.

Feeling settled and that one has made the right decision at the end of the study period, of course, does not mean that there were no prior concerns. In the second interview

---

8 Because the two questions on the rightness of the move were asked at the end of the fifth questionnaire, it could be that having brought more people to New Zealand was the cause of their positive response rather than the consequence. Our interpretation, however, is that the two are mutually reinforcing: contentment with the move is linked to encouraging others to do likewise.
(1999), for example, when participants were asked if they had experienced ‘culture shock’, 43 per cent of the South Africans responded positively as against 30 per cent of the Chinese and 18 per cent of the Indians. They were also asked, in that and the subsequent three interviews, whether they had experienced ‘homesickness’. The majority responded positively in the second-wave interview (77 per cent of South Africans, 64 per cent of Chinese and 54 per cent of Indians), but the percentages fell sharply in the following years, especially among the Indians. Only 18 per cent of the Indians reported homesickness in wave 5, compared with 41 per cent of the Chinese and 32 per cent of the South Africans.  

Understanding satisfaction

The South African immigrants were generally more positive about their move to New Zealand than were either the Indians or, especially, the Chinese, and they were also more involved in both promoting and successfully completing chain migration. ANOVAs (the results of which are not reproduced here) confirm the inter-relationships. In analyses of the participants’ scores on all three factors, it was their country of origin that accounted for most of the variation. The implication, therefore, is that the South Africans were more active in promoting migration to New Zealand because they were more positive about the experience themselves.

Why should this be? The questionnaires used in the various waves of the study consistently covered a number of aspects of the immigrants’ lives, including their employment, education, housing and social interaction experiences, as well as their health and well-being. From these, several elements have been identified to explore whether there were major differences between the three groups in their experience of living in New Zealand which might account for differences in their overall levels of satisfaction with the move and hence their promotion of further migration. We are positing that satisfaction is an intervening variable between the migrants’ experiences of life in New Zealand and their involvement in promoting chain migration, although satisfaction was only measured at the end of the final interview so causal links in a dynamic process over the five years of the study can only be inferred.

By far the clearest difference between the three groups was in their employment experience (Table 14). Participants were asked about their current employment situation each year. Of those interviewed in all five waves, none of the Chinese were employed full-time in every year, compared with two-thirds of the South Africans. Furthermore, only one of the South Africans reported being unemployed and seeking work (twice), whereas a majority of both the Chinese and the Indians reported being in that situation on at least one occasion.

With regard to housing, the participants were asked each year whether they were satisfied with their current accommodation. Most replied that they were in most of the interviews, and the differences between the three groups were only slight: the Chinese (perhaps reflecting their greater employment difficulties) were slightly less likely to

---

9 Among both the Indians and the South Africans, a greater number reported in the last two annual interviews that although they didn’t feel homesick themselves, others in their immediate household did.

10 A considerable number of the Chinese, and some of the Indians, were in full-time education for some of the period, seeking to enhance their qualifications and their facility with the English language in order to improve their prospects for employment (Trlin et al, 2004)
say that they were satisfied than were the Indians and South Africans. On social interaction, participants were asked in the fifth wave interview whether they had experienced any event or feature with regard to social interaction which they saw as a difficulty. A minority identified such an event/feature, with the Chinese participants again more likely to do so than members of the other two groups.

Each of the five questionnaires asked the participants two batteries of questions regarding their physical health and general well-being. The responses were summed to give aggregate measures, according to standard scaling procedures. These measures were summed for each participant over all five waves, and the mean calculated for each of the three groups. The results show no differences among them (Table 14); on average, members of all three groups were equally healthy-unhealthy.

Finally, as an indicator of commitment to New Zealand and as a reflection of the migration experience, we looked at the number of participants and their spouses who had taken out New Zealand citizenship by the time of the fifth interview. The South Africans (both the participants and their spouses) were least likely to have decided against an application and were slightly more likely to have already obtained New Zealand citizenship. The number who had decided not to apply was greatest among the Indians.

Given that only 80 participants remained by the end of the study, formal statistical analysis evaluating the relative impact of the various factors identified here is largely uninformative, particularly so since there is considerable collinearity among several of the variables. What comes through clearly in all of the attempted tests, however, is that by far the most significant influence on the intensity of the chain migration network, however measured, is country of origin. The South Africans have the most intense networks and the Chinese the least. Nevertheless, analyses of the actual impact of those networks – the number of individuals assisted to migrate – indicate that there are no substantial statistical differences among the groups.

Conclusions

Although a majority of the three groups of skilled immigrants discussed here had friends already in the country, few had relatives already in New Zealand. Furthermore, although these friends and relatives may have provided a great deal of general information and encouragement, most of the participants in the study did not rely on them either for migration assistance or to find either employment or housing.

11 One participant – a Chinese – and two of the spouses – one Chinese and one Indian – were not eligible for citizenship. Although citizenship can be used as a measure of commitment to New Zealand, some may have taken it out simply to facilitate further international travel (to Australia, for example), whereas others may have retained dual citizenship and taken up New Zealand nationality simply for convenience while living there – especially if they intended to travel internationally, since New Zealand citizenship would make re-entry much easier. New Zealand, India (since 2003) and South Africa allow dual citizenship; China does not.

12 For some of the Indians, until a recent change in the legal situation under an Act passed in December 2003 (see http://www.immigration.com/india/dualindia.html), taking out New Zealand citizenship carried the negative consequence of losing home-country citizenship, which included the right to own land and other assets. For others, the costs meant that the decision to take out citizenship was staggered within families.
Chain migration was not the norm for the arrival and initial settlement of these skilled migrants.

Having arrived in New Zealand, some of the new residents then promoted their new home to friends and relatives, with whom they maintained close contact and, in some cases, visited frequently. A proportion of them – never more than one-fifth in any single year – actually assisted relatives to move to New Zealand and others actively promoted migration by their friends. In all, over the four years of the study after the initial interview, 104 relatives had been assisted to migrate, an average of one per original panel participant. Many of the 27 who left New Zealand before the final interview did not assist anybody to migrate whereas the immigration of 99 relatives was assisted by the 80 participants remaining in the study, an average of 1.24 per person. Over the first four years of their residence a considerable number of the new settlers used their networks to established strong migration chains, therefore, being sure they had made the right decision to migrate themselves and feeling settled in their new home country (with the latter perhaps assisted by the social networks established through the friends and kin encouraged and assisted to join them in New Zealand). And, of course, these chains, and others still only latent, may generate even more moves during the latter half of the first decade of settlement.

Within this general pattern, however, there were considerable differences among the three migrant groups. The South Africans, who generally had more in common with New Zealanders in both language and socio-cultural norms and experiences than either the Chinese or the Indians, were much more satisfied – especially in the early years – and much more active in promoting migration to New Zealand. This greater socio-cultural similarity was matched by their more positive experiences in the labour and housing markets in comparison with the Indian and, especially, Chinese participants. Over the four years of the study, however, the Chinese and Indians become more positive as they successfully negotiated routes into the labour market, many through tertiary education pursued to enhance their qualifications and ability with the English language. As a consequence, the Indians and Chinese became more active in promoting movement to New Zealand later in the study period: indeed, over the full period the Indian migrants assisted more of their kin to move than did the South Africans.

There are no norms against which to compare the experience of these three groups of skilled migrants to New Zealand, which makes it rather difficult to frame firm conclusions about the strength of chain migrations in this particular case. Clearly further migration to New Zealand followed the arrival of the 107 original participants in the study and (in most cases) their immediate families – though it is not possible to address the counter-factual of how many would have come without the encouragement and/or assistance of the participants and their partners. Further, we have no information on any snow-balling effects: have those assisted to move by the

---

13 Not all migrants will have been disposed to sponsor further migration of course, and others may not be able to do so because they lack ‘eligible’ relatives. Furthermore, with transnationalism families can be scattered over different continents as a strategy for future opportunities and security. We have no figure for the number of friends who actually migrated.

14 One reason for the weaker chains involving the Chinese from the PRC is that they come from a generation of smaller and declining families with siblings also finding opportunities in Hong Kong, USA, Canada etc.
participants assisted others in turn? What is clear is that the nature of the migrants’
experience during the first years in New Zealand influenced the degree to which they
encouraged migration by others. The Indians and Chinese were much less active in
the early years than their South African counterparts, but once they became settled
and had negotiated the labour and housing markets relatively successfully they too
became active promoters of migration to New Zealand. The Chinese remained less
involved in establishing such chains but by the end of the period the Indians were
extremely active, suggesting that the moves by the 26 skilled migrants remaining in
the study and their immediate family members were establishing what could, over the
following years, become quite substantial migration chains.

Forty years after the appearance of the MacDonalds’ (1964) classic paper on chain
migrations, this New Zealand study suggests that it may be time to reconsider both
their definition of chain migration and Boyd’s (1989) later synthesis of the literature
suggesting the central role of family and friendship networks in the promotion of
international migration. The nature of contemporary labour markets, information
transmission media and the opportunities for international travel mean that potential
migrants have many more sources of information about opportunities – including their
own experience – in other countries than was available even four decades ago.
Nevertheless, the results of this exploratory study of skilled new settlers to New
Zealand show that some chain migration continues. Sponsorship of friends and
relations is far from uncommon, especially as the new arrivals adjust to the socio-
cultural features of the host society and participate in mainstream social and economic
activities.

Chain migration continues to play a role in the era of transnationalism, therefore –
even among skilled, relatively affluent migrants – but it may no longer play the
central role posited for it a few decades ago. The globalisation of contemporary labour
markets – coupled with the emergence of other ‘drivers’ of international migration
(Hugo, 1999, 2-11) – means that substantial numbers can emigrate successfully
without the pre-migration and initial settlement assistance of family and friends that
the chain migration model posits, although where there are tight restrictions on
immigration the existence of strong networks can be very helpful in helping potential
settlers to make their applications. Once these ‘pioneers’ are settled in their new
homes, however, the findings of this New Zealand study indicate that further
migration is then stimulated – perhaps aided by immigration policies that encourage
human capital recruitment as well as family reunion. Chain migration is thus a
continuing part of the patterning of international flows, inter-woven with the greater
independence of movement that is now feasible.
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Table 1. Pre-arrival contacts in New Zealand, by country of origin.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>China</th>
<th>India</th>
<th>South Africa</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Family members already in New Zealand</strong></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immediate</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-laws</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Had friends already in New Zealand</strong></td>
<td>26</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Had ethnic association contacts in New Zealand</strong></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Had business contacts in New Zealand</strong></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Had previously visited New Zealand before applied</strong></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Was in New Zealand when approved</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visiting</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Studying</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2. Migration arrangements, by country of origin

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>China</th>
<th>India</th>
<th>South Africa</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Used immigration consultant</strong></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sources of information about job prospects</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NZ government</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relatives/friends in NZ</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relatives/friends at home</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agent</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>How paid for move to New Zealand</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal funds</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family money</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loan</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sold assets</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>36</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3. Contacts with the country-of-origin (percentage of participants in each year)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>China</th>
<th>India</th>
<th>South Africa</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Keep regular contacts with relatives and friends in home country</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Provided assistance to relatives overseas</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Travelled overseas in last year</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Intend to travel to home country in next year</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Visited by relatives since taking up permanent residence in NZ</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Visited by friends since taking up permanent residence in NZ</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4. Establishing migration chains, by country of origin (percentage of participants in each year)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>China</th>
<th>India</th>
<th>South Africa</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Intend to assist/encourage relatives to move to New Zealand</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Intend to assist/encourage friends to move to New Zealand</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Encouraged relatives to move to New Zealand</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Friends assisted/encouraged to move to New Zealand</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Assisted relatives to move to New Zealand</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5. Frequency of contact with the country-or-origin by participants remaining in New Zealand through the five annual interviews of the study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of years reporting regular contact with persons in home country</th>
<th>China</th>
<th>India</th>
<th>South Africa</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of years in which had travelled overseas</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of years in which intend to visit home country</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of years reporting visits from relatives</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TOTAL                                                                | 24    | 26    | 30           |
Table 6. Frequency of migration promotion by participants remaining in New Zealand through the five annual interviews of the study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>China</th>
<th>India</th>
<th>South Africa</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of years in which intended to encourage relatives to move</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of years in which intended to encourage friends to move</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of years in which have encouraged relatives to move</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of years in which assisted/encouraged friends to move</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of years in which assisted relatives to move</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>24</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 7. Total contact-and-assistance scores by participants remaining in New Zealand through the five annual interviews of the study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>China</th>
<th>India</th>
<th>South Africa</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-20</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-30</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>16.3</td>
<td>19.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 8. Principal components factor analysis of contact variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>I</th>
<th>II</th>
<th>III</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assisted relatives</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>-0.22</td>
<td><strong>0.65</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assisted friends</td>
<td><strong>0.81</strong></td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encouraged relatives</td>
<td><strong>0.79</strong></td>
<td>-0.31</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intended encourage relatives</td>
<td><strong>0.63</strong></td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>-0.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intended encourage friends</td>
<td><strong>0.87</strong></td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travelled overseas</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td><strong>0.52</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.64</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intended visit home country</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td><strong>0.68</strong></td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regular contact home</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td><strong>0.57</strong></td>
<td>-0.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relatives have visited</td>
<td><strong>0.53</strong></td>
<td>-0.24</td>
<td>0.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eigenvalue</td>
<td>3.31</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>1.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per cent</td>
<td>33.7</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>13.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean factor scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>China</th>
<th>India</th>
<th>South Africa</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Factor I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean Score</td>
<td>-0.87</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANOVA coefficient</td>
<td><strong>-1.47</strong></td>
<td><strong>-0.48</strong></td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td><strong>22.7</strong></td>
<td>R² 0.35</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor II</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean Score</td>
<td>-0.15</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANOVA coefficient</td>
<td>-0.41</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>R² 0.02</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor III</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean Score</td>
<td>-0.32</td>
<td>-0.20</td>
<td>0.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANOVA coefficient</td>
<td><strong>-0.75</strong></td>
<td><strong>-0.63</strong></td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td><strong>5.0</strong></td>
<td>R² 0.11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Coefficients and F-values significantly different from zero at the 0.05 level or better are shown in bold.
Table 9. Number of times participants assisted family groups of different sizes to migrate to New Zealand

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>China A</th>
<th>China L</th>
<th>India A</th>
<th>India L</th>
<th>South Africa A</th>
<th>South Africa L</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A – all panel study members; L – those who remained in the panel study through to the last interview
Table 10. Number of participants who assisted relatives to move to New Zealand by whether they themselves had relatives there prior to moving

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>China</th>
<th></th>
<th>India</th>
<th></th>
<th>South Africa</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Relatives in NZ</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All study members</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviewed at all waves</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 11. Mean scores on the three contact-and-assistance factors by whether participants themselves had family and/or friends in New Zealand prior to migrating and whether they had assisted relatives to move.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>II</th>
<th>III</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Assisted Moves</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Family members already in New Zealand</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td></td>
<td>-1.03</td>
<td>-0.85</td>
<td>-0.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Africa</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>-0.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Friends already in New Zealand</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.90</td>
<td>-0.81</td>
<td>-0.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>-0.20</td>
<td>0.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Africa</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>-0.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Family or friends already in New Zealand</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.75</td>
<td>-0.91</td>
<td>-0.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.24</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>-0.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Africa</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>0.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Family and friends already in New Zealand</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.86</td>
<td>-1.10</td>
<td>-0.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>0.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Africa</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>0.18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 12. Participant evaluation of the move as reported in the final interview (2002) by those remaining in the study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>China</th>
<th>India</th>
<th>South Africa</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Did you make the right decision to come to New Zealand?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not sure/don’t know</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not sure/don’t know</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>How settled do you feel?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Completely</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Very unsettled</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Completely</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Very unsettled</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>23</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 13. Mean scores for participants and partners remaining in the study at the time of the last interview (2002) on the contact-and-assistance factors, by evaluation of the move

**Did you make the right decision to move to New Zealand?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Respondent</th>
<th></th>
<th>Partner</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not sure</td>
<td>-0.56</td>
<td>-0.13</td>
<td>-0.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>-0.31</td>
<td>-0.61</td>
<td>-0.73</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**How settled do you feel?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Respondent</th>
<th></th>
<th>Partner</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Completely</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>-0.38</td>
<td>-0.30</td>
<td>-0.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>-0.42</td>
<td>-0.35</td>
<td>-0.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Very unsettled</td>
<td>-1.02</td>
<td>-1.63</td>
<td>-0.63</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 14. Employment, housing and health experiences by respondents remaining through the full five years of the panel study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>China</th>
<th>India</th>
<th>South Africa</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Times reported being unemployed and seeking work</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>In full-time employment at all waves</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Times reported being satisfied with current accommodation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reported social participation difficult: wave 5</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mean sum of well-being scores across all five waves</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>52</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mean sum of health scores across all five waves</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>124</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>New Zealand citizenship – respondent</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taken out</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applied</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will apply</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Against/deferred</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>New Zealand citizenship – spouse</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taken out</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applied</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will apply</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Against/deferred</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>